

11th March, 1924

**THE  
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

**(Official Report)**

---

**FIRST SESSION**

**OF THE**

**SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1924**



**SIMLA  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS  
1924**

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME IV, PART II—19th February, 1924 to 12th March, 1924.

	PAGES.
<b>Tuesday, 19th February, 1924—</b>	
Question and Answer ... ..	771
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee Presented ... ..	771
Resolution <i>re</i> Muhammadan Representation—Debate Adjourned <i>sine die</i> ... ..	772-786
Resolution <i>re</i> Constitution of High Courts—Withdrawn ... ..	786-790
Resolution <i>re</i> the Return to India of Mr. B. G. Horniman—Adopted ... ..	791-816
<b>Wednesday, 20th February, 1924—</b>	
Committee on Public Petitions ... ..	817
Statement laid on the Table ... ..	817-821
Election of a Panel for the Advisory Publicity Committee ... ..	822
Demand for Supplementary Grants ... ..	822-863
<b>Thursday, 21st February, 1924—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	865-867
Unstarred Questions and Answers ... ..	867-870
Statement of Business ... ..	871
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ... ..	871-873
The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ... ..	873-875
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ... ..	875
The Indian Evidence (Amendment) Bill—Leave to Introduce refused ... ..	875-878
The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill—Introduced... ..	879
<b>Monday, 25th February, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	881
Questions and Answers ... ..	881-922
Unstarred questions and answers ... ..	922
Motion for Adjournment—Leave refused ... ..	922-926
The Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ... ..	926-927
The Indian Coinage (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended... ..	927-939
The Central Board of Revenue Bill—Passed as amended ... ..	940
Amendment of Standing Orders—Referred to a Select Committee ... ..	940-941
Election of a Panel of the Standing Committee to advise on questions relating to Emigration ... ..	941
<b>Tuesday, 26th February, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	943
Questions and Answers ... ..	943-948
Amendment of Standing Orders—Nominations for the Select Committee ... ..	949
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee presented ... ..	949

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
<b>Tuesday, 26th February, 1924—</b>	
Resolution <i>re</i> the Grievances of the Sikh Community—Adopted, as amended ... ..	949-992
Resolution <i>re</i> the Release of Sardar Kharak Singh—Adopted	992-1001
Resolution <i>re</i> the Release of Maulana Hasrat Mohani—Adopted, as amended ... ..	1001-1015
<b>Wednesday, 27th February, 1924—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	1017-1018
Election to the Panel of the Advisory Publicity Committee ...	1018
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Introduced...	1018-1019
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Introduced ... ..	1019
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended ... ..	1019-1043
<b>Thursday, 28th February, 1924—</b>	
Question and Answer ... ..	1045
Unstarred Question and Answer ... ..	1046
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—(Amendment of section 375)—Referred to Select Committee ... ..	1046-1056
The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill—Motion to circulate for opinions adopted ... ..	1056-1060
The Adoption (Registration) Bill—Leave to introduce refused	1060-1063
The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ...	1063-1065
The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill—Introduced ... ..	1065-1067
<b>Friday, 29th February, 1924—</b>	
Budget for 1924-25 ... ..	1069-1095
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion for leave to introduce adopted ... ..	1096
<b>Saturday, 1st March, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	1097
Questions and Answers ... ..	1097-1117
Unstarred Questions and Answers ... ..	1117-1118
Message from the Council of State ... ..	1118
Amendment of Standing Orders—Election of the Select Committee ... ..	1119
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced ... ..	1119
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Passed ... ..	1119
<b>Monday, 3rd March, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	1121
Questions and Answers ... ..	1121-1139
Resolution <i>re</i> the Separation of Railway Finance from General Finance—Discussion postponed ... ..	1139-1142
<b>Wednesday, 5th March, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	1143
General Discussion on the Budget ... ..	1143-1206
<b>Thursday, 6th March, 1924—</b>	
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Date for presentation of Select Committee's Report extended and Mr. M. A. Jinnah nominated to the Select Committee ... ..	1207
General Discussion on the Budget ... ..	1207-1272

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
<b>Saturday, 8th March, 1924—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	1273-1306
Special Session of the Assembly in Simla ... ..	1307
Unstarred Questions and Answers '... ..	1307-1315
Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed ... ..	1315
Messages from the Council of State ... ..	1315
Resolution <i>re</i> Separation of Railway Finance from General Finance—Consideration Adjourned ... ..	1316-1318
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	1318-1319
The Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	1319
The Criminal Tribes Bill—Passed ... ..	1319-1320
The Indian Tolls Bill—Motion for taking into consideration negatived ... ..	1320-1326
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Referred to a Select Committee ... ..	1326-1327
Resolution <i>re</i> The Ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of, and Traffic in, Obscene Publications—Adopted as Amended ... ..	1327-1338
<b>Monday, 10th March, 1924—</b>	
Members Sworn ... ..	1339
Questions and Answers ... ..	1339-1371
Unstarred Question and Answer ... ..	1371
Question <i>re</i> Cabinet Committee to consider Indian Affairs ... ..	1372-1375
The Indian Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Date for presenta- tion of Select Committee's Report extended ... ..	1375
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee presented ... ..	1376
Salary of the President of the Legislative Assembly ... ..	1376
The Budget—List of Demands ... ..	1376-1430
<b>Tuesday, 11th March, 1924—</b>	
Death of Mr. G. M. Bhurgri ... ..	1431-1434
Questions and Answers ... ..	1434-1443
Statement of the Position of the National Party in regard to the Demands for Grants ... ..	1443-1444
The Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i> ... ..	1445-1518
<b>Wednesday, 12th March, 1924—</b>	
Message from the Council of State ... ..	1519
Report of the Select Committee on Standing Orders—Present- ed ... ..	1519
The Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i> ... ..	1519-1605

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 11th March, 1924.

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

## DEATH OF Mr. G. M. BHURGRI.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru** (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Sir, before you begin the business of the day, it is my painful duty to convey a very sad news to this House. It is the news of the untimely death of our colleague, Mr. Bhurgri, which sad event occurred last night. We were informed of it only a few minutes ago by a press message. In Mr. Bhurgri, Sir, many of us lose a true and valued personal friend and the House loses a very earnest worker, a valued colleague and true patriot. I have no doubt that the House will agree to communicate a message of sympathy and condolence to his relations and to express the grief which I am sure is felt by every Member of this House.

**Maulvi Muhammad Yakub** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhamadan Rural): Sir, I wish also to associate myself with what has fallen from the lips of Pandit Motilal Nehru. Sir, I knew Mr. Bhurgri for the last 25 years from the time when he joined the collegiate school at Aligarh. He was in his school life popular and won the esteem and love of all those who came in contact with him, and afterwards in public life he proved to be a true Aligarh boy, a genuine patriot and a worthy son of the Motherland. It is very sad indeed that the cruel hand of premature death has snatched away from us a young man and a valuable servant of the country at a time when his services were so badly needed. When we all came to Delhi at the commencement of the present Session, I looked forward with great eagerness to the time of his arrival here, and was very much pleased at the prospect of meeting him again, but unfortunately it was not destined to be, and we will not see him ever in this world. Really it is very sad, and it is difficult for me to convey by means of any words, the expression of our feelings. With these words I support the proposition that we should convey our condolence to the bereaved family of the late Mr. Bhurgri.

**Maulvi Abul Kasem** (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, the news of the death of Mr. Bhurgri came to me as a very great shock. I came to know him at the meetings of the Congress, about 20 years back. He was one of the very few Muhammadans who had the courage of his convictions, and ventured to go into the Congress camp in spite of the jeers and the jibes of the members of the community, and he has maintained that character to the end of his life. He wanted, Sir, to do his duty by the country without fear and favour. He feared not any man, however high or powerful he might be, and he cared not for the claps or the cheers of the populace. But he did his duty honestly, according to the dictates

[Maulvi Abul Kasem.]

of his conscience. He was one of the best Indians, and I believe one of the foremost Muhammadan public men that I know of, and Sir, I believe, although unfortunately for us and unfortunately for the country, he was not allowed by Providence to take his seat in this House or to take part in the debates of this Assembly, he was not unknown to the Imperial Legislature, as he was for some time a Member of the Council of State, and had to resign it as a protest. I, Sir, associate myself with the request of Pandit Motilal Nehru that this House should convey regret and sympathy with the members of the bereaved family, and I can assure you, Sir, that to us Muhammadans the loss of Mr. Bhurgri is very great, because we have few men of his ability, of his character and of his influence.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas** (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): I rise, Sir, to pay my tribute to the memory of the late Mr. Bhurgri. My acquaintance with him began with the Provincial Legislature, and, ever since I came in contact with him, I had been greatly impressed by his broad outlook, by his capacity to rise above any communal considerations, and above all by his sterling independence. He belonged to that class which I am afraid has been grossly misunderstood during the last 10 years at least. He had much genuine sympathy with order and orderly Government, but he combined with it also such a strong sense of criticism for whatever he found defective in the present administration that, even though everybody in the country may not appreciate the loss sustained by the country in his death at this juncture, I am sure not many years will be required in order to appreciate what great services he did in his own way till now, and how very useful he would have been hereafter. I particularly wish to refer, Sir, to his very broad outlook in connection with Hindu-Muslim unity, and I think it is a real disaster to the country at large that at a time when the Hindu-Muslim question is developing in such an ominous manner, the country should be deprived of his wise counsel, his great influence, and above all, his level-headedness. On behalf, therefore, if I may claim to say so, of at least one section of the Hindu community, I think the House would do very well indeed to support the motion of the Honourable Pandit, and I only hope Mr. Bhurgri's mantle will fall on somebody equally correctly and with equal force.

**Sir Campbell Rhodes** (Bengal: European): Sir, I had not the honour of the acquaintance of our late colleague, but, on behalf of my community, the European non-officials of this House, I should like to associate myself with this vote of condolence and express our sympathy with those members of the House who have lost a close friend.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley** (Home Member): The late Mr. Bhurgri, as Mr. Abdul Kasem said, never actually took his seat as a Member of this House; but we knew him well on the Council of State, and there are many of us who had the privilege of his private friendship. I myself saw much of him and on somewhat intimate terms, and I regret the loss of one who had a particularly charming disposition, open outlook and independent mind. There has been more than one occasion on which he differed from Government, I regret that he found it necessary to resign his seat on the Council of State; I regret again that he never, as we thought, did full justice to our real attempts to secure a provision of the Treaty of Sèvres. But, Sir, these were differences of

opinion only and nothing that I say now must be taken to retract from my real appreciation of his character and my sincere regret that death has deprived this House of close association with one who would have been of real value to its counsels—a moderating influence and a unifying influence. With great sincerity, I associate myself, on behalf of Government, with the expressions of sympathy and regret on the loss of Mr. Bhurgri.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya** (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): It is a sad duty, Sir, which one has to perform in offering a tribute of love and respect to the memory of an esteemed brother and a countryman. I had the privilege of knowing Mr. Bhurgri for many years, and I feel that there was not a man in the country whose patriotism was more ardent and more sincere, or whose love of his fellow-men was more genuine than Mr. Bhurgri's. On questions of Indian nationalism he had only one view. As a Muhammadan, he believed in his faith and lived up to it, but he did not allow any questions of faith to stand between him and his national duty to the country. He was always an influence for good in promoting peace and harmony. The personal worth of his character, his sweet disposition, the sweet reasonableness which he always displayed and his burning patriotism are fresh in the memory of many of us. It is a great loss to the country that such a man should have been taken away from our midst at this juncture. All that is left to us now is to offer a loving tribute of respect to his memory and our deep sympathy to those he has left behind him, and I join with my colleagues in doing so.

**The Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma** (Member for Education, Health and Lands): I may be permitted to join the Members of this House in the tribute of praise, love and regard for the memory of my dear old friend, Mr. Bhurgri. I knew him in my pre-official days, when I was a member of the Congress, and I may say that all those who were connected with that national movement owe much to the solid national instincts of Mr. Bhurgri who attempted to rise above communal prejudice and looked at every problem from a truly national standpoint. I was associated with him as a Member of the Council of State, and his level headedness, and his practical mind, were continually in evidence whenever he tackled any subject on its merits. We, the Members of the Council of State, regretted very much when he chose on a question of principle to resign his seat there, and were looking forward to his coming back to us. But, when he chose this House, we felt that what was our loss was going to be your gain, and, when we met a few months ago, we looked forward to renewing those old ties and associations. But alas, I am to be disappointed. His loss is particularly unfortunate at a time when true Indian interests required to be based upon the consolidation of the friendly relations between Hindus and Mussalmans. Well, Sir, I need say no more except that the Members of the Council of State are no less sorry than you that the untimely death of Mr. Bhurgri has deprived the country of the loyal services of a true citizen and a sincere patriot.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I personally feel overcome with so much grief at the sad news of the death of Mr. Bhurgri that I cannot adequately express what my feelings are. He was a personal and a true friend of mine and I was associated with him for a number of years. In him I have personally lost one of the few true friends that I have in this world; but what is more, it is a national loss. Mr. Bhurgri was a tower of strength not only in his own community, but

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

also among the other communities with whom he worked. He was a man who was thoroughly disinterested. He never cared either for popular applause or for Government favours. He stood out on every occasion and did what his judgment and his convictions dictated to him. Sir, the loss of such a man is a national loss and at this moment I feel it will be very difficult to fill his place in the political world of India. I thoroughly associate myself with the motion of the Honourable Pandit Moti Lal Nehru and I hope that this House will carry it.

**Mr. N. M. Dumasia** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, I beg to associate myself with what has fallen from previous speakers. I knew Mr. Bhurgri intimately for the last several years. He was a great gentleman. India is poorer by his loss, which will never be replaced. He was a friend, philosopher and guide to his community; but he was also a true Indian patriot. I remember one instance of his love for Indians. The old Provincial Councils elected two Members to the Viceregal Council. When he saw that Mr. Gokhale's position—Mr. Gokhale was a candidate—was at stake, he not only powerfully supported him but gave away his vote to Mr. Gokhale, although there was a powerful Muhammadan candidate in the field. That showed that he was above party considerations and communal considerations, and, I think, India has lost a great and true son, and his loss, especially to his province and to his community, is irreparable. With these words, I beg to associate myself with the expressions of regret expressed by the previous speakers.

**Mr. P. E. Percival** (Bombay: Nominated Official): Sir, I desire personally and also on behalf of the Bombay Government entirely to associate myself with the expressions of regret voiced by the Honourable Members of this Assembly, in respect of the premature death of Mr. Bhurgri.

**Mr. President:** I know that I shall be expressing the unanimous desire of the House when I say that I shall make it my immediate duty to convey to Mr. Bhurgri's relatives the sincere and deep expression of sympathy which this House feels with them in their bereavement, and, in order to show the sincerity of those tributes, I shall make it my business to send them a copy of to-day's proceedings.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

##### PUNISHMENTS INFLICTED ON THE POSTAL STAFF IN THE PUNJAB AND N. W. F. POSTAL CIRCLE.

736. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to furnish the following information:

- (a) Number of punishments by fine, during the years 1921-22 and 1922-23, respectively:
  - (i) In the Punjab and N.-W. F. Postal Circle as a whole?
  - (ii) In the Lahore G. P. O.?
  - (iii) In the Rawalpindi G. P. O.?
  - (iv) In the Ludhiana, Gujrat and Derajat divisions (separately).



- (b) Number of punishments by withholding increments, during the years 1921-22 and 1922-23, in (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) above in (a)?
- (c) Number of punishments by dismissal and dispensing with of services?
- (d) Number of cases in which increments have been stopped to effect future increments, and the resultant loss to the officials during the rest of their services?

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:** Government do not think any useful purpose will be served by collecting and collating the elaborate statistics asked for by the Honourable Member. If any postal official has been unjustly punished, he has the right of appeal.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** May I ask whether Government have received any appeals from any of these officials?

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:** I believe some appeals have come in, but I could not answer offhand.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** What has been the fate of these appeals?

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:** I could not say.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Honourable Member give the information after inquiry?

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:** I shall give the information to the persons concerned. If the Honourable Member can point out that anybody has been unjustly punished, I shall give him the information.

PUNISHMENTS INFLICTED ON THE POSTAL STAFF OF THE RAWALPINDI  
G. P. O.

787. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state separately, the number of postal officials suspended, dismissed and whose services were dispensed with by Mr. Williams, Postmaster, Rawalpindi, during his time and the figures for the corresponding period of his predecessor?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state the number of postal officials re-instated in the Rawalpindi G. P. O. on appeals against the orders of Mr. Williams, Postmaster, Rawalpindi?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state the amount of arrears and pay paid by Government to officials mentioned in (b) above and to their substitutes, respectively, during their period of suspension?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state the net loss caused to the Department by these punishments?

**Mr. G. R. Clarke:** (a) Three, ten and nineteen, respectively, by Mr. Williams. There were no suspensions or dismissals for the corresponding period of his predecessor, but the services of three officials were dispensed with.

(b) Eighteen.

(c) Amount paid to officials re-instated was Rs. 2,176-7-0 and that paid to substitutes was Rs. 2,722-10-0.

(d) Rs. 1,445-12-0.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** I did not quite catch the Honourable Member's reply to part (c) of the question.

**Mr. G. E. Clarke:** Amount paid to officials re-instated was Rs. 2,176-7-0 and that paid to substitutes was Rs. 2,722-12-0.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** Was any action taken against Mr. Williams?

**Mr. G. E. Clarke:** I do not think this question arises.

PUNISHMENTS INFLICTED ON THE POSTAL STAFF OF THE RAWALPINDI  
G. P. O.

788. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** Is it a fact that the following postal officials were suspended, dismissed or their services dispensed with by Mr. Williams, Postmaster, Rawalpindi, and that at least three of them, namely, Shiv Das, Jan Mohammed and Ishar Das, have subsequently died?

Serial No.	Name.	Length of Service.
1	Ram Narain Chopra	14 years.
2	Jaggat Singh	4 "
3	Amar Dass	6 "
4	Gurwardhan Nath.	3 "
5	Arjan Singh	7 "
6	Banot Singh.	1 year.
7	Wazir Singh	2 years.
8	Lachman Dass	3 "
9	Mathra Dass	2 "
10	Shiv Dass	5 " Died.
11	Daya Ram	6 "
12	Mohammad Alam	6 "
13	Barkat Hussain	2 "
14	Gian Chand	3 "
15	Jagan Nath	5 "
16	Ram Asra Mall	5 "
17	Balwant Singh	
18	Jan Mohammad	2 " Died.
19	Ishar Dass	3 " "
20	Saddar Din	2 "
21	Feroz Din	2 "
22	Aas Nand	2 "
23	Lakhmi Dass, Postman	22 "
24	Wishva Nath	
25	Ghulam Hussain	
26	Jagan Nath	22 "
27	Bishamber Nath	12 "
28	Karm Din	8 "

**Mr. G. E. Clarke:** Yes.

REJECTION BY MR. WILLIAMS, POSTMASTER, RAWALPINDI, OF MEDICAL  
CERTIFICATES GRANTED TO THE STAFF EMPLOYED UNDER HIM.

789. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to state the number of cases in which proper medical certificates, granted by competent medical authorities, namely, (a) Civil Surgeons, (b) Staff Surgeons and (c) registered private medical practitioners, were rejected by Mr. Williams, Postmaster, Rawalpindi?

**Mr. G. E. Clarke:** (a) Nil.

(b) Two.

(c) Nine.

**STRENGTH OF CLERICAL STAFF IN AND HEAD POST OFFICE IN THE PUNJAB AND N. W. F. CIRCLE.**

740. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to state the present clerical strength in each head office in the Punjab and N. W. F. Circle and that actually justified by the present time-test?

**Mr. G. E. Clarke:** A reference is invited to the reply given by me on the 25th February, 1924, to Mr. Kamini Kumar Chanda's starred Question No. 428.

In order to ascertain the number of clerks actually justified by the time-test in each of the offices concerned at the present moment, it would be necessary to record special statistics. Government do not propose to have this done, as any shortage of staff that there may be will be automatically made good under departmental arrangements.

**CASE OF MR. E. F. FLYNN, LATE PLATFORM INSPECTOR, AMBALA.**

741. **\*Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney:** 1. Will the Government be pleased to state whether one Mr. E. F. Flynn, late Platform Inspector, N. W. Railway, Ambala, was prosecuted at the instance of the Station Master and the Assistant Traffic Superintendent for having abetted the embezzlement of Rs. 18 and tried by the Sessions Judge, Ambala, with the aid of a jury, with the result that he was honourably acquitted with the finding that the case against him was a trumped up one?

2. Is it a fact that the said Mr. E. F. Flynn was, after re-instatement in his post lasting only for a few days, brought under reduction, and is no longer employed in the Railway?

3. Are the Government aware that, when he was paid his gratuity, his services were described as efficient, faithful and continuous?

4. Is it a fact that the said Mr. E. F. Flynn served the N. W. Railway for over thirty years and being under fifty years is physically quite fit to serve longer?

5. In view of the finding of the Sessions Judge and his re-instatement, and the absence of any other known reasons, will the Government be pleased to state the reason for the subsequent forced retirement of the said Mr. E. F. Flynn? What action do Government propose to take?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Government are making inquiries and will let the Honourable Member know the result in due course.

**HOLIDAYS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT.**

742. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** (a) Have Government issued any orders reducing the number of holidays in the Secretariat of the Government of India?

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

(c) What was the object underlying those orders? If they were intended to effect any economy in the working expenses, will Government please say, Department by Department, what economy has been effected in each case since the experiment of those orders?

(d) Do Government propose to re-sanction all those holidays that were granted before those orders retrenching the holidays?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** (a) Yes.

(b) A copy of the orders on the subject will be placed in the Library of this House.

(c) The Honourable Member will find an answer to this part of his question in the orders issued: the object was to substitute a smaller number of real holidays for a larger number of nominal holidays. There will be an improvement in Secretariat work, but it is not possible to estimate this in terms of definite saving.

(d) No.

#### OFFICE HOURS OF THE SECRETARIAT.

748. **\*Mr. Chaman Lal:** Is it a fact:

(a) That strict vigilance is kept over the working hours of the members of the Government of India Secretariat below the rank of the Registrar, while there are no standard office hours for officers above that rank, nor is there any record kept of the latter's casual leave or absence from their office?

(b) That members below the rank of the Registrar have generally to work overtime without any extra remuneration and that their closing hours in some departments are so late that no time is left for recreation or evening exercise?

(c) Do Government propose to consider the desirability of introducing a uniform system of office hours and of casual leave for all members of the Secretariat of the Government of India irrespective of rank and issue orders that the Secretariat offices should ordinarily close not later than 4-30 P.M.?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** (a) The office hours for the staff are 10-30 A.M. to 4-30 P.M. or 10-30 to 5 P.M. Saturday is a half holiday. It is a customary precaution in all offices to exercise some checks over the observance of these hours which are lighter than those in Government offices in England and to maintain a record of the casual leave enjoyed, which again is more liberal than that permitted in Government offices in England. These hours apply in name only to officers above the rank of Registrar, for few of them find it in practice possible to observe them. As in the higher grades of the Civil Service in England a 7-hour day has little meaning, so here the officers of the Secretariat work long beyond office hours. It is extremely rare for an officer of the Government of India to take casual leave, or to enjoy an occasional holiday. The practice rather is that after his tenure expires, he then takes regular leave.

(b) Members of the staff work extra hours whenever necessary and like the officers give generous measure. No extra remuneration is paid for such work except to the Assistants in the Budget section of the Finance Department who have work of quite exceptional nature during the Budget

season. Normally, however, as indicated in the answer to (a), the hours are not such as to deprive the staff of leisure or recreation.

Every member of the office establishment is allowed ten days' casual leave during the year, in addition to certain occasional holidays and five days' joining time at the move from Simla to Delhi and from Delhi to Simla.

(c) Government do not consider it necessary to change the existing system. A change in the direction suggested by the Honourable Member would necessarily bear more hardly on the establishment than on the officers.

ALAMBAGH TEMPLE DISPUTE.

744. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether their attention has been drawn to the Lucknow letter published in the "Indian Daily Mail" in its issue of the 27th February under the heading "Alambagh Temple Dispute"?
- (b) If so, will they please enlighten the House as to the incident, and the cause of the delay of the Railway authorities to settle the matter, referred to?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Government have seen the letter referred to. Full information about this incident has already been published in the Press and the Railway authorities issued a communiqué on the subject on February 1st last. It relates to two temples on land acquired by the Railway in 1920, and required for new loco. shops. Compensation was paid for the temples and demolition was begun. But the Hindus objected and prolonged negotiations ensued between the Railway authorities, the Local Government and certain prominent Hindu gentlemen. It has been decided to rebuild the temples at the cost of the Railway. There are still certain outstanding points, but it is believed that they are in a fair way to settlement.

APPOINTMENT OF A RATES TRIBUNAL.

745. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to the reply given to the Honourable Maharaja S. K. Acharyya's Question No. 94 in the Council of State on the 18th February, will the Government be pleased to state whether any decision has been arrived at in regard to the appointment of a Rates Tribunal?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in this Assembly on the 8th March, 1924, to Mr. Joshi's question\* on the subject.

AMENDMENT OF THE INCOME-TAX ACT.

746. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to the reply given to Question No. 97 in the Council of State on the 18th February, will the Government be pleased to state whether they have taken any action as was proposed to be done? If not, will they be pleased to state when they propose to take up the matter?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** The Government are informed that an appeal has been filed in the Calcutta High Court, against the decision referred to. The Government await the result of this appeal.

\* Vide Unstarred Question No. 184.

## EXPENDITURE ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL DEPARTMENT.

747. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) With reference to the reply given to Question No. 4, on the 80th January in the Council of State, will the Government be pleased to state the reasons why the expenditure on the Ecclesiastical Department rose from roughly 19 lakhs in 1914 to 33 lakhs in 1923?

(b) Do Government propose to bring down the expenditure on the department to the pre-war level? If not, will they please state the reasons?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** (a) As noted on page 175 of the Retrenchment Committee's report, the increased expenditure is almost entirely due to the revision of pay and allowances, and to the inclusion of leave allowances not previously shown under this head.

(b) As stated in my reply to a question put in this Assembly on the 1st February, 1924, it has been decided to make reductions to secure an ultimate saving of Rs. 4,80,000 a year, the bulk of it by the end of 1925-26. The whole position will be reviewed at the end of seven years.

**Mr. Ohaman Lal:** Are there any Pundits or Maulvis catering to the spiritual wants of His Majesty's Indian troops?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** Yes, Sir, the expenditure on them is shown in the Army estimates.

## RADIUM INSTITUTE AT RANCHI.

748. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Is it a fact that a Radium Institute has been established at Ranchi for the treatment of Cancer and other allied diseases?

(b) If so, will the Government be pleased to state whether the expenses of the Institute are borne by the Bihar and Orissa Government or by the Central Government?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** (a) Yes.

(b) The recurring expenses of the Institute are borne by the Bihar and Orissa Government, but the Government of India made an initial grant of Rs. 2 lakhs in 1920, in furtherance of the scheme.

**Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha:** Are Government aware that the number of patients at this Institute from provinces other than the province of Bihar and Orissa far exceeds the number of patients who belong to that province?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** I have no figures on the subject.

**Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha:** Have Government received any recommendation from the Government of Bihar and Orissa for any further grant to this Institute since 1920?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** Not that I remember, but I have not referred to the papers.

## OPENING OF A CENTRAL RADIUM INSTITUTE.

749. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** Do Government propose to open a Central Radium Institute at a central place for the benefit of the general public?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** Government have no such proposal before them.

MORTALITY FROM CANCER.

750. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the approximate number of deaths annually from cancer in India?

(b) If not, will they please make an inquiry into the matter?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** (a) and (b). The information required by the Honourable Member will not be available until registration improves in efficiency, and patients resort more readily to hospitals. I regret therefore that it is not possible to tell the Honourable Member what he wants to know on this subject. In the circumstances an inquiry would serve no useful purpose.

WAGON ALLOTMENTS FOR COAL.

751. \***Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** (a) Is it a fact that the Secretary, Indian Mining Federation, sent several protests both to the Coal Transportation Officer as well as the Government of India against the manner in which wagons have been allotted since April 1923?

(b) Is it a fact that the member of the Indian Mining Federation sitting in the Advisory Board has, on several occasions, condemned the system of allotting wagons and recorded his notes of dissent also?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state what action was taken on the protests referred to in (a) and (b)?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I think I am correct in saying that during the summer of 1923, no protests were received. On the contrary, all demands for wagons were complied with. As late as December, 1923, again, as I told the House recently, I met the Indian Mining Federation and their Chairman told me that they had no representations to make about wagon supply. But in January, the usual seasonal pressure began and complaints became numerous not only from colliery owners but also from consumers. Arrangements have now been made for supplies to small collieries. I have no information about the complaints to the Coal Transportation Officer and his Advisory Committee.

WAGON ALLOTMENTS TO THE SMALLER COLLIERIES.

752. \***Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** (a) Is it a fact that the Coal Transportation Officer and the President of the Advisory Board do not ever acknowledge the receipt of complaints made to them by the proprietors or their agents of the minor collieries?

(b) Is it a fact that under the present arrangement the following wagon supply alone was made to the smaller collieries:

*On B. N. Railway.*

On 17th February 1924—*Vid* Waltair only.

On 24th February 1924—On lower section of K. K. Link—Up supply.

On upper section of the K. K. Link—Down supply and partly Up supply.

On 25th February 1924—No allotment.

*On E. I. Railway.*

On 17th February 1924—Up and Down supply—Full on indents but with preference to Down supply.

On 24th February 1924—Up supply 33 per cent. to 40 per cent. Down supply—Full on indents.

On 25th February 1924—Up supply—50 per cent. Down supply—Full on indents.

Barakar Depôt—Full on indents, for both Up and Down and on both 24th February 1924 and 25th February 1924?

(c) Is it a fact that on 17th February 1924 one colliery was supplied 5 wagons against the basis of 4 wagons while another got only two against a basis of 4 wagons?

(d) If the answers to the above be in the affirmative will the Government be pleased to state whether better and more satisfactory arrangements will be made so as to ensure a sufficient and timely supply of wagons to the minor collieries also?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Inquiry is being made and the result will be communicated to the Honourable Member in due course.

POSITION OF BILLS PENDING IN THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE ON THE DISSOLUTION OF ONE CHAMBER.

753. **\*Mr. K. C. Roy:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to explain the position of Bills pending in the Indian Legislature when one Chamber of the Legislature is dissolved?

(b) Is it a fact that in England and in the Dominions the result of a dissolution of a Chamber of the Legislature is that all pending Bills lapse?

(c) If the answer to (b) be in the affirmative, do the Government propose to take any steps to bring the practice and procedure of this Legislature into line with that of the other Parliaments of the Empire?

**Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith:** (a) In the opinion of the Government of India the effect of the Government of India Act, and of the Rules and Standing Orders made thereunder, is that pending Bills do not lapse merely by reason of the dissolution of a Chamber of a Legislature.

(b) It is a fact that in the United Kingdom all pending Bills lapse on the dissolution of Parliament. In the Standing Orders of the Parliaments of South Africa and Australia express provision has been made to the same effect.

(c) The matter has already been receiving the attention of the Government, who think that it is desirable on several grounds that, on a dissolution of a Chamber, pending Bills should lapse, unless they have never been within the cognisance of the Chamber which is being dissolved. Government therefore contemplate the making of a rule under the Government of India Act, which would have this effect.



**Dr. H. S. Gour:** Is the Honourable Member aware that the tenure of office of Members of Parliament is five years whereas the tenure of office of the Members of the Legislative Assembly is three years? Is the Honourable Member further aware of the fact that, when Bills are introduced, it takes sometimes two and often three years to elicit opinions from the public and that the Bills are then ripe for further progress?

**Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith:** I am aware of that, Sir.

**Dr. H. S. Gour:** Have the Government of India adverted to those facts in contemplating a change in procedure?

**Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith:** Undoubtedly.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** May I know, Sir, if a similar difficulty has been referred to the Government of India in respect of provincial Legislatures and whether the Government of India contemplate altering the rules in regard to the provincial Legislatures in respect of this matter? Has any reference been received from Madras, for instance?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** No, Sir. I think I am correct in saying, after consulting my Honourable colleague, that in neither of the two Departments concerned have we had any reference on that subject.

---

STATEMENT OF THE POSITION OF THE NATIONALIST PARTY  
IN REGARD TO THE DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru** (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Sir, before the House enters upon a discussion of the remaining items of demands for grants, I beg your indulgence to allow me to make a statement. As the House will remember, in speaking yesterday on my motion for the total remission of the first demand, I made it perfectly clear that we were pressing that motion in order to establish a principle. I was speaking as a member of the whole Nationalist party and not of that section only of the party which consist of swarajists. I went further and said that the step we were taking was no part of what is called the wrecking policy generally attributed to that section. Now, Sir, we went to divisions on the first four of the demands yesterday, and every one of those demands was rejected by a majority. Since then we have met and considered the position and we have come to the conclusion that we have established the principle which we maintain and that it would not be necessary in dealing with the subsequent demands for grants to-day and on the following days to continue the same procedure. We therefore are now agreeable to let the discussion on the remaining demands proceed in the ordinary course. I make this statement to make the position of the Nationalist party quite clear and I hope it will be received, especially by the Treasury Benches, in the spirit in which it is made.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, as a member of the Nationalist party, I entirely endorse what Pandit Motilal Nehru has said. I want to make it clear further that the Nationalist party here in this House do not stand for any wrecking programme. I wish to make it further clear, especially with reference to what fell from my Honourable friend, Mr. Chatterjee, yesterday that the Nationalist party

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

is a party which is formed to work in this Assembly and nothing more; and in this Assembly we stand to pursue a policy and a programme of a constitutional character. We shall pursue that policy and that programme until the last stages of the constitutional struggle are exhausted. There is no idea in the mind of the Nationalist party to resort to civil disobedience. There is no idea in the mind of the Nationalist party that we want revolution. There is no idea in the mind of the Nationalist party that we are going to carry on the campaign of non-payment of taxes. Sir, it is perfectly legitimate for us, having regard to the ruling that you gave, that we could use the general discussion in what we wanted to make clear, namely, that we condemn the Government of India, we condemn the Secretary of State for India. Why? Because you have not satisfied us, in regard to the Resolution that we passed here by an overwhelming majority of 76, a Resolution which was a demand for reforms; and we wanted therefore to put in the clearest possible manner our protest, our condemnation, our disapproval of the way in which you have met us. We also recognize that there are difficulties, but we feel that you have failed, entirely failed, so far to satisfy us. Therefore, Sir, I do not think it fair for the Government to allege or attribute anything else to us except what is stated by me, nor do I wish that any wrong impression should be created abroad. As to what the Nationalist party stands for I have stated, and there can be no room for misunderstanding.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey** (Home Member): Pandit Motilal Nehru has asked that the Treasury Benches should express approval of the action which his party now proposes. The Treasury Benches are unable, and do not desire, to go into any question regarding the internal politics of the Nationalist party. We are not fully aware of its composition; I do not discredit to it when I say that up to the moment we have had some doubt as to its policy, or indeed if it has any one policy. When we are told that they have established their principle by the votes of yesterday, we take liberty to doubt it; when we are told that they have proved anything at all by their votes of yesterday, we equally take the liberty to retain our own opinion on the subject. They now desire, I understand, not to press their motions for the complete refusal of grants. We have no desire to challenge that decision. We ourselves have always been prepared to discuss these grants for the legitimate purpose and in the constitutional object for which they are put forward; we are so prepared to discuss them to-day. With regard to what Mr. Jinnah has said, I will only say in reply that I have not any desire to associate his section of the Nationalist party with the programme to which he referred. I was careful yesterday in speaking on the general subject to say that we do not charge them with any such intentions. I was careful to limit myself to reminding the House that we had had previous experience of mass movements in India and desired to see no recurrence of those experiences; mass movements we may perhaps see, but we do not wish to charge his friends with a wish to promote revolution or wreckage. We are both here for the moment on the floor of the House, fighting out a constitutional issue and we have no desire for the moment to look outside or to forecast anything that might happen off the floor of this House. For the present, we are content to fight out a constitutional issue in constitutional ways; one of those ways is the free and open discussion of all the demands put forward by Government for their expenditure. We are perfectly prepared to undertake that discussion.

# THE BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS

## SECOND STAGE—contd.

### *Expenditure from Revenue—contd.*

#### DEMAND NO. 5—LAND REVENUE.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Land Revenue'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND NO. 6—EXCISE.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Excise'."

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju** (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, my motion is that the demand under the head 'Excise' be reduced by Rs. 100. When I ask for reduction by a small amount, it is understood that it is with a view to raise a discussion with reference to the excise policy of the Government of India. I know, Sir, that in all provinces it is reckoned as a provincial subject. We are only concerned with the excise revenue raised in a few of the minor provinces under the Government of India. My object in raising this question is that the Government of India should set a good example to the other provinces in this matter. After all, the Government of India is raising about 50 lakhs which they are able to increase within the last ten years after the war, and they are spending very small amounts for the recovery thereof. The question is whether it is necessary to raise excise revenue at all; whether it is necessary to continue the policy hitherto adopted. Unless the Government of India can afford to forego such a small amount as 50 lakhs, we cannot expect the provinces, which are realizing crores, as in Madras, in Bombay and in the United Provinces, to be able to afford to give up that revenue. Though it is not very easy at one step to put an end to the drink evil in this country as it was in many other countries, we can usefully follow the example set in such a backward country as Russia or even such an advanced country as America. We have seen the advantage derived in America. It is practically admitted and conceded that she has increased not only individual efficiency but also increased the national efficiency. Though there is complaint from the richer section in America, the poorer section, especially the ladies, welcome that prohibition, because it ensures their husbands' attending to the domestic duties better, their saving a larger amount than they did before, their being able to work harder, their being more useful to themselves and to the country. I do not understand, that by adopting the policy of restricting the hours of sale and restricting the places of sale, we are reducing the consumption. If we go minutely into the figures, though there is a slight decrease, they are had enough for the country. The whole country including the Government

[Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju.]

of India should thank Mahatma Gandhi for setting up this crusade against this drink evil; and you will find that through his association with this question in the years 1921 and 1922, not only here and there but throughout India there was a decrease of consumption and also, necessarily, a decrease of revenue. Even under the Government of India, as was pointed out by the Retrenchment Committee, you find that they considered about the expenditure of Rs. 88,000 in order to prevent any liquor shops being opened three miles around cantonments. What is the object? The object is to see that their own sepoy or soldiers are not tempted to indulge in this drink. I ask, if the military population need to be safe, why should you not attempt a similar thing with reference to the civil population? It is suggested in some provinces that local option can be adopted. But I may tell you, Sir, from my own experience of a municipality, though on principle they agree that we should not open shops if they are not desired by the people, as a matter of fact they are opened in spite of protests. It is properly stated that, when you raise a large revenue, you naturally depend upon it for your general purposes. When you depend upon it for your general purposes, you will find some excuse or other for securing a larger revenue to meet your expanding objects of administration; and therefore the persons who advocate prohibition always suggest, "Do not depend upon this excise revenue for your general purposes."

**Mr. President:** Before I allow the Honourable gentleman to open that very large subject of Prohibition under a very small vote, I should like to be satisfied what this vote is for.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member): The sum asked for under this head represents the loss on exchange on the leave allowances of certain excise officials employed in minor administrations.

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Sir, I may be permitted to state that I am constitutionally entitled to raise a discussion of the policy when the demand of even a rupee is made. It is not a question of the amount. It is a question of the policy we are criticising. We want to impress this upon the attention of the Government of India so that they might follow a better policy in the matter of excise. We have no . . . .

**Mr. President:** I wish further to be satisfied that in this case it is not the Government of India merely acting as the agent of the Local Governments.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** No. It refers to officers of the minor administrations whose leave salary is payable by the Government of India and this is the exchange on their leave salary. They are not acting as the agent for the provincial Governments in this matter. The Government of India are acting in their capacity as a Local Government. Of course the Government of India are not responsible for the excise policy of the greater part of India, and this subject naturally raises a part of the excise policy of the whole of India including the provinces.

**Mr. President:** Do I understand from the Honourable the Finance Member that the Government of India is responsible for the excise policy of those minor administrations to which this vote refers?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** That is so, Sir.

**Mr. President:** Then the Honourable Member is in order.

**Mr. B. Venkateswaraiah:** In order to emphasise my view, I may be permitted to read what the Retrenchment Committee have stated in order to increase the revenue. They have stated it at page 248 of their report. After stating:

“Of the increase of Rs. 1,47,000 since 1913-14, Rs. 38,000 is on account of excise compensation to the Indore Durbar, under an agreement by which a zone of 3 miles round the Mhow cantonment is kept free of State liquor shops”.

they add:

“It has been brought to our notice that there is a considerable loss of revenue to the Central Government owing to the North-West Frontier Province and Delhi drawing their supplies of country spirit from major Provinces which retain the still-head duty on the liquor so supplied. We think that endeavour should be made to come to some equitable arrangement with the supplying Provinces, or, alternately, that the possibility should be considered of manufacturing the necessary supplies of country spirit in an area under the administration of the Central Government. It is estimated that an arrangement of this kind would ultimately yield an additional revenue to the Central Government of about Rs. 10 lakhs.”

Sir, I think it is high time that the Government of India should follow the bright example set up in America and even in backward Russia. India should not lag behind in putting an end to this vice-begotten wealth. In England they have utilised a portion of this amount for educational purposes. They call it whisky money for education. May I ask the Member in charge of the Government of India whether he is going to utilise the amount raised by this excise revenue even for educational purposes. On the other hand, we find in these minor provinces, instead of increasing the educational charges, they have reduced it by Rs. 9 lakhs. Then, what are you doing with this revenue? You do not want it for your ordinary purposes. My object is that you should not at all depend upon this portion of revenue for any of your administrative purposes. I do not want to go into the provinces, because the same cry was made in all provinces. But I confine myself to the Government of India. They can set a bright and good example to the other provinces in either putting an end to his encouragement indirectly of the drink evil or in utilising this amount by earmarking every pie of it for educational purposes. With that view, Sir, I move my motion that the Demand under the head ‘Excise’ be reduced by Rs. 100.

**Mr. President:** Amendment moved:

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

**Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests):** Sir, I associate myself fully with the views expressed by my Honourable friend from Madras. It is high time that the Government of India should now consider whether it is not right in the interests of the masses of this country, about whom they many times speak in this House, that they should stop completely the production, distribution and sale of liquor. I think, Sir, there will not be many people here who will say that the habit of drinking is a good habit. Most of us,—although I am very sorry to say that all may not agree with me,—think that, if there is any evil which

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

reduces the efficiency of the people of this country more than any other evil, it is this drink evil. Therefore, if we want to serve the interests of the masses of the people, especially the working classes, we ought to stop the production and the distribution of liquor. Unfortunately, the Government of India have got the monopoly of the production of liquor in this country, and they depend to a great extent upon the revenue which they get from the liquor traffic. But, Sir, if the Government of India take a plebiscite of the people of this country, I am quite sure that the majority of people will be in favour of completely stopping the production and the distribution of liquor. If they lose a small amount of revenue from liquor—I say, Sir, small, because if this revenue is lost to the Government of India, they will get a larger amount of revenue from the increased efficiency of the people—they will get a larger amount of revenue from other sources. People themselves will be ready to pay any taxes which will not reduce their efficiency. I therefore think that the Government of India should stop the traffic in liquor altogether; and, if they want more revenue, it is better that they should educate the people and make them able to be more efficient. If the liquor shops are stopped, I am quite sure that the large number of prisons will also be closed and there will be saving more than to compensate for the loss of revenue. I think, Sir, that there is no doubt in the minds of people who have studied this problem of liquor traffic that sometimes liquor shops are forced upon people who really do not want them. I do not say that the people in the locality do not go and take liquor in the shops. But when you start a liquor shop near the house of a poor man, who on account of over-work is exhausted, it is more than human to expect him not to go to the liquor shop. Liquor shops are provided with the approval of Government, and therefore the poor people succumb to the temptation which is placed in their way. If the liquor traffic is prohibited, I am quite sure there will not be a single public meeting of the working classes in this country asking the Government to bring back the liquor shops to them. Although temporarily the Government may lose some revenue, their power to get revenue from the people will greatly increase. I, therefore, think that my Honourable friend, Mr. Venkatapatiraju, should put this motion to the vote and allow this House to express its feelings on this subject.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya** (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I support what Mr. Raju and Mr. Joshi have said on this question. The growth of the evil of drink has been one of the unfortunate aspects of British rule in India. It is not that the habit of drink was unknown in India, but the evil has assumed enormous proportions by the system of excise administration which has grown up during the last several decades. On a number of occasions, members who have met at the Temperance Conferences and at Social Conferences have requested the Government to put down the evil of drink. For a number of years we struggled to have the principle of local option accepted. Some changes have been made and the principle has in some cases been accepted. But even now the evil remains appalling in its character and devastating in its influence upon large numbers of the working classes of this country. It is an evil which particularly afflicts the humbler classes, the men who toil and toil and who sweat in order to earn their living. It is these men who are largely victims of the present policy by which intoxicating drink is brought to their doors and they cannot resist the temptation of utilising it. The evil of drinking is prohibited

12 Noon.

both by the Hindu religion and by the Muhammadan religion. In a tropical country like India this evil should easily be put down. On the contrary, the system that has been adopted has led to its growth year after year and decade after decade and, even if we take into account the changes and improvements that have been introduced in some parts of the country, the evil remains an enormous one. We have now the happy and cheering example of the United States of America for putting down this evil of drink, and I think that my friend Mr. Raju has raised this point very properly in this House in order that the Government of India should lay down the principle that the manufacture and sale of liquor and of all intoxicating drinks of that character shall be prohibited. India sacrificed a very handsome revenue in order to help China to get rid of the opium evil. (*A Voice*: "With what result?") The moral responsibility for the failure of the effort does not certainly lie on the head of India. Personally speaking, as an Indian, I feel a great moral satisfaction that we are not the means of enslaving the people of China in the matter of the use of opium and I wish that we should be able to feel the same satisfaction that as an administration, our Government are not responsible for enslaving the people of India, so far as the humbler classes are concerned, in the matter of the use of intoxicants and liquor. It is for the Government of India to lay down this policy. I know that under the present constitution, it is principally the provinces which have to deal with this subject of excise, and I have every hope that the provinces will also do their duty in this matter. But unfortunately or fortunately in this instance, so far as the present discussion is concerned, there is still a portion of the excise revenue which is retained by the Government of India. The Government of India is responsible for the administration of Excise in some minor Administrations. Therefore the principle of the Excise policy can be discussed here, and I hope that every Member of this House, European as well as Indian, will be able to give his support to the proposal that the Government of India should formulate a policy of the total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of drinks. I fully realise that this policy, if adopted, will not be brought into full effect at once. It will take some time, it must take time, but once the right decision is arrived at, I hope it will not be many years before the country will get rid of this great demon of drink. It is in the interests of humanity, in the interests particularly of our humbler fellow-subjects, that I plead that this policy should be adopted and adopted now in order that the provinces may be given the right lead from the Government of India.

**Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon** (United Provinces: European): Sir, with all due respect to the previous speakers and with an equal abhorrence with them of the evil of excessive drinking, I venture to submit to the House that the argument which has been put forward against the policy of excise on liquor has underlying it a fallacy which has now lived long enough to die. The effect of an excise policy is not to encourage but to restrain drink. To increase the price of liquor, which is the direct effect of an excise duty, is to make liquor accessible to a smaller number of people. Drinking is a social evil. It is to be controlled, checked and prevented by education and example, but not by legislation. Let Government give up control of the manufacture and sale of liquor in India. What will happen? India has in the coconut palm, the date palm and the *mahua* tree, not to mention others, an endless source of supply for the manufacture of intoxicating liquors. If Government have no control over this manufacture, can it be believed that the manufacture and sale of liquor will stop?

[Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon.]

Are there not people in India who will undertake the manufacture and sale of a commodity which offers handsome profits? And what will happen when the bottle of country liquor for which you now have to pay two annas can be obtained for two pice? Surely that is a question which commonsense can readily answer. I say by all means let India go on in its growing dislike for this evil of drink. Let those who lead the people advise them, encourage them, to give up a degrading and disgusting habit. But do not let us make the mistake that it is encouraged by the control by Government. That makes liquor more difficult and more expensive to buy. It would be a much worse position if Government control were entirely removed; for then, in every village, whosoever pleases could collect his cocoanut juice or his *mahua* flower and turn out liquor for sale. I repeat that the removal of Government control before Indian society generally is strong enough to produce some one of the type of a "Pussyfoot Johnson" would be fatal. I therefore oppose this Resolution.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qayyum** (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I do not think I need say very much on this subject. It is known all over the world that liquor and intoxication of every kind are injurious not only to the health of the public but also to the morals of the people. This fact has been recognised in the countries in which the use of liquor was prevailing for a very long time. Those countries have realised the injurious effects of that habit and have legislated for its prevention. A vast continent like America, with its past history of indulgence in liquor, has thought it right and essential to legislate on this subject and there is no reason why India, which is climatically behind America for the necessity of using liquor, should lack in enacting legislation of that character. We must learn this from America and from Europe where it is found necessary to restrict the evil by all possible means, though some of the countries have not gone so far as to legislate for it. Well, if it is considered to be a social evil, as my friend the last speaker has said, there are other social evils which we are trying to stop by legislation. Only the other day in this House certain enactments were passed raising the age of girls, who were taken away by people from lawful custody for illicit purposes. We may as well say that let that evil be removed by social remedies and social means of putting stop to it. These are two things which have just struck me in the speech of the last speaker. What I was really thinking of was this, that the difference between a man and other animals lies only in the matter of intellect. If the use of liquor in unlimited quantities is permitted—and I say here that it is very difficult to keep oneself within the limits, (*Laughter and cries of "No."*) yes, people have found it very difficult to keep within limits; some have gone to the grave over it; and if that faculty, which distinguishes the human being from the animal, or rather from the ordinary brute, is to be exercised, and the use of that faculty is kept in abeyance for the time a man is under the influence of liquor, is it not necessary that we should stop this evil, and thereby stop people from drifting into the position of brutes? It is possible that custom may keep people within limits, but I ask what about the young persons who are trying to get into the habit of using liquor. Who is there to prevent them from drifting away and exceeding the bounds? There may be the parents to watch them, but possibly even the parents may not be able to keep them in check from indulging in that evil. I think that, if there is any evil to be stopped by legislation, it is this, and if it results in the loss of revenue, which is the only disadvantage, I suggest, that we should forego it and should legislate to stop the evil.



**Mr. B. C. Allen** (Assam: Nominated Official): Sir, I think that the question is not so much what the different sections of the House wish to do, but what they are able to do. If I am right in assuming that my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, has not, like myself, been connected with the administration of an Excise Department, I would like to point out to him that the avowed policy of Government is to restrict the consumption of excisable articles. The way to do that is two-fold; one is to restrict the sources of supply; that is, to reduce the number of liquor shops as much as possible; the other is to enhance the revenue with the hope of making liquor, opium or other excisable drugs so dear as to reduce consumption. I would inform the Honourable Pandit from my own personal experience that it is quite easy to force up the price of liquor so high and make it so difficult to obtain as to result in an increase in drunkenness. If people cannot get liquor, they will make it for themselves, and in this country it is the easiest thing in the world to make fermented or distilled liquor. Our experience has been that when liquor cannot be obtained from licit sources, it is obtainable in far less wholesome forms and taken in greater quantities. Garden managers are not likely to encourage their coolies to take liquor. My friend Mr. Joshi regards these gentlemen, I know, with some suspicion, but he will, I think, agree with me in that. Yet in my experience I cannot recall any case of complaint being made to me in respect of Government liquor shops. I do not say that there have not been any such cases, but no such complaint has been made to me personally. But I have frequently received complaints from managers of the serious results arising on their gardens from illicit brewing or distillation, and I remember a case in which a manager asked me to open a Government liquor shop in order to reduce drunkenness amongst his coolies. The Honourable Pandit referred to China. I would point out to him that the poppy is being cultivated freely there. Do you suppose that we could stop the consumption of opium in China merely by stopping its production here?

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** I am reminded of Felix Holt. He said, "If some one must steal, I will not."

**Mr. B. C. Allen:** The Honourable Pandit is really confusing the moral and practical issues. With regard to America,—I speak with very great discretion as to what goes on in that great country,—one has heard a great deal of the effect of stoppage on the people of America, on the morals of the people. Many have said that it has led to a great increase in consumption of liquor among the young. I assure the House that they would be making a great mistake if they adopted this Resolution, and that they will be doing nothing whatever to encourage the cause of temperance.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao** (Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): My Honourable friend, Mr. Allen, referred to the policy of Government in the past. This policy has been stated to be the maximum of revenue and the minimum of consumption. This policy has undergone considerable examination during the last three years, since the new constitution has come into existence, and it has been generally felt that, while the maximum of revenue has been retained, the minimum of consumption has not been adhered to, and, while the rates have been put up, consumption has considerably increased in various classes of liquor. It is absolutely unnecessary at the present time to examine the figures.

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

Every Provincial Government and every Provincial Legislative Council has gone very fully into this matter, and it seems to me altogether unnecessary now to discuss the past policy of Government as to whether it has been successful or not.

Reference has been made to America and to the experiment with regard to total prohibition. In regard to that there are two views. One set of views regards prohibition as a total failure, while the other states that it has done considerable good so far as the poorer classes are concerned. Crime is stated to have decreased; general conditions have improved, and so on. Literature has been distributed throughout India on the subject in favour of temperance, and various temperance organisations in the country are also discussing the question. The whole case of total prohibition has already been stated by my Honourable friend Sir Narasimha Sarma in the old Legislative Council; so that, so far as we are concerned we have given thought to this Resolution. Well, I do not know whether he holds the same opinion at the present day. That is a matter which we should like to know, because Members' opinions seem to change very much after taking office. (*The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee*: "They are much wiser men now.") There are, however, one or two points which I should like to bring to the notice of Honourable Members, and that is, that with the introduction of the Reforms, the subject of Excise has been transferred to the Provinces and the Ministers have been placed in charge of the administration of these excise laws. One question which has been discussed is whether a new policy of either gradual reduction or total prohibition should be introduced in the Provinces, and I should like to bring to the notice of Honourable Members the difficulty that has been caused by the Government of India in this matter. As Honourable Members are aware, foreign liquor is a source of considerable revenue on which my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett certainly relies to make up his Budget . . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett**: You have thrown out the request for money with which to collect it.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao**: I am perfectly certain you will take care that this money is realised somehow.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey** (Home Member): Not by your aid.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao**: I am not going to discuss that question now. Sir, the revenue that is derived from spirits and liquors is Rs. 2 crores 22 lakhs. Under the head, Beer, Porter, Cider and other fermented liquors, it is Rs. 14,40,000 and under Wines about Rs. 12 lakhs. Sir, I myself was anxious to introduce a Bill in the Madras Presidency known as the Local Option Bill, and I introduced it in the Madras Council and it was sent up for the sanction of the Governor; the Bill was about to be introduced, when suddenly, a telegram was received from the Government of India that I should not proceed with that Bill. The reason for it was that the Bill as defined also touched foreign liquor, and empowered local authorities to restrict the consumption of this foreign liquor which forms the subject of this revenue to which I drew attention. Therefore, Sir, if the question of local option, or the question of total prohibition, is to be pursued in the Provinces, we have here a complication that the Government of India come down and say that their revenue, with reference

to the import of liquor, will be interfered with by any measure introduced in the Provinces.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** It cannot now.

**Diwān Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** There again my Honourable friend is referring to something which is nothing to do with the present motion. Therefore, Sir, if you wish that Provinces and ministers are to pursue a policy, you must get over the difficulty that is being experienced in the Provinces, namely, that, while they will be at liberty to proceed with local option laws dealing with liquor, this question of foreign liquor has introduced a complication and local option Bills in the Provinces cannot now be proceeded with. I would therefore ask my Honourable friends who sit opposite to me to consider, if this policy of leaving this question of excise entirely to the Provinces is carried out, whether they should not make up their minds to give liberty to the Provincial Legislatures to enact laws which would cover, not only country liquor and duty, but also the prohibition of the sale of imported liquors in this country. That is a question for the serious consideration of the Government. If they wish really the Provinces to shoulder the responsibility of dealing with this question of social reform, they must make up their minds to leave liberty with the Provinces to deal with the question, not necessarily of country liquor, but also to prohibit the sale of these spirits and liquors imported from abroad. That is one question that I should like to place before my Honourable friends.

Then, as regards the broader question, I might perhaps mention that the Punjab has now a Bill, I do not know if it has been put on the Statute-book yet, but that Bill has been affected by this difficulty, and in Madras I was unable to proceed with my Bill and it could not be placed on the Statute-book. Therefore, Sir, I would earnestly ask my Honourable friends who wish to promote reform in this House to consider this aspect of the case, and I would especially appeal to the Honourable Members of the Government to decide once for all whether it would be open to Provincial Legislatures to undertake legislation affecting also the imported liquors, thus removing the ban which has been placed on my Bill.

As regards the general question, Sir, I might perhaps also say that the Provinces at present derive considerable revenue from the sale of intoxicants. In Madras our revenue has gone up considerably from 375 lakhs in 1916-17 to 535 lakhs in 1920 and to the neighbourhood of 500 lakhs in 1922-23. In fact, of the revenue we have assigned to Madras, about one-third is now derived from Excise. The question of excise revenue becomes extremely complicated. I am bringing this fact to the notice of my Honourable friends for the reason that the whole basis of these Provincial revenues will have to be gone into, and what sources should be assigned to the Provinces and what sources should be assigned to the Central Government is a matter which requires much fuller consideration than it has received in the past. Sir, there is one other matter. Sir James Meston (as he then was) said deliberately before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, that the one reason why the excise revenue was assigned to the Provinces under his scheme was to check the tendency of Provincial administrations to undertake legislation with reference to temperance reform. I say, Sir, that attitude is altogether unfair to the Provinces. To place revenues in the hands of Provincial administrators purposely with a view to check this tendency to undertake temperance reform is certainly a circumstance of which I, at any rate, do not approve. Therefore, Sir, the whole question is beset with difficulties, and I implore my

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

Honourable friends who are responsible for the Provinces of this country to undertake the re-examination of the principles of the division of Provincial and Central revenues with a view to ease the situation in the Provinces. Honourable Members are also aware that this question is continuously raised in the Provincial Legislatures and the Ministers are face to face with this tremendous difficulty which would throw upon them the responsibility of finding ways and means for the omission, or rather for the gradual reduction, of this great revenue which they are now receiving.

**Dr. L. K. Hyder** (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, statements are sometimes made in this House which go unchallenged. I must say statements sometimes emanate on this side of the House and a large number of times I have noticed that they emanate from that side of the House also. Two things have been said, one that the total number of shops has decreased. I grant that this book, which has not been written by me but has been compiled by the Statistical Department of the Government of India, bears that statement out. But with regard to the second statement, that the excise revenue has decreased, I do not think that that statement is borne out by this book. Consider, Mr. President, that your revenue from excise has nearly doubled in the course of a decade. In the year 1910 you got only 11 crores, in the year 1920 you got 20 crores. The policy has been enunciated by my friend Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao: maximum revenue from minimum consumption

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** The policy is not mine, it is the Government's.

**Dr. L. K. Hyder:** Maximum revenue from minimum consumption. I shall put it to any sensible man, if common sense has not disappeared, that these two things are diametrically opposed to each other. If the Government of India monopolise this business of manufacture, distribution and sale of all manner of intoxicating liquors and drugs, I say it can follow the policy of a monopolist in two ways. Number 1 is this—that it says we shall sell only a small number of units and charge a very high profit. This is one way. On the other hand, it can say we shall sell a large number of units and charge a very small profit. I say that these figures which I have quoted to you show that in the course of 10 years your revenue has been going up:

In 1911 it was	11	crores.
" 1912	" 13	"
" 1913	" 13	"
" 1914	" 14	"
" 1915	" 12	"
" 1916	" 13	"
" 1917	" 15	"
" 1918	" 17	"
" 1919	" 19	"
" 1920	" 20	"

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** Have you the figures of consumption?

**Dr. L. K. Hyder:** I have not got the figures of consumption—I will look them up, but what is the exact point you wish to raise? (*Mr. H. Calvert and another Honourable Member:* “The increase is due to higher rates.”) Both my friend there and Mr. Calvert raise the point that the rate has been put up. Now, it is contrary to all principles that, if you put up the rate, the amount consumed will go on increasing. (*An Honourable Member:* “Has it increased?”) I say that your revenue has doubled in the course of 10 years. They say “What about the figures of consumption—has the total quantity consumed increased or not?” I put to them this position—that, if your object was to gain revenue, you have been eminently successful. If your object was to restrict the consumption of these deleterious drugs, you have not been successful. Consequently, from these figures which I am quoting I am entitled to draw the conclusion that you have not been following the monopolist's policy of selling a very small quantity and putting a high rate of tax on it, but you have been doing just the opposite thing—you have been charging the same amount of excise revenue and the natural result has been that the total quantity consumed has always been increasing. (*The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:* “That is quite untrue.”) You will have an opportunity of refuting it. Well, Sir, the second point to which I wish to refer is this that the Government of India could not honestly face any other civilised Government in the world if a list were made out of the kind of things from which the Government of India derive this revenue. These are the things from which the Government of India derive their revenue—rum, country spirit, *ganja*, *bang*, opium. It would make any Government uncomfortable, and the only two things which I have to say are first, that the Government of India have not followed the policy of restricting the consumption of these deleterious drugs in India, and secondly, that they have been deriving an ever increasing quantity of revenue from them.

**Mr. H. Calvert** (Punjab: Nominated Official): I am afraid this Assembly runs a grave risk of adding one more to the grievances of the Sikhs. I tried to get my learned friends to speak on that point, but they seem unaccountably shy. All I want is just to add one or two remarks to those which fell from my friend, Mr. Allen. I think, I am correct in saying—and I hope the learned Member from Bombay will correct me if I am wrong—that in that Province they deliberately adopted a policy of progressive reduction of consumption, with the result that the last annual report issued from that Province shows a marked increase in cases of illicit distillation. We in the Punjab, also have tried this policy of progressive reduction of output with progressive increase of taxation and we came to a limit at which we were defeated by a very marked increase of illicit distillation. What any Government has to aim at is just that balance by which you can decrease consumption without stimulating illicit distillation. I think, Sir, that most Provincial Governments would be very thankful to any Member of this House who would assist them in arriving at a policy which would enable them to reduce consumption without increasing illicit distillation. I think those who have had experience of excise administration agree that practically every provincial administration is anxious to show a reduction in the consumption of liquor but that every administration is faced with this difficulty, and I think, Sir, if instead of putting all the blame on the administration for failure to bring about a further reduction, Honourable Members' interest took the form of assisting the administration by suggestions of practical utility for stopping this consumption, most Local Governments would be very thankful indeed. In our particular

[Mr. H. Calvert.]

case, Sir, we have special local difficulties into which I do not wish to enter; but the mere fact that the Punjab is so interspersed with territories belonging to Indian States makes it practically impossible for us to control the import of liquors across these various boundaries. We are much interspersed with islands of State territory, especially in those districts where the consumption of liquor is most popular among the local inhabitants.

**Dr. H. S. Gour** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhamadan): I move, Sir, that the question be now put.

**Mr. President:** The question is that the question be put.

The motion was adopted.

(The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett rose in his seat.)

**Mr. President:** I will allow the Honourable Member his right of reply on this occasion, but I think he might have risen earlier.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** Sir, the discussion to-day has been on the question whether we shall reduce by Rs. 100 a vote of Rs. 4,000 for Excise. On that we have discussed very broadly the general Indian policy of Excise. That is a policy which, as was stated at the beginning, depends almost entirely on the Provincial Governments, and though no doubt a general discussion was entirely in order on this particular vote I think that a good deal that has been said travels very near the line of relevancy.

As regards the statements that were made by my friend, Dr. Hyder, I would like to draw his attention to the fact that it has been the experience of many Governments besides the Government of India and the Local Governments that a policy of maximum revenue and decreasing consumption is a successful one. In the United Kingdom there has been a very large increase in revenue raised from liquor during the last 10 or 15 years accompanied all the time by a very large decrease in consumption. The idea that the two cannot go together is, I think, one which he would find it difficult to support if he looked into these statistics of actual consumption. I have no statistics of the actual consumption in India with me at the moment, but I am informed that the same fact is true in the case of India.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar** (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Not in Madras.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** The total revenue which is raised in connection with this vote is not the large sum which has been spoken of, but it is a sum of Rs. 45 lakhs. This vote has reference only to those minor administrations such as Ajmer-Merwara, the North-West Frontier Province and others which are under the control of the Government of India. In their case the policy adopted by the Government of India is to follow the policy of their big neighbours. It comes back, therefore, to the question of what is the policy of the Punjab Government, and what is the policy of the Government of the United Provinces in regard to Excise, and it would not be possible, I think, for the Government of India to introduce a policy, shall we say, of prohibition, even if it were desirable, in such a place as Ajmer Merwara by itself. It must depend on the provinces with whom in this matter it is not for the Government of India directly to interfere.

The point has been made by Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao that the Government of India's policy in connection with imported liquors comes in. I am sorry I am unable to discuss that. It was in order on the Customs vote. If the Honourable Member had given me an opportunity then, we might perhaps have been able to discuss it. I might add however that, the Committee on Taxation which is under consideration may have an opportunity of considering this question. Undoubtedly, the existence of two different Governments collecting revenue from the same commodity is one of the difficulties which has been raised by the federalisation of the Government of India and it is one of the difficulties that will have to be looked into. A copy of the Volume entitled "India in 1921-1922" has just been put into my hands, on page 224 of which occurs the following statement:

"A study of the excise figures of the different provinces shows plainly the honesty of Government in its professions to reduce the consumption, and the success of the policy which it is at present pursuing. In the United Provinces, while the increase in excise revenue from alcoholic liquor during the decennium ending 1920-21 was 52 per cent., the consumption decreased during the period by no less than 26 per cent. In Madras, while the total excise revenue has risen during the last ten years by 81 per cent., the consumption per hundred of population has been almost stationary."

We have had an interesting discussion on this vote. I should like now to ask the House to come back to the question of what it is. This is a vote for Rs. 4,000 to pay the loss in exchange on the leave salaries of certain officials who will during the year 1924-25 draw leave salaries in sterling, and those officials are connected with the excise administration of Ajmer-Merwara, Delhi, etc. The reduction of that vote by Rs. 100 would possibly lead to the necessity of our presenting a supplementary demand because it is such a small vote. I would therefore suggest to the House that, having made clear its opinion on this subject, it should not proceed to deprive us of money which may be absolutely necessary for the purposes for which it is obviously required.

**Mr. B. Venkatsapiraju:** Under the circumstances, I do not wish to press my motion.

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

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 4,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Excise'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND No. 7—STAMPS.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Stamps—including expenditure in England'."

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee** (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, I want to . . .

**Mr. President:** Does the Honourable Member wish to move his motion?

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee:** I want to say a few words before . . . .

**Mr. President:** I understood the Honourable Member was a whip of the party of which Pandit Motilal Nehru is the leader.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee:** I want to withdraw, but I want to make a few remarks . . . .

**Mr. President:** No, the Honourable Member cannot make any remarks in withdrawing his motion.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafee:** The Honourable the Home Member expressed his doubt as to whether we have established the principle we stand for by throwing out the demands of the Government . . .

**Mr. President:** That has nothing to do with the Vote on "Stamps."

The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,14,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Stamps—including expenditure in England'."

The motion was adopted.

#### DEMAND NO. 8—FOREST.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Forest'."

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Sir, I move that the demand under the head 'Forest' be reduced by Rs. 100.

The main object of raising this question is to confine myself to one aspect of it instead of dealing with the whole forest policy. With reference to the Forest Research Institute at Dehra Dun, I can without fear of any contradiction assert that the policy of the Government of India has been halting and hesitating. We know, Sir, at one time in the year 1921-22, both the Government of India and the Secretary of State had agreed to train students for forest service in India. Afterwards, for reasons best known to themselves, they wanted to recede from that position, and then an attempt was made by introducing a Resolution in this House on the 11th September, 1922, by the then Secretary of the Revenue and Agriculture Department, the Honourable Mr. Hullah, who stated that the Central Institution, which would be started according to the previous Resolution at Dehra Dun, to train recruits for the Imperial services would be only a preliminary training in India and that the recruits should have the final training only in England, where, on the recommendation of the Inter-departmental Committee, a Central Institution at the cost of the Colonies as well as of India is to be started. When that Resolution was moved in this House, it was negatived. Since then nothing has been done except to give a reply to a question by Mr. Patel on the 11th February, 1924. The question was whether Government could state the decision arrived at by the Secretary of State on the question of recruitment for the forest service by selection in India as well as in England, whether recruits would be trained at the Central Institution, and whether Government could lay



on the table the correspondence. The answer given by the Honourable Mr. Butler was that, in accordance with the wishes of the Indian Legislature as voiced in their Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State on the 11th and 19th September, 1922, respectively, the Government of India had prepared a scheme for the joint training of all Indian forest service recruits at Dehra Dun and that it would be submitted to the Secretary of State for orders as soon as the Standing Committee had approved of the financial expenditure involved.

Now, Sir, with reference to the various recommendations made, they are given effect to without delay of any sort as soon as they are made. When a question comes up that recruitment should be made in India and educational institutions should be started in India, all sorts of difficulties are thrown in our way. Now it has taken three years to consider whether we should start an institution in India for the training of men in India for our forest services. I may invite the attention of this House, Sir, to the opinions expressed by various gentlemen, Professors of English Universities and officers employed in Government, stating that it is useless to send students from India for forest research training in other countries. At any rate, according to the opinion of the Honourable Mr. Bore who has done splendid service as an assistant to the Honourable Sir William Meyer and who gave evidence before the Lytton Committee, there are better facilities in India for forest training for Imperial purposes. And not only that, it is suggested that for the purpose of securing further training in Europe or America special leave might be granted for six months or a year to men trained here. It was acknowledged that the best forest training in Europe was given in Germany and after that in America, and I think that England comes last in this respect. We all know that we had a Forest College long before there was a similar institute in England, and it is admitted that the flora of Europe is quite different to that of India and hence the knowledge required by forest officers is essentially different for India from that required in Europe. In these circumstances what was Government's difficulty? Did they desire to secure recruits elsewhere? If they want talent and capacity, if they want economy, then these are all obtainable in India, provided that efficient, practical as well as theoretical, training is given. The common complaint about these institutions has been that they give theoretical training but not a proper practical training. If we wade through the evidence given before the Lytton Committee it will be seen that the Forest Institute at Dehra Dun was not up to the mark in the matter of practical training. In these circumstances, Sir, I am sure the Secretary of State would not stand in the way of accepting the policy once accepted by his predecessor, Mr. Montagu, though not by Lord Peel. And, therefore, as we have a Labour Ministry in England, they would not stand in the way of the proposal made by the Government of India to make our institutions in this respect thoroughly fit for imparting every branch of training. And this need not take much time. The Government say they are waiting for the acceptance of the proposal by the Finance Committee. I am sure, when they are sanctioning larger amounts than is required for this purpose for objects which may not be quite so pleasing to them, they will readily sanction any amount for this purpose. I am quite aware, Sir, of what the Retrenchment Committee have recommended in this connection. Perhaps they thought that, when you have some other institutions for training forest officers, it is not wise to spend a large amount on an institution which is not meant to provide training for all purposes, and they knew that the Government did not want to spend money on recruits

[Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju.]

to be trained in other places, because it costs a lot to train them; for instance in England it costs 350 pounds a year, nearly Rs. 5,000, for every student. And I am sure the Retrenchment Committee would have been quite ready to sanction a higher expenditure had they known that the intention and desire was to make the Research Institute at Dehra Dun an institution complete in itself and capable of giving full and complete training to students there, so that recruits need not be sent to other places to complete their training in forestry. I am sure the Retrenchment Committee would not have condemned such expenditure because it would really be a useful investment conducing to the progress of the country. I submit that that is the policy which the Government of India have carried out in accordance with the wishes of the House and they want it accepted. I earnestly appeal to the Government not only to sympathise but translate their sympathy into action and allay comment. I hope that the next time we meet we will find that further recruitment in other places has been stopped, because the old system of 50 per cent. to be recruited in India and 50 per cent. in England should be put an end to. If that idea was once given up and we looked only to our institutions to train our own men, then I think that we could do it. It would satisfy Indian aspirations, and I do not think that any political principle requires the obtaining of foreign recruits for this service. I hope the House will join me in saying that we want our institutions to be complete and thoroughly well equipped and recruitment confined to India. With that object in view I move my motion.

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler** (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): I think, Sir, I can save the House from a long discussion if I rise at once to reply to what has been said by my Honourable friend. He has raised the question, which has been familiar to us for a very long time, of the place of training for forest probationers. In reply to Mr. Patel on the 11th February last I said that the Government of India, in accordance with the wishes of the Indian Legislature as voiced in the Resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State on the 11th and 19th September, 1922, respectively, had prepared a scheme for the joint training of all Indian Forest Service recruits at Dehra Dun and that it would be submitted to the Secretary of State for orders as soon as the Standing Finance Committee had approved the financial expenditure involved. My Honourable friend was aware of that reply, for he has read it out himself and I take it he is satisfied with it. But he has criticised the delay which has occurred. Sir, there were two reasons for the delay. First of all, until we had the College properly equipped, it was not fair to India to suggest that recruits should be trained there. During the last few years there has been a very notable change in the Forest Research Institute at Dehra Dun. We are now approaching completion there of

economic workshops for wood-seasoning, testing preservation, and the like, which are amongst the best of their kind in the world. This being so and now that the institute is within reach of being a going concern, the Government of India feel that it can no longer be said that by bringing recruits to India to be trained they were sacrificing their efficiency. We are now satisfied that without loss of efficiency we can train our recruits in India, provided that the expenditure which still needs to be incurred on the institute is met. It is now possible, which it was not before, to consider seriously the proposal to bring all our recruits out to India, and to train them all together at Dehra Dun in accordance with the wish expressed by both Houses of the Legislature. The other

reason for delay has been the question of money. We had, as I have explained, to build the new workshops we needed and to get the college thoroughly equipped. We could make no progress until we had done this, and for that purpose money was needed. Well, as the House is aware, the last few years have been years of financial stringency, and only last year we had the Retrenchment Committee inquiring into this very matter. It was necessary therefore to hold up further expenditure until the Retrenchment Committee had had their say. They did go into the matter, and found that the educational side of the institution was necessary. Directly we got line clear on this point, we went ahead and prepared our estimates, and laid them before the Standing Finance Committee. The Honourable Member has suggested that perhaps we might have dispensed with that step, but supposing we had dispensed with it, and had gone ahead without the sanction of the Finance Committee, I wonder what the criticism would have been about our autocratic conduct. As it is, I had the pleasure to lay those estimates before the Standing Finance Committee only a week or two ago, and after a very thorough investigation, and examining the plans and everything, they gave their final approval to the money we needed for completing the institution to a point where we could take action; and those estimates will come before the House under the Civil Works estimates, and will, we hope, be voted by the House. In the meantime we have made our proposals to the Secretary of State and I trust that before very long we may receive his orders.

The Honourable Member also raised the important question of the Indianisation of the Indian Forest Service. With reference to what the Honourable Member said on this point I may point out that we have taken a very big step forward recently in this matter. Two or three years ago the Indian Forest Service was in the main a European service. From 1920—I think that was the year—as a result of the Islington Committee's Report, it was decided to adopt a definite percentage for the recruitment of Indians. As matters now stand, 12·5 per cent. of the posts in the service are reserved for officers promoted from the Provincial Service, whilst 40 per cent. of the direct recruits each year for India itself are to come from India. We made a big recruitment on that basis in 1921 for the first time; and Honourable Members will have seen in the Gazette of the last few weeks that numerous Indians, I think the number is 21, have just joined the service after two years' training in England. They form a very big addition of Indians to the Forest Service. The result is that the percentage of Indians in the Forest Service has risen very rapidly this year. The figure now stands altogether at 28·5 per cent., and it will go on rising as the European element at the top retires from the service. I have now explained the position both as regards recruitment and the training of probationers, and I hope the Honourable Member, after hearing what I have said, will not press his motion, because really we are entirely at one with him in our efforts to give Indians opportunities in the service and also to give in India the training which India needs.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas** (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): Sir, there are just one or two questions that I would like to ask of the Honourable Secretary in the Department of Education, with reference to the statement which he has just now made. I would like to know the reason for the delay in getting the Secretary of State's sanction to the scheme, and the approximate date when the Department expects that the Secretary of State's sanction will be available to them. Secondly, in connection with the Indianization of the

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

service to which the Honourable Member referred with some approval, I think it is necessary and useful to know exactly the period within which this 50 per cent. proportion fixed by the Commission to which he referred is likely to be reached. I think the Honourable Member in charge of the amendment said that he hoped that this restriction will not apply then. Whether that is a question which is within the purview of this House to discuss or to raise at this stage or not is a different question. But a smaller question is, at this rate at which the Department continues to recruit Indians, which I understood is about 40 per cent. every year, what is the period within which the Indian section of the service will reach the proportion of 50 per cent. which has been laid down by the Commission?

**Mr. M. S. D. Butler:** Sir, it is almost impossible to give a definite date because it depends on what we call the rate of decrement at the top. Normally officers retire at a more or less known rate, but just now, owing to the system of premature retirement, many officers are taking proportionate pensions, and that upsets the whole calculation. But obviously if you consistently take in at the bottom 52 per cent., and officers at the top fall out more rapidly than was expected, it will not take a very large number of years to reach the point when Indians will fill 50 per cent. of the posts. More than that I cannot say. It will, I am afraid, tax the brains of a better mathematician than I am to make any precise calculation. It is really not worth while for me to make a guess. As regards the other point, about the Secretary of State's orders, I am not in a position to say much. I said in my answer that a despatch would be sent as soon as the Finance Committee had given their approval to the scheme for building. The Finance Committee did not meet till about a fortnight ago. As to when we shall get the orders of the Secretary of State, I do not know. It depends on the Secretary of State when he will come to a decision and what his decision will be.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Sir, I should like to ask the Honourable Member one or two questions in regard to this Forest Service. May I ask him whether the Government of India still regard the proportions that he mentions, which I take it have been sanctioned by the Secretary of State, as meeting the present situation with reference to the Indianization of the Forest Service. I take it that the proportion which my Honourable friend has mentioned, namely 40 per cent. in India and 12½ per cent. by promotion from the provincial service, namely a total of 52½ per cent., is the total Indian recruitment for the Forest Service. I should like to know whether the recruits in England, namely, the rest, 47½ per cent., whether it is open to Indians in England who have undergone training at the forest research colleges of Oxford, Cambridge and Edinburgh, whether they will be admitted there by any Selection Committee—whether that is open or closed to Indians. Sir, the whole question of Indianization of the service, if I may venture to say so, has been fixed at any rate for some time till the Secretary of State chooses to revise those figures, I take it, under orders passed on the recommendations of the last Public Services Commission. And in view of what has taken place in this House and the various discussions that have taken place here and outside, I would like to know whether the Government of India would reopen this question and urge upon the Secretary of State to revise those figures as early as possible. That is the question which I should like to raise with reference to this amendment. Another point is, my Honourable friend

Mr. Butler stated that 28½ per cent. is the present figure of Indians in this service. Perhaps he is also aware that during the years 1919 and 1920 the India Office recruited an enormous number to the various services on the ground that recruitment was stopped during the war. I have the figures in the written report. There is a considerable number which would block up for a long time to come promotions to the higher ranks of the Indians that may now find place at the bottom of the service. Therefore, on those grounds, it seems to me that the time has come when the Government of India, in view of the discussions that have taken place and which have eventuated in the famous document known as the O'Donnell circular, should re-open this question and secure better proportion of Indians in this service.

**The Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma** (Member for Education, Health and Lands): Sir, the proportion that was fixed was 40 per cent. in the case of direct recruits and 12½ per cent. by way of promotion from the provincial forest service. It is true that a large number of recruits were taken in England, mainly European, but that disproportion was made up during later years. During the year 1920 when I took over charge, it was difficult for me to secure more than 4 recruits from India. But during 1921, we succeeded in securing a larger number and that is the reason why of the 41 gazetted officers who have recently joined the Indian Forest Service, as many as 21 are Indians. That is because we have, in order to make up the deficiency during the previous years, recruited a larger number during 1921 and later years.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Notwithstanding all these efforts, the percentage is only 28½ at present.

**The Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma:** During later years the provincial Governments, owing to the necessity for retrenchment, have come up with proposals that the recruitment may be delayed and latterly we have received very disappointing replies that they could not absorb any more recruits into the Imperial Forest Service. That is the position as it stands now. As to whether the proportion of 40 could be raised in future would depend largely upon the consideration of the question after the Lee Commission has reported. We are awaiting the recommendations of the Lee Commission and as soon as the recommendations are received, the Government of India will go into the whole question and try to fix future recruitment on a reasonable basis and the wishes of this House will be duly taken into consideration.

**Mr. President:** The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Forest'."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Forest' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The question now is:

"That a reduced sum not exceeding Rs. 7,31,900 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Forest'."

The Assembly divided :

AYES—60.

Abdul Karim, Lhwaja.  
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.  
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.  
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.  
 Aney, Mr. M. S.  
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.  
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.  
 Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.  
 Chaman Lal, Mr.  
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.  
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.  
 Das, Mr. Bhubanananda.  
 Das, Mr. Nilakantha.  
 Datta, Dr. S. K.  
 Dumasia, Mr. N. M.  
 Duni Chand, Lala.  
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.  
 Ghulam Abbas, Sayyad.  
 Gour Dr. H. S.  
 Govind Das, Seth.  
 Gulab Singh Sardar  
 Hans Raj, Lal.  
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.  
 Ismail Khan, Mr.  
 Jeolani, Haji S. A. K.  
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.  
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.  
 Kartar Singh, Sardar.  
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.  
 Kazim Ali, Mr. M.  
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.

Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hossain.  
 Kun, Maung.  
 Lohokare, Mr. K. G.  
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.  
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mo. an.  
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.  
 Misra, Mr. Shambhu Dayal.  
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.  
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi  
 Sayad.  
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.  
 Nehru, Pandit Suamlal.  
 Patel, Mr. V. J.  
 Piyare Lal, Lala.  
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.  
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.  
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.  
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.  
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.  
 Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.  
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.  
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan  
 Bahadur.  
 Shafee, Maulvi Muhammad.  
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.  
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.  
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.  
 Syamacharan, Mr.  
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.  
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.  
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—51.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.  
 Ahmed, Mr. K.  
 Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.  
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.  
 Ajab Khan, Captain.  
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.  
 Allen, Mr. B. C.  
 Bahawal Baksh, Chaudhri.  
 Bell, Mr. R. D.  
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.  
 Burdon, Mr. E.  
 Butler, Mr. M. S. D.  
 Calvert, Mr. H.  
 Chatterjee, The Honourable Mr. A. C.  
 Clarke, Mr. G. R.  
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.  
 Dunk, Mr. H. R.  
 Faridoonji, Mr. B.  
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.  
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.  
 Ghulam Bari, Khan Sahib.  
 Gidney, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.  
 Hailev, The Honourable Sir Malcolm.  
 Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.  
 Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.  
 Holme, Mr. H. E.

Howell, Mr. E. B.  
 Hyder, Dr. L. K.  
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.  
 Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.  
 Makan, Mr. M. E.  
 Moir, Mr. T. E.  
 Moncrieff Smith, Sir Henry  
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur  
 Saiyid.  
 Nag, Mr. G. C.  
 O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.  
 Owens, Lieut.-Colonel F. C.  
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.  
 Percival, Mr. P. E.  
 Pilcher, Mr. G.  
 Rajan Baksh Shah, Mukhdum Syed.  
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.  
 Roy, Mr. K. C.  
 Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.  
 Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.  
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.  
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.  
 Turing, Mr. J. M.  
 Ujagar Singh Bedi, Baha.  
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President:** I propose to take the Demand for Railways at Half-past Two.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

DEMAND NO. 9—RAILWAYS.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 67,71,60,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Railways'."

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar** (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, before I begin my speech on the motion, I beg to submit that I want to place before the Assembly a change in the figures that was introduced yesterday in the statement placed on the table in connection with Railways. It will be seen that page 4 of the original statement has been substituted by the new page with certain alterations. The alterations come up under the head "3(a) Operating Expenses other than Fuel" where you will find an addition of 80 lakhs, and under "4. Renewals and Replacements Programme, Revenue" you will find 1.15, that is, 1 crore and 15 lakhs are added. With these alterations the matter is now before the Assembly. Since then I have sent in another amendment which is not on the agenda, and I do not know when it will be taken up. I wish that that 1.15 crores added to the programme of Revenue Expenditure should be removed, that is that the figure should be reduced by that amount. That is another motion that I have placed before the Secretary. I do not know if the President is going to allow it now. If allowed, I will also take that into consideration. (Pause.) I take it, Sir, that I may dilate on that unless you rule otherwise.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** May I make a suggestion? As the revised statements were circulated only yesterday I will not take the point of order regarding the other amendment which the Honourable Member proposes to move in regard to the 1.15 crores. I suggest that it will be more convenient to the House if that amendment is taken separately and not mixed up with the other amendments of the Honourable Member.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I am agreeable to that course. I will not mix it up now. Then, as it stands, Honourable Members will see that I propose to ask for reduction in expenditure of about 10½ crores. Ordinarily it should be taken as an unreasonable proposal and I will have to justify my position if I am to ask the Assembly to vote with me on the motion. I will briefly explain the position and show that I have done much less than what I ought to do, because as it is a matter in which a sudden cutting down may not be possible, I have allowed latitude of 4 crores to be spent by the department this year and I would propose that that be also reduced before next year. I will come to that later on when I place my case before Honourable Members. The first point that I want to place before the Members is that we have from 1913-14 increased only our working expenses from 29 crores to 67 crores. We are now concerned with working

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

expenses and I propose with your permission to deal with the general question on this Resolution and deal with the particular parts relating to each of the Resolutions later when they are taken up.

I now deal with the first motion relating to the Engineering Department, in which I propose a reduction of 40 lakhs. It is a part of a general scheme which I will explain to Honourable Members before I commence this. It will be seen that railways in India have been working profitably for about the last three and three-quarter or four decades, and it is necessary for us to know how the working expenditure compares with the gross earnings of the railway systems out here. It will be found that between the years 1880 and 1890 it has worked out at about 50 per cent. of the gross income, 51 crores being the expenditure for an income of 101 crores during that decade. And from 1890 to 1900 it has been less than 50 per cent.; it has worked out at 48 per cent. nearly of the total revenues, the total revenues being 108.9 crores, and the working expenses being 88 crores. During the next decade, from 1901 to 1910, the total gross revenue was 367 crores, while the working expenses were 191 crores, which works out at about 52 per cent. Now, Sir, from 1911 to 1917-18, which includes the war period also, the revenue has been Rs. 405 crores and the expenditure Rs. 293 crores, which is also about 50 per cent.; and since then from 1918-19, we have gone up to about 72 per cent., and the latest is about 69 per cent., and what is proposed to be expended takes us to 72 and odd per cent. So that it will be seen, when I place these figures before you, that it is for the purpose of showing that it is not a matter of one year or two years; it is not a matter of our suddenly increasing expenditure for particular purposes; and I do not come before this Assembly before five years had elapsed after the close of the war. Prices have gone down and that is recognised by the Department also, and the circumstances are favourable for the position being put on a firm basis. That being so, we shall start with the basis that, for forty years India has not required more than about 50 per cent. from the gross earnings on railways for the purpose of working expenses. Well, it is not a chance figure that I give. Comparing India's percentage of working expenses to gross revenues with Great Britain's expenditure for working expenses on railways, you will find, during the pre-war period, Scotland spent the least, England a little more and Ireland a little more, and the average is 62 per cent. for the United Kingdom.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** (Commerce Member): May I ask the Honourable Member his authority for that statement?

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar**: The British India statistics will show it. I took it from the Library and will place it before you.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: May I correct the Honourable Member? The actual statistics for Great Britain are 80.45 per cent.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar**: Probably it was for a later period. It was the pre-war period I referred to and, if you will satisfy yourself about that, you will find I am correct. I am concerned with that only because we do not know all the circumstances in which in Great Britain they are spending money on railways now. The statistics were available up to 1916. What I may mention is that, while for the 40 years we have been working at between 48 and 51 per cent., in Britain it has been always 60 to 62 per cent., and I say that 10 per cent. is natural and is probably an allowance for the higher scale of pay they are giving there. But India



has not come to a state when we are allowing the salaries they are allowing, and this 10 per cent. is the normal shortage rate of expenditure apparently because of the circumstances of the country, and nobody can argue that India requires more money than an average of 40 years of the railway working. However, I can go further this way. From the year 1912-13 to the year 1916-17 the expenditure has been 29 crores, though the income has risen from 56 to 62 crores within these years. There was no need to raise it. In 1913-14 it could not be said there was any reason for not increasing the expenditure if needed. You can therefore take it as a standard, and after 1913-14 up to 1916-17 you have not had the necessity to raise the expenditure by one pie. 29 crores is the expenditure, while the income has increased up to 62 crores. That is with the year 1916-17. Then I will go to the next year, 1917-18, that is the year in which the war practically closed. There the income is 68 crores, the working expenses are 31 crores, giving about 47 to 48 per cent. only. But then in 1918-19 and 1919-20 for a 76 crores income it is 37 crores expenditure, and for a 79 crores income, it is 45 crores expenditure, respectively, for those two years. That will clearly show that, after the war concluded, the increase that was needed was spent for the actual additional expenditure that might be required for the rehabilitation of the railways and for working up the arrears of depreciation. Whatever it is, the point that is clear is there was no need in any year prior to the war, or in any year subsequent to the war, of any ordinary expenditure which will amount to more than 50 per cent. of the gross revenues from State Railways of the country. Then, Sir, my question arises. Now the revenue has been 93 and odd crores, that is the anticipated revenue for 1923-24, and that for 1924-25 is put down as 97 crores. Then, Sir, taking the natural circumstances, and allowing for all increases of expenditure from 31 crores, I take 1917-18, the last year of the war, and I take 29 crores for 1913-14—I say that from 31 crores in 1917-18 we have run up to 66 crores, and this year's Budget adds 2 crores more and makes it about 69 crores. That is to 31 crores we add an expenditure of about 38 crores. But, Sir, you will notice that till yesterday I did not give in an amendment for a reduction of the programme revenue. The programme revenue originally set apart and that now set apart is additional. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes has said we need not refer to that, and I will not refer to that now. The original programme revenue mentioned was Rs. 9,80,000. I do not want to touch it because I am agreeable that the programme revenue should increase in proportion to the capital expenditure that you make, so that we can have a free strengthening and expansion of railways, better accommodation and every other convenience that you can think of. I am not opposing it. Before I begin my full remarks on this subject, I may also mention I am agreeable that the Railway finance should be separated from the General finances. I am of that view myself and I am of the view also that the revenues of the country should not take away too much from the railway receipts. As much as possible of the money should be placed before the Railway Board or such other agency as might be constituted for the purpose to spend it in the expansion of the railways. But if I can show that 10½ crores will be the least amount that will have to be taken from there for the purpose of the general revenues, you will find that it is not really very much. If you get 22 crores total profit and take 10½ crores for general revenues, you get the whole balance for the expansion of the railways. This balance is not made available by the method adopted, namely, to spend for the working expenses much more than is needed. I mean that these three or four years it has been, so managed

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

as to spend considerably more than what is essential. That is my plea, Sir, and I am prepared to discuss it in detail if I am asked to explain each point. Be that as it may, the points I have urged will clearly show that out of the 97 crores of revenue you expect, more than 50 crores cannot be the working expenditure. I give 52 per cent., not 50 per cent.; I give 2 per cent. more and I also do not oppose any expenditure on programme revenue. Put it even at 15 crores; I have no objection to that because I know it is only a non-recurring item. For 5 years you might spend any money on it; but, as regards recurring expenditure, we must arrive at some definite position. This Assembly ought not to be told you can put into that expenditure anything you like or anything you expect. You will find the number of miles has not increased by more than 233 miles within the last so many years from the date of the war, so that it cannot be said that you have got to spend the revenue on any large expansion. (Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney: "In how many years?") The number of miles comes to about 250 or 350 since the commencement of the war—I cannot give you the exact figure—I have got it, but I do not think it is necessary for this purpose. I am allowing 52 per cent. of the revenue for the purposes of this expenditure. Both the Acworth Committee and the Retrenchment Committee have gone into the question of the programme revenue which should be set apart for overtaking arrears and for depreciation. The Acworth Committee, of which my friend on the left was a distinguished member, has calculated the arrears of depreciation and the average expenditure on depreciation. They have put it at 18 crores arrears, and 9 crores 30 lakhs every year for ordinary programme revenue. It has been pointed out by the Retrenchment Committee that this 9 crores 30 lakhs is the actual theoretical calculation of the depreciation, but the expenditure cannot be more than 6½ crores or 7 crores per annum; and they also suggested that the arrears of 8½ crores might be distributed over 5 years, so that about 3½ crores may be added to the 6 or 7 crores, and it might be provided at the figure of 10½ crores per annum. Honourable Members will see that last year, though they provided about 10 crores for programme revenue, they could not spend the money and the memorandum on the Railway Budget explains why they could not spend the money—because they say the whole principle of railway administration relating to renewals and extensions was reconsidered, special experts had been appointed and they were examining the questions—not because, as the Honourable the Finance Member would have it, in his statement, that they retrenched expenditure and saved the programme revenue. Actually this explanation is given in the several paragraphs of the Railway Budget memorandum where they say they could not spend the money because provision for capital expenditure had to be examined and several changes had to be made in the estimates and so they were only able to spend 7 crores. If it was new construction they may not be charged to programme revenue at all. So that what I submit is that an average of 10 crores for programme revenue for a few years more does not matter. Now, to continue my argument with an anticipated revenue of 97 crores, if you allow 50 crores for expenditure you must have a balance of about 47 crores available. Out of this 26 crores will go towards the expenditure that is referred to at page 1 of the Appendix B—that is, interest on capital charge, purchase of railways, repayment of capital, interest on capital contributed to Indian States and Railway Companies, miscellaneous railway expenditure, etc. All these may be taken at 26 crores. So out of 47 crores if 26 crores are taken away, 21 crores should be the normal balance

available for distribution between the general revenues and railway depreciation and—capital programme. I mean that that should be the position. That is the general line of my approaching the subject and I do not think it can be questioned. There are many experts here who may attempt to question my views, but I think the examination of the 50 years' working of the Railway administration that I have made above confirms me in my position and it will be very difficult for me to go over to any other view. What I say is that we must see, after budgeting for 50 crores expenditure, we have about 20 crores extra to be taken over. Besides this 20 crores we have 9 crores 80 lakhs for programme revenue. I do not propose to touch that. This 9 crores 80 lakhs is the amount of annual expenditure which the Acworth Committee decided upon, but the Retrenchment Committee said that it should be only 7 crores. There will be 2 crores extra no doubt, but that money and more may be required for revenue expenditure for capital purposes, so that if that is left out you will have the normal profit of 21 crores out of the 97 crores gross income. We are told—of course I am going to deal with it later—that 4·27 crores will be the amount that will be available for the revenues of the country, next year out of 22 crores that must be available. Therefore, I submit the case that I place before the Government asks for a reduction of 10½ crores. It is only about half the actual amount; this ought to be spared if the administration is working the thing properly. That is so far as the general features of the case are concerned.

Then I have to take the Assembly through the various remarks that have been made by the Retrenchment Committee. I refuse to believe, Sir, that any one in India at present can easily criticise the Committee's report because I have been able to see that every line of that report deserves a volume to be written upon it. It is closely reasoned, every table has been considered and I am satisfied as far as I have seen that it is not right for anybody easily to throw away that report which has been approved of by all the Departments so far as I know. Therefore, if

I base my arguments on the Report of that Committee, I think I am on safe ground. The Committee point out this fact, Sir, that while the revenue has grown from 56 to 92, the expenditure has grown from 29 to 67 in the year 1922-23. They make special mention of it and they dwell on each of these items, but they only make a total reduction of 4 crores and they add that it may be left at 64 crores, for 1923-24 while what was provided for was 67·99 or 68. In every paragraph they point out that you will have to make very large reductions in the totals. But in making those general statements, they also show how the reductions ought to be worked and brought about. They explain how each 1,000 ton gross mileage, engine mileage and train mileage has to be worked out and how all these questions should be considered so as to bring about a uniform scale of expenditure in all the Railways. It will perhaps be unnecessary for me to go into details, except for showing that the subsequent figures that I am going to place before the Assembly are figures that have been worked up based on the suggestions made in that Report, so that, as I said, I will be on safe ground to place those figures before the Assembly.

What I propose to do is to ask for a reduction in all of 10½ crores. I allow another 10 and odd crores to be distributed, for Railway works, etc., and I do not propose to reduce this figure. The general administration portion of working expenses is covered by the Resolution that I move at present. If any of my friends want any explanation on any items I

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

am prepared to give it to them, because I do want to stand cross-examination if necessary. Now in the general administration the provision made for the coming year is 8 crores, and the provision made in 1913-14 was 4 crores. General administration ordinarily should not increase proportionately with the income except in some items, but I am prepared to allow the full expenditure in many cases. What does it come to? To 4 crores—if you take the income in the year 1913-14. It was 56 crores—and the present income that is anticipated is 97 crores, 75 per cent. more will be the charge that you can make, and that will come in all to about 7 crores at the highest expenditure. I take it that that may be for general administration, fixed at 6½ crores. 1½ crores must be cut out as extraordinary expenditure, and I say it would not be very difficult to find this. I have placed before the Honourable Member in charge a small table that I have prepared in connection with this matter, and I have shown, as far as I could, how the increase is going on. I have shown in the table that the Railways have had a varying number of officers who are paid more than Rs. 1,000 disproportionate to their needs. These officers are employed in certain railways in larger proportion than the mileage controlled by them would warrant, while other railways are more frugal. So it is found impossible to make out why there should be such a large staff for the length of mileage they maintain. For example, I find in the G. I. P. Railway 228 officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and more. These officers include people who are drawing Rs. 700 but who would eventually rise to the maximum of Rs. 1,500 or so. You find that there are 263 officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and over in the N. W. R., 209 officers in the E. I. Railway, 155 officers in the B. N. Railway and 160 officers in the B. B. & C. I. Railway. In fact, I had given the mileage of each railway, but somehow that has not been typed. But whatever it is, you will find on examination that the number of officers employed by some of these Railways is too large and unnecessary, and I am sure a prudent commercial concern would not employ such a large number of highly paid officers. Therefore, this is a matter which will have to be looked into by the Department. That is one point.

Sir, you will find another table showing the number of people reduced in this year's Budget. It is said that 8,600 and odd people have been sent away—probably people earning Rs. 15 or so and a few officers getting Rs. 100, Rs. 50 and so on,—but I do not see any practical and material reduction in the figures. Now it was pleaded by the Honourable the Finance Member that his Department had exercised control over expenditure and that there was saving effected, but I do not see any saving effected like that. What I find is this, that, while 64 crores was the amount allotted by the Retrenchment Committee for the year 1923-24, I find 68 is the total expenditure provided in the 1923-24 Budget, 64 is the revised estimate and 70 is proposed to be expended in 1924-25. I do not understand it at all. If there was a full reduction of expenditure, it must directly have gone down to the scale of working expenses in pre-war times. The gross earnings grew very rapidly. Ordinarily there should not be such growth in expenditure, but actually what we find is that within the last four or five years expenditure has gone up far beyond anything that one can think of. It was 31 crores in 1917-18 and now it is 70 crores and odd, so that there must be something definitely done to see that the expenditure does not go up but goes down. What I propose to do is this, that the 8 crores provided for the whole of the general administration should be

distributed amongst the head so as to get about 1½ crores cut out. I have worked out the details on certain principles on a paper which I have supplied to the Honourable Sir Charles Innes.

I shall now take up the Engineering Department, because the others are not before us. I have not worked out the figures for steamboat services and others. I have worked out the figures for the engineering portion, Locomotive, Traffic Department, Stores and other expenditure. There is a provision made of 8 lakhs and odd for other expenditure though in many Railways there is no provision made under this head. From these eight crores I propose to make a reduction of about 1½ crores, and this is how I work it out. I find that the percentage of expenditure on the engineering staff of all railways is 24·5. The total is 8 crores and the average is worked out at 24·5. But, if you work it out in detail, you find the Assam Bengal Railway takes 28·6 per cent.; the Bengal Nagpur Railway 24·7; the B. B. & C. I. 22·6; Burma 23; Eastern Bengal 22; East Indian Railway 21·7; Great Indian Peninsula 24; Madras and Southern Mahratta 26; North Western 27; Oudh and Rohilkhand 26; and the South Indian 27. The percentage of the East Indian Railway, 21·7, is the lowest and it is one of the best worked railways under this head and I do not see why the contribution for engineering establishment there should be less than on other railways, unless it be that capital programme expenditure is included in the others which I dare say is not the case. Now, looking at the generally bloated nature of the expenditure under this head on all the railways, I take 20 per cent. as a proper working figure for all the railways on this account. 20 per cent. of this eight crores ought to be quite sufficient to man any railway engineering departments properly. If you take it at that figure, it comes to about 150 lakhs and I want a reduction under this head of 47 lakhs. I therefore place it before the Department concerned to consider whether they should not adopt this standard of establishment on all railways which is maintained by the East Indian Railway, and even improve upon it. It may be that particular railways require a larger staff. I can quite well understand that. I asked the Department some time back if they had finished this grouping of railways and they replied that they were considering it. That is the most important matter. The first thing that the Retrenchment Committee pointed out was the necessity for this; and a Financial Commissioner and a Special Officer have been employed on this since last April. The first requirement is a grouping of the railways in such a way that the 3½' gauge lines are divided in such a way that the same group of Railways are provided with a staff and other heads of expenditure of a particular standard, and the 5'·6" railways also are similarly grouped. (*A Voice*: "May I ask if the Honourable gentleman is referring to the height of the officers on these railways?") If I heard the remarks clearly, I would be able to reply to that. (*A Voice*: "Are there any officers 3' 6" in height?") Well, that is the way this has been going on. They have been apparently taking the length of persons into consideration and providing all the higher staff. What I have asked for is to find out the proper expenditure on this. I have urged it and you will have to answer it, unless it be that you argue that these people will be made to lie down the whole length of the lines and prove the need. I am going on certain proportions in regard to this expenditure. I do say that there may be special cases on particular railways where it can be demonstrated that a larger staff is required for one reason or another. If you group the railways you can tell us, say, that out of 1,500 miles of this railway about 40 miles are on a ghat section which

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

requires special establishment and cost of maintenance and 20 miles are laid on porous grounds which will cost more proportionately for repairs, etc. Is there any such programme being drawn up? I want this done at the earliest possible moment. The suggestion has been made by the Retrenchment Committee that the railways should be grouped under five heads. It may be that they can be grouped under four heads, and there may be exceptional portions of those railways to be taken into consideration. For example the Eastern Bengal Railway requires an expenditure which can never be justified in any way. Even if a portion of the line has to be closed, that had better be done, or it should be made over to a company, or, if the planters want it, it should be transferred to them; it should not be run at this great loss. I say these are points which it is not possible now to dilate upon. But the retrenchment that I ask for is very simple and everybody will agree that the expenditure must be brought down. I allow under this head alone about one crore more than is necessary for expenditure by the Department. I want only a reduction of about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  crores under the various heads. It must be looked into; it cannot be put off. The war can be an explanation only for some years. I ask the Honourable Members of the Assembly to give effect to this motion so that the Department might be put on its mettle and go into the whole question. The other heads and the percentages they work out are also given in my tables.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Sir, the Honourable Member who has just spoken was yesterday going into the lobbies against Government not from any view of the merits of the case but merely to indicate his opposition to anything the Government might do. I must say, Sir, that, when I heard his speech this morning I was at a loss to know whether he had merely changed his tactics, whether he was still working in the same spirit of opposition but had merely changed his method, whether the speech we have heard to-day was just another but more circuitous form of obstruction. If it is not that, then I wondered when I heard it, whether it was an elaborate joke, whether really the Honourable Member intended us to take him seriously. It is perfectly obvious, Sir, that Mr. Rama Aiyangar has devoted a great deal of study to the statistics of railways. And, Sir, he has apparently in the course of that study evolved methods which would justify his being appointed at once as the Agent and General Manager of any railway in any country instead of practising the law in Madras. Sir, Mr. Rama Aiyangar by a process of arithmetical calculation, by dwelling upon pre-war ratios, has arrived at the conclusion that this House can seriously ask the Government at once to cut down the ordinary working expenses by no less than  $10\frac{1}{2}$  crores of rupees. Only last year, Sir, we had a really competent Committee, namely, the Retrenchment Committee, presided over by one of the biggest business men in the world and composed entirely of very distinguished business men in India. They devoted themselves, Sir, to a study of the Indian railways. They devoted themselves to that study with the express object of effecting retrenchments. In their report, Sir, they made some very valuable suggestions, which suggestions are being followed out. But, Sir, that Committee was not able to recommend to this House a reduction of ~~10~~ crores in working expenses. The only reduction it recommended was in programme revenue expenditure. Yet, Sir, it is left to Mr. Rama Aiyangar to try to persuade the House that it is a practical proposition

for this House to vote here and now that our working expenses should be cut down by 10½ crores. Now, Sir, what does Mr. Aiyangar base his argument on? He goes back to pre-war history, he goes back to our operating ratio at a time before the war. He points out that our working expenses have increased enormously: I think he said from 29 crores in 1890 to 68 crores this year. He says that it is intolerable that this sort of thing should go on; and he now proposes that we should at once go back to the pre-war operating ratio and, if I understood him correctly, reduce our working expenses to 50 crores. Has it ever struck the Honourable gentleman that this increase in working expenses is not peculiar to India, that it has occurred in the railways of every country in the world? And that fact shows that there are some causes at work which go far beyond the alleged inefficiency or extravagance of the Indian Railway Board. Now, Sir, let me prove the statement I have just made. In 1914, Sir, the working expenses of the Canadian Railways were 178 million dollars. In 1922, Sir, they were 300 million dollars. In 1914, the working expenses of the United Kingdom railways, given in dollars, were 425 million dollars. (*Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya*: "Will you kindly mention the percentages?") Later. In 1922, Sir, those working expenses had risen to 851 million dollars. In France, Sir, in 1914 the working expenses were 252 million francs. In 1922, they had risen to 1,472 million francs. In Switzerland, Sir, the working expenses in 1914 were 81 million dollars; in 1922, they had risen to 77 million dollars. Now, Sir, I think I have proved my point. I think I have proved that this increase in ordinary working expenses is due to causes which are entirely outside the control of any one who is responsible for the working of railways in any country in the world; and that, Sir, is surely a sufficient answer to the proposal made by Mr. Rama Aiyangar that our working expenses next year should be cut down by 10½ crores. I do not think, Sir, that the House will accept that motion. There are other motions coming along, and during the discussion of those motions no doubt many points will be raised. But I am sure, Sir, that this House is not going to accept straight off this motion of Mr. Rama Aiyangar that we should cut down the working expenses of Indian Railways at one fell swoop by 10½ crores; and I hope, Sir, that the House will not accept that motion.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya**: Will the Honourable Member kindly give the percentages of increase in the working expenses of the foreign railways he has mentioned, as between the expenses before the war and after?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: Do you want the operating ratio? I mentioned first the Canadian Railways: the operating ratio increased from 78.63 per cent. in 1914 to 89.16 per cent. in 1922. The operating ratio of the United Kingdom Railways increased from 52.75 per cent. in 1913 to 65.95 per cent. in 1920. The figures for 1921-22 are not given. In France the operating ratio increased from 63 per cent. in 1913 to 157 per cent. in 1920. In Switzerland the operating ratio increased from 75 per cent. in 1914 to 94.4 per cent. in 1921.

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Sir, the subject itself is a very difficult one. I, for want of knowledge as well as time, have not been able to read through all the figures in the way my Honourable friend, Mr. Rama Aiyangar, has done. Therefore, I am not in a position either to confirm or to deny the accuracy of those figures. But, Sir, when a Member of

[Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju.]

this House tries his level best to go into the figures, is this the way we expect the Official Benches to deal with the matter, by a bantering tone, one Honourable Member asking whether percentages are to be measured by inches, and another gentleman saying that Mr. Rama Aiyangar should be employed as an agent of a railway? Sir, when we have come here, we want to understand the position. If we are mistaken, we expect that Members would come forward and tell us where we are mistaken. Sir, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes has told us, "Our railways are working efficiently; what more is wanted? Compare them with other railways of the world." Perhaps, Sir Charles Innes does not want to compare the comforts given on the railways in other parts of the world. If he had gone and travelled on other railways, in Canada, in England, in Germany, in Italy, in France or anywhere, he would have found that his first-class accommodation is not at all better than the third-class accommodation in those countries. Unfortunately, in this country, Sir, we have not very high wages. In India, we are paid not more than Rs. 20, whereas in England and America and other places they are paid Rs. 250 to 300. Where Rs. 7,000 or more are paid here, they are paid ten times more. But, so far as Indians are employed, look at the other side of the picture. Take the railways in other countries which are paying Rs. 250 to Rs. 300 for job porters; the higher officials there are paid not more than 10 times the lowest level. Here, they are paid 100 times, 150 times, sometimes 200 times more; and the saving in the expenses which are incurred in paying the lower services, are utilised in meeting the cost of the higher appointments. (*An Honourable Member*: "Nonsense".) It is so when we compare the lower salary paid with the highest paid in any Department of Railways. But this much is certain. We are not experts. Fortunately for us, laymen, the Retrenchment Committee has helped us a good deal. They have placed materials before us and enabled us to criticize you. Sir, with all your knowledge, to a certain extent. They gave us a simple rule: "whatever you do, we will not be satisfied unless you give us 5½ per cent. on the capital outlay." I may mention here to the House that the capital outlay which was taken is not the ordinary capital outlay; we have omitted all our losses, we have omitted all those annuities which you have paid, we have only taken a very small amount. I take it for granted that that capital outlay is accepted by the Government and by the railways. On that capital outlay the Retrenchment Committee asks you to have 5½ per cent. And I may mention another thing, Sir. They speak of the losses on the strategic railways, and say they ought to be included. Now what is the loss on strategic railways. Only 1½ crores. Even including the 1½ crores, if we take 5½ on the capital outlay, we should have 8½ crores by including the losses on our strategic railways of 1½ crores; we are collecting about 6½ crores. Now we can only correct it in this way. We have not got our staff of gentlemen who helped the Retrenchment Committee in preparing the groundwork for calculating it and how to calculate it and how to see, for instance, the life of an engine. These are the various things which experts are expected to do, and we expect. Sir, that the Honourable Mr. Hindley will help us. The Honourable Mr. Hindley and the Honourable Sir Charles Innes should come to our help and not be in the opposite camp in order to criticise us. They should come to our help, to explain to us, to satisfy us and to tell us that they are doing their level best and they are here to help us to produce efficient results. We should not resort to mutual recrimination but should



co-operate with one another, helping one another, so that you will satisfy us and we will help you to whatever extent you want. Is it not in this House that, when you wanted 150 crores, we very readily gave it, not because we understood it, but because we thought that you would do your level best to help us, and bring about efficient results? What do we find? There has been an increase by 25 per cent. and more on passenger rates and railway freights. There is no prospect of reduction. My friend Mr. Joshi would ask when you are going to reduce third class fares. We have not even the prospect of realising the interest on the capital we have invested. Is it wrong on our part to expect the department, which has got a special officer, which has got a special financial adviser to come to our help? He is a financial adviser to us and not to the Railway Department. He should come to our help and tell us how best to secure the retrenchment recommended by the Committee? If you have done that, you have done a great deal. Of course you have not done that. We must rely more upon the report of the Retrenchment Committee than on the statements made by the Official Benches.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** Sir, whilst I do not think that it is particularly difficult to say something on the amendment before the House, I certainly do feel that the complaint that I made during the general debate on the Budget that the number of days provided for discussion of the various items before us are very few is more than amply borne out to-day. The Honourable Mr. Rama Aiyangar, I know as a matter of fact, has tried and done his best with the figures and papers that he got, and I will be the last person to endorse what the Honourable the Commerce Member said that anything that Mr. Rama Aiyangar said in his opening remarks should not be taken seriously. I fully appreciate why the officers in charge of the department should feel a little annoyed on account of the tall order given by Mr. Rama Aiyangar, but the reason of the different outlook of each is not far to seek. Mr. Rama Aiyangar tries to study the figures as he sees them and according to the best of his abilities. The department and the officers in charge of the department, experts as they are in this subject, practically know where Mr. Rama Aiyangar either overlooks something or has forgotten to take cognisance of something else. I think, Sir a good way out of what is now before the House is what for the time being has been put off, namely, the separation of the railway from the general Budget, and secondly, if I may say so, the discussion of the railway Budget, not simultaneously with the Budget of the country, but at some other period (Hear, hear) preferably in July or September. The whole Budget of the country in round figures exceeds Rs. 220 crores. The railway budget by itself accounts for nearly one half of it, namely, Rs. 100 crores, and the subject matter opened up by my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar's great industry covers the very substantial amount of about Rs. 65 crores. I therefore felt, Sir, that the Honourable Member in charge of the department might have begun by at least appreciating Mr. Rama Aiyangar's zeal and his great anxiety to look into the figures, to understand them, and if possible to arrive at some sort of retrenchment or reduction in this respect; certainly not in the light of what the Honourable Sir Charles Innes referred to, the spirit that prevailed yesterday afternoon, but pre-eminently in the spirit which has prevailed in this House since noon to-day.

With these preliminary remarks, I go on to the discussion of the various items moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar, I said, Sir,

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

that it is not difficult to discuss these items. I repeat that it is not difficult to discuss these items. Mr. Rama Aiyangar suggests in a Budget of very nearly Rs. 60 crores, or Rs. 63 crores, I forget now, a cut of very nearly Rs. 12 crores. Mr. Rama Aiyangar was good enough to say that the Inchcape Committee that sat last year did very useful work. I would only point out to Mr. Rama Aiyangar that in spite of the good work that that Committee did, out of a Budget of Rs. 68 crores of working expenses, they could only lay their hands upon a cut of Rs. 4½ crores. It is not that Lord Inchcape spared his knife, if he found there was the slightest opening for it. It is not either that he was unwilling to do it. I assure Mr. Rama Aiyangar that he and his committee let their knife work wherever they found the smallest opening for it. It is true that the various details indicated by the Inchcape Committee do not necessarily mean that the cut should stop at Rs. 4½ crores, but that it should increasingly go on effecting more economies on similar lines. My Honourable friend Mr. Chatterjee says 'No'. I can only tell him what my impression on that Committee was; but we feel that we have not allowed enough time to the Railway Department to do it. I would join anybody in this House who searched in that direction a year or two later, but at this very moment to come out with the proposal that Rs. 12 crores should be taken off out of a total of Rs. 60 crores and odd appears to me, Sir, to be rather a tall order; and I would suggest to Mr. Rama Aiyangar not to mind the few remarks that we heard from the opposite benches just now, but to rest content with having started this debate at this juncture and to send to the department his detailed views and to ask Mr. Hindley to criticise his views for his satisfaction. These subjects can always come up and will come up almost every Session. Next September or whenever we meet next, whenever His Excellency the Viceroy decides that supplementary grants should come on, the Railway Budget is again bound to come before the House in one form or another and I hope that Mr. Rama Aiyangar's curiosity and his criticism of every one of the items that he has referred to would then be satisfied by the Honourable the Chief Commissioner of the Railways. If it is not then satisfied, I am sure Mr. Rama Aiyangar need not be told what to do. But I do think that he would do very well to spare this Assembly the very difficult task of going into the details of these items 1 to 7, covering a cut of very nearly 12 crores of rupees out of a total expenditure of 60 crores of rupees. I feel very strongly, Sir, that Mr. Rama Aiyangar cannot expect that there has been such extravagance in that department that all of a sudden simply by waving the magic wand of the Assembly, almost immediately, the Railway Department can forthwith save 20 per cent. of their estimated expenditure. I do believe . . . . .

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Will the Honourable Member confine himself now to the proposal which is now before the House and enlighten the House with his views on the question of reducing 40 lakhs out of the engineering department, to which I understand Mr. Rama Aiyangar's proposition refers?

**Mr. President:** No motion has been proposed. The Honourable Member spoke for a good deal of time but did not move any motion. I allowed him to proceed on the original question before the House. If the Honourable Member had moved his motion regarding the engineering department, I would have had to pull him up as he was out of order.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I moved . . . . .

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member could have moved any one of the motions in his name. Taking them all together, they represent a reduction of 10½ crores, and I allowed him to proceed because the discussion of that question was in order on the motion originally put from the Chair, namely, the vote of 67 crores. If he had moved his reduction of 40 lakhs in relation to the Engineering Department, then he would have confined his remarks to the Engineering Department and to nothing else.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** It was only at the end that I referred to the head relating to the Engineering Department and I also referred to the percentages of that Department only. I also said at that time that I would begin with a general statement in respect of the heads covered by my motion and I would state the figures and percentages of the other heads later on . . . . .

**Mr. President:** I never heard the Honourable Member move his motion. The speech of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas also proved that the discussion was on the general reduction of 10½ crores. I assumed at the time that it was more convenient not to ask the Honourable Member to confine his remarks to a particular item as the Honourable the Commerce Member would like to have an opportunity of a general reply to him. If the Honourable Member wishes to move his motion that the provision under the head Engineering Department be reduced by 40 lakhs, then the discussion must be restricted to that item.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I understand, Sir, that we were discussing all the four motions which suggest that the Railway Budget be reduced by 10½ crores and when I spoke I was thinking that the House would prefer to wait for a more reasonable motion.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** There is no motion about general reduction here. What I said was that I would dwell first on the general aspects of the discussion and I would confine my remarks to the figures relating to the Engineering Department.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** My notes show that the Honourable Member said that he proposed to reduce the budget by 10½ crores.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** I think the proposal now before the House is that the amount relating to the Engineering Department be reduced by 40 lakhs. Am I right, Sir?

**Mr. President:** I never heard the Honourable Member move it. I understood him to say that he wanted a general discussion and it seemed to me a more appropriate thing to do. The Honourable Member devoted a greater portion of his speech to the larger subject, namely, the reduction of the Railway Budget by 10½ crores. It was only at the end of his speech that he came to the Engineering Department. The Engineering Department was of course in order under the main motion. But, if the Honourable Member had moved his motion under the head Engineering Department, then I would not have allowed the Honourable Member to speak as he did.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I think, Sir, I said at the beginning that I would first make general remarks relating to the whole subject and then go into each head. It was after any general discussion that I confined

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

myself to the percentages of the Engineering Department. It may be that I have committed a formal mistake by not moving, as the Chair says, that the provision under the Engineering Department be reduced by Rs. 40 lakhs.

**Mr. President:** That is precisely what I am pointing out to the Honourable Member. It is obvious that, if the Honourable Member moves his motion about the Engineering Department, we must confine ourselves to that subject.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** Then I move, Sir :

"That the provision under the head 'Engineering Department' be reduced by Rs. 40 lakhs."

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Can we not take all the motions (1 to 7) included under motion 30 together as they all relate to general administration. This procedure will be much more convenient to the House.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I have no objection to adopt that course.

**Mr. President:** If the Honourable Member chooses to move his motion regarding the Engineering Department then I shall have to ask the Honourable Member to confine his remarks to that subject only.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** Then I will move the whole of my motion, namely :

"That the provision under the following sub-heads be reduced as shown :

- (1) Engineering Department by Rs. 40 lakhs.
- (2) Locomotive Department by Rs. 27.79 lakhs.
- (3) Carriage and Wagon Department by Rs. 30.77 lakhs.
- (4) Traffic Department by Rs. 48.85 lakhs.
- (5) Audit and Accounts Office by Rs. 17 lakhs.
- (6) Stores Department by Rs. 6.20 lakhs.
- (7) Other expenses by Rs. 8.76 lakhs."

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** What is your ruling, Sir? Shall I go on in the same strain and on the same line as I was doing before? I really wonder what difference all this discussion has made.

**Mr. President:** No difference at all.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** Sir, my Honourable friend has said that the question of grouping of railways, which was recommended by both the Acworth and the Incheape Committees, has not been, if I understood him aright, attended to by the Railway Department. But the subject is still reported to be under consideration. I suppose what he meant was that they have come to no definite decision or conclusion on this point. Now, there I absolutely agree with my friend and think that it is a point on which one may elaborate a discussion on the Budget concerning the Railway Department. Both the Committees referred to laid very great stress on it and the Incheape Committee particularly said that the Railway Department here should attend to it forthwith. They also thought that great economies could be effected by the grouping of railways and that it would be rather interesting to know how much more time the Railway Department are likely to take before any further substantial step

is taken or a policy decided in connection with this unanimous recommendation of these two Committees. I feel, Sir, that my Honourable friend did refer also to the working charges of the various railway lines and it was on account of this reference that I said what I did before the Honourable Pandit interrupted me. I think he referred to the working charges in foreign countries and compared them with one another in order to show why the working charges here had not gone down or had gone up more than what they did in other foreign countries. These comparisons, though very useful from a technical point of view, are rather misleading when you come to apply them practically as we have several times been told by the Government Benches. You often find that the conditions are not the same and you will find that any calculation on such comparisons, especially as far as finance is concerned, may be misleading, for you do not know whether the conditions in the countries you are comparing are parallel. I will only indicate one direction in which all the figures given by the Honourable Sir Charles Innes at the request of the Honourable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya may be found to be liable to revision. What are the items which some of these countries include in their working charges? Till very lately the working charges of some of the Indian railways as printed in some of the reports included several things which were in addition to the working charges and I therefore submit that no conclusion should be arrived at for the purposes of a cut in this House simply because it is based on comparisons of working charges of foreign countries as printed in their reports. I feel that it is possible that many of my Honourable friends in this House may feel that what I say does not amount to much of a support to what my Honourable friend has tried to impress upon this House. I am afraid that, if we are to look at this Budget in a serious light, and if we are to come to any decision here, then it is very necessary that we should not pass this cut, especially as it is a big amount, without being convinced that it is capable of being put into effect without affecting either efficiency or progress. I do not say that Mr. Aiyangar's cuts have nothing in them. It is possible that, if we compare notes with the Honourable the Chief Commissioner for Railways; they will both come to some sort of conclusion which may enable us to embody the cuts, perhaps in the supplementary grants. But at this stage to make a big cut of 12 crores or 10 crores is, I am afraid, a proposition which should not and cannot appeal to many of us.

**Mr. M. K. Acharya** (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I hope, Sir, that no great surprise will be caused by the fact that I, who belong to the much decried Swaraj party, am rising at this stage to make a few remarks and to take part in to-day's discussion. I assure the House that we Swarajists are just as human as anybody else, and that it is from a purely human standpoint that we propose to look at these figures and take part in the discussion, however we may be disposed to vote when the time for voting comes. In a preliminary way may I be permitted to state that I have listened with great interest to the very arduous statement placed before the House by my Honourable friend, Mr. Rama Aiyangar; and I also desire to add my own feeble protest that the work done by him, without the aid of a huge department to help him and without the assistance derived from officers who are experts, has not been appreciated. I dare say that the Honourable Member for Commerce intended it as an appreciation when he said that my Honourable friend, Mr. Rama Aiyangar, must be made Agent of some railway. I believe it will be only logical if I wish the Honourable Sir Charles Innes to become

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

a lawyer, for only in the legal world the maxim, it is said, obtains that, when you have no case for the defendant, you should abuse the plaintiff's lawyer. I have been listening to the discourse of Mr. Rama Aiyangar and to the expert reply of the Honourable the Commerce Member; and it strikes me that the expert was not trying to meet the layman on fair grounds. It struck me that the way that Mr. Rama Aiyangar has been working has been on perfectly logical lines. He has been hauling up department after department, taking up the figures, trying to see what cuts could be made in the most constructive manner that evidently suggested itself to him. Of course it is not for me to say whether his estimate of 10 or 12 crores is a correct estimate. That is another question. Just now the motion before the House is only with regard to 176 lakhs. He has given the various sub-heads under which the various cuts will have to be made and I dare say that the explanation will be coming from the Government side as to how far these cuts may or may not be made. Now, for one thing, there was a talk of the working expenses and the percentage spent on the working expenses in India and elsewhere; and I believe that the figures which I took down from the Honourable Sir Charles Innes seemed more to help Mr. Rama Aiyangar than destroy his figures. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes said that the percentage in Canada in 1911 was 78·16 and in 1922, 89·16, an increase of only about 16 per cent., and in the United Kingdom 52·75 in 1914 and in 1922, 66·85. In France the increase seems to have been very abnormal, namely, from 63 to 157; and probably here India comes nearer to France. Here it has gone up from 31 to 69, an increase of over cent. per cent., and in that respect, unless the Honourable Sir Charles Innes is prepared to show that conditions obtaining in India are as abnormal as those in France, I do not know if it will be justifiable to grant an increase of expenditure in 1924-25. In Switzerland again, he said, it rose from 75 to 94, that is, only 19 per cent. All these increases show only 14, 15, 16 and 19 per cent., but here, if I have been following Mr. Rama Aiyangar's figures, the working expenses during the past 10 years seem to have increased by a very large percentage, probably more than 100 per cent.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** May I correct the Honourable Member. The figure for 1914 was 52·8, and in 1923-24, 64·70, and in next year's budget 68·9.

**Mr. M. K. Acharya:** I thank the Honourable Member for the correction. Even then the increase seems larger than the figures quoted for other countries where the conditions are far different from those obtaining in India. Anyway, as the Honourable Member from Bombay has put it so well, there is no use in juggling with these figures or as to what obtains in other countries. We are more concerned with India. We are misled by calculations as to what obtains in other countries. Railways in other countries add to the wealth of those countries, whereon expenditure goes very much to improve the condition of the people; whereas here it does not matter to the average cultivator, it does not affect him whether we run one thousand or ten thousand miles. To him there are other more important things such as irrigation, education, etc. Now these comparative figures do not help us very much, and therefore the question is whether these suggested cuts can or cannot be made in the figures before

the House. Some way must be found by which we, laymen, may rest satisfied that the Department has not been absolutely stubborn. I

hope the doctrine of prestige will not affect the railways also.

4 P.M. I am acquainted to a small extent with the working of one railway in South India; and I know whatever the increase in expenditure there has been (I have not got the figures before me) so far as the bulk of the expenditure goes, whether that goes to engineering, or traffic or other departments,—I know from first hand knowledge, because I was connected with a Railway Employee's Association on the South Indian Railway, that the lot of the lower grade employees is not at all improved. I would wish that the Railway Board should direct attention to see that when these large increases in the working expenses are sanctioned, some portion at least of it goes to alleviating the condition of the men in the lower grades, and that the greater portion is not consumed in large increases to the highly paid officers on Rs. 1,000 and more. However, that is by the way. I hope, for the satisfaction of the Assembly, the Railway Board will go patiently and not in the manner in which unfortunately Sir Charles Innes chose to reply to the Honourable Mr. Rama Aiyangar this evening—will go patiently into the figures and find out a satisfactory way in which the railway expenses can be cut down, taking all our circumstances into account.

**Mr. W. S. J. Willson** (Associated Chambers of Commerce: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I feel I can add very little to the discussion which has taken place to-day because, though I listened most attentively to the remarks of my friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar, I really could not find a great deal of substance in them. He quoted a good many figures, but as he proceeded he seemed to answer his own argument by defeating it. I found myself again, after he asked for details, very much handicapped when Sir Charles Innes gave his reply, because I do not write shorthand and I cannot take the figures down at that rate, and work the results out for myself. On the whole I am a great deal more in accord with the remarks of Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas than with anybody else who has spoken. The House has decided that the railway separation question is to be gone into in the Autumn Session, and I find that an extremely agreeable proposition, because with all this tremendous weight of figures which we get here at this time of the year, it is quite impossible for Members to go into them, and it is not the least surprising that we should get somewhat confused, get quite wrong in the conclusions we draw, if we try to go into them in a hurry. The views which are expressed in all these little disputes on figures are all very confusing also, because one section of the House is all for beating down expenses, which of course is a very laudable object in its way, while another Member rises to say the conditions of the employees have not been improved. Those are contradictory points of view, and of course it is very difficult to give effect to both of them. Then Mr. Venkatapatiraju complains, on a motion for the cutting down of expenses, that the accommodation given by the railways is not good enough, and he says that the first class accommodation in India is no better than the third class abroad. Well I did not know he was such a great traveller, but it has not been my experience that the first class accommodation here is no better than the third class accommodation abroad; if it is we certainly have to pay a great deal more for it. Another remark made by Mr. Aiyangar was that the East Indian Railway is the best managed railway . . . .

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** May I explain, I did not say that. I gave that figure for this one department. It is one of the best managed railways, I said, but certainly you will find in the table I have given that in each way other railways take the credit.

**Mr. W. S. J. Willson:** I only jotted down that you had said it was one of the best managed railways, and I was going to make a point that that was an argument in favour of company-managed railways, but of course that is another subject to which we shall devote a little attention in September. Now, Sir, another thing which strikes my attention in the figures given by Sir Charles Innes with regard to the figures of increase of expenses of continental railways (as I say I could not take them down), but it struck me from the figures he read out that the greatest increases had taken place in the State-managed railways abroad.

As I have said, Sir, I do not think we can very profitably spend our time on arguing about the railways now when we have decided to treat ourselves to the whole question in the autumn, and I do not think that Mr. Rama Aiyangar can claim to have three times the ability of the Inchcape Committee and proceed to cut the Railways down by 10½ crores, while they (the Inchcape Committee) were satisfied with 4½ crores, which I understand has already been done. If that be so, Sir, I do not propose for my part to carry on the debate further, seeing that we have some 65 items in our Budget. I happened to notice last year that the House made the mistake of devoting far too much time to the earlier items, and then at the last hour we were rushed to passing through the rest without any discussion at all. In view of the fact that we are going to treat this to a thorough examination in the autumn, I think we might very well leave it till that time.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Sir, I wish I could agree with Mr. Willson in the suggestion he has put forward, that because some aspects of the railway administration are to be considered by a Committee in the autumn, we should allow this matter to pass without further discussion now. The matters which have been referred to the Committee which was appointed by this House relate to the question of the separation of the Railway Budget from the General Budget. The questions which are now before the House are questions which affect the general administration of the finances of the railways, and I do not think that, unless the House appoints a Committee to go into this question separately, this matter can be properly dealt with. I fully recognise the difficulties that stand in the way of a proper examination of the Railway Budget at this moment. Not many members of the House have had all the information that they should have; not many of them have had the time that they should employ on the study of this important question of railway finance; and yet the matter is of such importance that the House must consider it in its general aspect and must come to a conclusion as to how this matter can be best dealt with. As my Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas has reminded us, the Railway Budget consists of about 100 crores of rupees. Is this House to allow this large Budget to be voted without being satisfied that the Department is being administered with proper care and economy? Mr. Rama Aiyangar deserves the thanks of this House, and I am sure we shall offer it to him most cordially, for the labour he has bestowed on this question. The figures he has given are enough to arouse attention and to call for explanation. I am sorry to say that the explanation which has been put forward has been anything but satisfactory. It is unfortunately the case in this House now, I say it



with much regret, having been a Member of this Council in its previous existence also for some years, that the tone adopted by several Members of the Government Benches is very different from what they should adopt. On a matter of such seriousness, which concerns 100 crores of rupees, it was inconceivable to my mind that any Member of the Government in charge of the subject should get up and try to ridicule the Member who raised the question, to say that he regarded it as an elaborate joke, regarded the discussion raised by Mr. Aiyangar as an elaborate joke, and to twit him with what happened yesterday. I submit, Sir, it was the duty of the Honourable Member in charge of Railways to answer specifically the questions which Mr. Aiyangar had raised. He asked that 10½ crores should be reduced. Did the Honourable Member give sufficient explanation to show that the Department was being administered economically? What did he do? He compared certain figures of increases in the working expenses of certain foreign railways and there he stopped. He did not go on to compare the conditions which prevail here with those which obtain in other countries where those railways run, and he did not tell us where the difference lay. He did not tell us whether in those countries the men who are running the railways are foreigners imported from outside, drawing higher salaries than they would have drawn in their own countries. He did not tell us whether the materials which the railways employ are materials mostly imported from outside and very little of them manufactured in the country in which those railways are run. He did not tell us many other things like that which would help the House in determining why it is that railway working expenses in this country have run so enormously high. I thought the Honourable Member in charge would help us to understand the position by placing before the House the figures which would enable the House to come to a conclusion whether this high expenditure was justified. (*An Honourable Member*: "He did".) I hear a whisper that he did. I beg to differ—he did not. Beyond telling us of the rise in general railway administration, he did not give us any specific figures which would help us to understand the position. And what is the position? Here we have this large Railway Budget. Working expenses have gone on increasing, as my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar has pointed out. The Honourable the Commerce Member has not disputed the fact that the figures have risen from 29 crores in 1918 to 68 crores this year. Their earnings, my friend Mr. Willson reminds me, have increased by 59 crores. We are now discussing the working expenses. Their earnings have increased and yet the Incheape Committee have passed a censure on the railway administration of this country for giving us such poor returns. He compared the figures of England and of other places, but he did not tell us whether in England the dividend returned on railways was 5 per cent. He did not tell us that in Japan it was 5·8 per cent. on the total capital invested. He did not compare the poor return we receive even on capital invested during the last few decades. That is not the way to deal with the matter before the House.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** May I interrupt for one moment? The Honourable Member has just made a statement that the return on English railways was over 5 per cent. In 1922 the return on English railways was 3·7 per cent.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** And in earlier years?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** In 1913 it was 3·63 per cent.; in 1920 it was 3·51 per cent.; in 1922 it was 3·78 per cent.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** I thank my Honourable friend for the statement. Now the Inchcape Committee recommended that the railways here should give 5½ per cent. He does know how far we are from that 5½ per cent. In that one recommendation, I submit, Sir, the Inchcape Committee included a good deal of condemnation of the present administration of railways in this country. I will draw attention to only one department—the Engineering department. I would draw attention to the number of foreigners employed on the railways in that department. The other day my Honourable friend Mr. Patel asked a question:

“Will Government be pleased to state the number of Indians employed in State-managed railways and receiving a total salary with an allowance above Rs. 300, Rs. 500, Rs. 750 and Rs. 1,000 and the total number of others receiving the same during each of the last five years?”

To that the Honourable Member in charge replied:

“The information in the form asked for by the Honourable Member is not readily available”

--he did not say it was not available, but that it was not readily available—

“but a statement is placed on the table showing the number of Indians employed during the last 2 years on State-managed railways as gazetted officers and as officials drawing Rs. 250 per mensem and over, as compared with the total numbers employed . . . Similar figures for 1919, 1920 and 1921 are not available.”

I am surprised that the Honourable the Commerce Member should make such a statement—that “The figures are not available.” If he had said they were not readily available one could understand it, but he said they were not available. However, the statement which he laid on the table showed that out of 468 gazetted officers only 122—that is, only 26 per cent.—were Indians, while Statutory Indians, namely, Eurasians and Anglo-Indians, numbered 148, and the percentage of Statutory Indians thus rose to 81.9 per cent. That was in 1922. In 1923 the total number of gazetted officers employed on State-managed railways was 478; of whom Indians numbered 128, giving a percentage of Indians as 27.0; Statutory Indians 154; and the percentage of Statutory Indians came to 82. Of officials (excluding gazetted officers) drawing Rs. 250 per mensem and over on scales of pay rising to Rs. 250 per mensem and over, the total was 1,798, and of these 81.5 per cent. were Indians; 1,094 or 61 per cent. were Statutory Indians. That was in 1922. In 1923 out of the total number of 1,711, 548 were Indians and 1,051 were Statutory Indians, the percentage of the latter being 61.4. From these figures it would appear that among gazetted officers the number of Indians including Statutory Indians was 81.5 per cent. of the total; that is to say, nearly 69 per cent. of the total were non-Indians. Now, Sir, we know what high salaries are being paid in this department of the railways as in other departments. The Honourable Member in charge does not tell us whether there was any scheme, any proposal, before the Railway Board or the Government of India to steadily reduce the number of imported men who were employed on these railways, whereby undoubtedly a reduction in the working expenses could be brought about. One might say that any reductions that might be effected in this way would not come to the large figure that my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar has suggested. Certainly not; but it must be only by small reductions like these that you can arrive at a large reduction; and this is one of the directions in which an honest and earnest effort is needed to reduce expenses and to do justice to the children of the soil.

There are other directions in which a great deal of unnecessary expense is incurred. I drew attention to one such matter the other day, namely, to the question of the manufacture of railway material in this country. A Government which is going to spend 30 crores a year for 10 years ought to find, if necessary, 50 crores to promote the manufacture of locomotives and other large machines, etc., which are needed by the railways in this country, so that all the transport charges and all the other unnecessary charges which are paid to foreign manufacturers should cease. That is another direction in which a reduction is possible. Speaking generally, I would say that it is necessary for all these and other reasons that there should be a Committee appointed consisting of Members of this House to go into the whole question of Railway administration. The matter is far too important to be lightly treated as it has been treated by the two Members on the Government side. The matter demands that there should be a thorough inquiry conducted by a Committee appointed by this House. This Committee should consist of European Members of this Assembly who should along with their Indian fellow-Members, go thoroughly into the question and submit their report. The Government should at least promise that before they ask the House to pass this huge demand. The Government should at least promise that they will agree to the appointment of such a Committee consisting of Indian and European Members on which also some officials should sit to furnish figures and other materials, which should examine and report to this House whether a large and substantial reduction cannot be made in the working of the railways. If that is not done, the House would not be justified, Sir, in sanctioning the Demands which have been asked for by the Honourable Member in charge of Commerce.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Sir, I beg to intervene in this debate just to refer to one or two aspects of the question. In the first place, I am in entire agreement with my Honourable friend Sir Purshotomdas Thakurdas in the remarks which he has made in regard to the extremely inconvenient position in which Honourable Members of this House are placed in their criticism of the Railway Budget. It is a part of the general Budget debate that is taken up in this Assembly, and considerable confusion must inevitably result in the appreciation of the main facts of railway finance and railway administration at a time when general financial questions and taxation proposals are under consideration by this House. Sir, the other day, when this question came up before the special Committee appointed to consider the question of the separation of Railway finance from the general finances of the country, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes made a statement that he was of opinion that the Railway Budget should be introduced at a different time from the general Budget of the Government of India, and that special opportunity should be afforded for the criticism and consideration of all questions that may arise in regard to railway finance and administration. Sir, I wish that this method had been adopted long ago. It seems to me that the whole question of railway administration which is coming up year after year is not receiving that consideration which it deserves. In various parts of the country criticisms have been made that comforts of passengers have not been attended to, that economies have not been practised, and that generally the railway administration has not received that attention from the authorities that it deserves to receive. Sir, if I rise to-day, it is emphatically to express my opinion that this separation should take place as early as possible, and that the various questions relating to railway finance and

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

administration should be discussed on a different occasion and with much more leisure and much more consideration than is given to the subject.

Sir, having said that, I have got one or two other complaints against my Honourable friends who are now defending this department to-day. The first complaint is that various methods of retrenchment have been referred to in the Retrenchment Committee's Report. As a result of that report, I have no doubt that we see here and there in the explanatory memorandum of the Railway Budget for this year and last year, certain economies have been practised by the Government, but the point that I wish to raise,—and I believe my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar has done a distinct service in regard to this matter,—the point that I wish to raise is again to draw the attention of this Assembly and also of the Government to the need for exploring further economies in the railway administration of this country. Sir, it was said last year in the explanatory memorandum that the Railway Administrations had appointed Retrenchment Committees. I tabled a question some time ago, and the answer that was given was not at all satisfactory to me, and I believe to-day my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes is not in a position to tell us what the result of the efforts of these retrenchment committees appointed by the various administrations has been financially. To-day we are exactly in the same position. The explanatory memorandum refers to one or two aspects of the Retrenchment Committee's report, and that is that about 36,000 subordinate employees have been sent away, and that, as regards the higher services, a certain number of persons have been discharged. But that is not at all the whole question. There are various other questions which have been suggested in the Retrenchment Committee's Report. I do not wish to weary this House by a citation from that Report but they are questions which deserve the attention of the Government, and if the Honourable Sir Charles Innes says to-day that since 1923 he is not in a position to say what the activities of these Retrenchment Committees are, I must say that we have a serious complaint against him that he does not keep us informed of the actual state of things. Therefore, Sir, I should think that the first duty of the Government is to appoint a Committee, or in some other manner ascertain what further retrenchments, such as those suggested by the Incheape Retrenchment Committee, could be carried out in the railway administration of India. I may say in this connection, Sir, that I feel the same difficulty as my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas feels in endorsing the actual cuts which my Honourable friend Mr. Rama Aiyangar proposes under the various heads. It is not possible in an Assembly like this to say whether the expenditure on engineering should be cut down by 40 lakhs, nor is it possible to say that the expenditure on the locomotive department should be reduced by the exact figure that he has mentioned in his Resolution. Therefore, it seems to me that there is a case, and a very strong case, for inquiry.

There is one other matter, Sir, a matter of vital importance, to which I should like to refer. Some Honourable Members have asked as to what has become of the grouping of railways. I hope they have perused the Memorandum which has been furnished to us to-day, that is, the Memorandum for 1924-25 in explanation of the Railway Budget. Honourable Members will have noticed at page 16 that there is some reference to this question of grouping of railways. It seems to me, Sir, that Honourable Members have not noticed that during the current year, a large scheme of re-organization of the Railway Board has been undertaken and this re-organization is coming into force next year. In connection with that

scheme, the Finance Committee was approached for sanctioning three appointments to give a start to that scheme. The whole of that scheme, Sir, it is stated in para. 85 of this Memorandum, has been framed on the main principles underlying the report of the Acworth Committee. I challenge that statement, Sir. The whole problem for us here in India is that the Railways are a centralised administration, and every part of India from Baluchistan right up to Cape Comorin has come to this Assembly for the rectification or for the modification of railway administration or for the ventilation of their grievances. One of the points that the Acworth Committee had before it was that three territorial Commissioners should be appointed and that the railways should be grouped under the territorial Commissioners who would attend to all matters on the spot. That was the main idea of the proposal for the grouping of these railways and for the appointment of these territorial Commissioners. Sir, in the scheme of reorganisation effect has not been given to that idea. On the other hand, the centralization of railway administration is continued and of course, I see a statement made here, and it is this:

"In view, however, of the importance of the questions involved, it has been decided to introduce this system tentatively and consider, after it has been in force for one year, whether it should be retained or altered in favour of a division of work on a territorial basis."

Sir, I have always felt that the centralisation of railway administration is an evil in a country of such vast magnitude, and that some provision of decentralisation to local authorities or to local administrations or to local legislatures is needed. I was looking forward to the institution of territorial Commissioners to connect them with local administrations and local Legislatures. This scheme has absolutely negated the idea of decentralisation. I know, Sir, the criticism that will be levelled against my proposal. It will be said that Territorial Commissioners would be a kind of post office such as Divisional Commissioners are at present. It is quite true, but it all depends upon the powers that you give them. Therefore, Sir, I think the most important aspect of railway administration is the creation of authorities in various parts of the country mainly with a view to connect them with the Provincial Legislatures and in that way to delegate to provinces the smaller grievances, so that we may confine ourselves here to the main problems of finance and railway administration. Until that is done it seems to me, Sir, that we are all groping in the dark. And this scheme, which I hoped would afford some amount of relief in this direction, does not satisfy the condition to which I was looking. Sir, I suggest to my friend Sir Charles Innes to refer this case either to the Railway Advisory Council or to any other Committee which he may specially appoint. I wish that this question of the smaller grievances of railway administration should be relegated to the background and that we in this Assembly should deal with the larger problems. That I consider to be the main reform in regard to our treatment of railway administration. And unless Honourable Members apply themselves to this larger aspect of this question, it seems to me, Sir, that we are absolutely wasting our time when we set about finding out whether there is a platform at a particular station or whether some station master has or has not been punished. Well, Sir, I ask seriously whether Sir Charles Innes' and our time should be wasted in these small matters while our main problems have to be solved. At the same time I think, Sir, that my Honourable friend should not hesitate to evolve a scheme of decentralization for the smaller questions.

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

There is one other matter in connection with the scheme which Honourable Members will notice. It is proposed that the authority of Agents and Railways Managers should be increased, and when I asked Mr. Hindley to whom these gentlemen are responsible he said they were responsible to their Home Boards. Certainly they are responsible to their Home Boards; they are not responsible to anybody in this country. And therefore decentralization will be a decentralization to authorities who are not responsible to anybody in this country; but what we want is decentralization of responsibility vesting in Provincial Legislatures or in the Indian Legislative Assembly. Therefore, Sir, I am not at all sure that this scheme which has been put forward as the reorganization of the Railway Administration which substantially increases the powers of Railway Agents and General Managers who are responsible, not to us, not to the people of this country, but to their Home Boards, is a scheme which I at any rate can commend. I contend, Sir, that the main problems of railway administration are not receiving attention for want of a sound scheme of decentralization. I also contend, Sir, that, considering the question from this broad aspect, railway financial questions also are escaping the attention which they deserve. I therefore think, Sir, that if this debate has served any purpose, if this larger aspect of the question is thereby considered, I shall be very satisfied. But if it is to serve no other purpose than that of criticisms of small details here and there, it seems to me that that will lead to no results.

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley** (Chief Commissioner: Railways): I should like first, Sir, to express my agreement with a great deal that the last speaker has said regarding the necessity for keeping from this House small details of railway working which can be better dealt with elsewhere. I should like also to agree with him and with other speakers in expressing my own opinion that it would be to the advantage of this House if we could have another time for talking about the Railway Budget than the time allotted for the general Budget. I do not wish at this moment to trench on the large question of the separation of finances which we are going to deal with later on in September. But I am very hopeful that, if we get to a solution of that subject, we may be able to arrange for the House a much longer time to consider the Railway Budget and all the important matters which hang on it.

I should like first of all, Sir, to deal as sympathetically as I can with the difficulties of the Honourable Mover of this amendment. He endeavoured by a process of simple arithmetic to show that we ought to be able to reduce our budget by 10½ crores. I think he said we ought by simple arithmetic to be able to reduce it by 21½ crores. He was kind enough to introduce a certain number of errors into his arithmetic by which he made us a present of 10½ crores and said we might pay back the other 10½ crores to general revenues. I know this is an extremely difficult subject. Critics of railway finance and railway working for years past have been frequently pushed into difficulties owing to the extreme complexity of the whole matter of railway working and railway accounts. They have taken refuge in certain formulas. They have taken refuge in what is known as the working ratio. People go about with the working ratio of different railways in their pockets. They say "that railway works at so much, this railway at so much." Now, Sir, it is very dangerous to use these figures in that rough and ready way. Railway working during the last two decades has become a very much more complex and

scientific matter than was the case before and is much more complicated than is generally appreciated. We find that in the course of working we have to get for our own purposes certain statistics. If the House perhaps has read some of the literature we have placed before it, Honourable Members will know that we have during the last year completely overhauled all our railway statistics. We acted perhaps originally on the suggestion of the Acworth Committee. We were certainly stimulated by the report of the Inchcape Committee, but we had already taken action. My predecessors had already started the ball rolling. We had an officer who studied the matter in America and Great Britain. Not content with that we had the whole matter gone into and during the last year we have now evolved a complete system of co-ordinated statistics which bring before the Railway Board's review and before the Agents of each of the Railways month by month figures showing the exact working results on their railways. It is not a matter of simply saying "one railway works at so much per cent. of its gross earning;" nor is it a matter of saying that one railway spends so much on one Department and so much on another Department. We are trying to get at the matter in a much more scientific way. I do not wish to weary the House by giving details of the statistics we have from each railway or the monthly forms which are sent to us. The essence of this matter is that we have established a uniform basis for these statistics. That is to say, all the railways now send us figures on a uniform basis. We know that, if one railway's figure is so much, the figures from other railways being on the same basis are therefore comparable. The figures that we get from the railways embrace a very large number of aspects of railway working. We have simplified the matter so far that the production of these statistics is not now a difficult matter. They come to us every month; we have them compiled in a comparative statement, or rather a large number of comparative statements—15 in number—representing different aspects of railway working. These comparative monthly statements are printed, and any widely divergent figures shown there on a particular railway are printed in block type. These printed statements are then at once sent out to the different railways and are used by the Agents and they are used by ourselves in our monthly reviews of railways. I was just explaining that to show that the matter has been dealt with by us in as scientific a manner as we can and in as detailed a manner as we can. We cannot expect to get results by going bald-headed for any particular portion of railway expenditure. We want to find out how much it is costing a railway to move a ton of goods one mile; we want to compare that with the neighbouring railway. We want to find out how many pounds of coal a certain railway is using for every mile that an engine runs. I have got that here. I have got the comparative statements here. I have got statements showing the number of pints of oil used per vehicle on every railway in India, on all the principal railways in India, that is to say, during each of the last three months. Now, Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to analyse in detail those statements. I should thereby keep the House longer than I think it would be willing to sit. But, if any Member wishes to examine these statistics, he will find them for the last three months I think in the Library. The establishment of these statistics took a very long time in the first instance. It was not until October last that we got completely the first lot of statistics, and we have been getting them every month since. I think, Sir, that I have perhaps said enough to satisfy the Honourable Mover that we are not neglecting this point; that we have started, we have had a good long start ahead of him, we started by much the

[Mr. C. D. M. Hindley.]

same method as he has adopted, and we have reduced it to a science, and it is a science of very great complexity.

Now, Sir, that being the case, I ask the House, is it reasonable, when I have shown that we are studying this question of economy and the question of expense in every detail by a scientific method, is it reasonable to ask us to take a big knife and cut another 10 crores off our working expenses? Now, what are those estimates? They are the best estimates that we as business men can make of the expenditure which is likely to be incurred next year. Would it be fair, would it be right to come here and say, "Yes, I agree with your arithmetic, we are quite wrong, I will take off 10 crores"? Would it be fair, knowing as we do know that the larger amount must be spent if the railways are to continue to run? That is the position, Sir. I have gone into this matter in detail because I realize from what other Members said besides what the Honourable Mover said that there is a general desire that we should take up this matter in detail and not stop short at what Lord Inchcape showed us. I entirely agree with Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas when he said that the Inchcape Committee did indicate to us certain directions in which we could make reductions. It was not intended, and I certainly never intended when I took up this job, that we were to stop short where the Inchcape Committee left us. I do not like the word "retrenchment" because it has got a different meaning to my mind—the economical working of the railways is the main object of the Railway Board at present. I might perhaps here,—I do not know if it is quite relevant now,—clear up a little matter which has puzzled a good many I think of the critics of railway administration. The Acworth Committee told us one thing, and the Inchcape Committee told us another. That is what I have often been told. The Acworth Committee told us to spend money; the Inchcape Committee to us not to. Now, Sir, I have been a student, a very close student, of both these Reports, and I would just like to mention that when this criticism was last brought to my notice, I mentioned at a meeting of Agents of Railways who were with me at that time that I had found a certain agreement between these two reports. I said that my interpretation of these two reports was that they indicated that the great need for India was efficient transportation all over India, cheap and efficient transportation. I knew Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas was waiting for that first word,—cheap and efficient transportation is the ideal which we have before us in every part of India.

Now, Sir, I would like to make one or two comments on some further criticisms which have been levelled against us. What have we done about grouping? Now, Sir, I do not think that it is altogether understood what grouping means. The Inchcape Committee did not say very much about it. At that moment they knew that grouping was being done in Great Britain and they assumed probably that it would be understood here. Grouping in India is a very difficult matter, a very much more difficult matter, than it is perhaps in a small country like Great Britain. The only point about grouping is that you may be able thereby to reduce your overhead expenditure; that is to say, you may be able to put two railways together and work them under one general office. Well, Sir, we are studying this question; we are asked how much longer we are going to study it. Now there is one very great difficulty for which I have not yet found a solution. Perhaps some one will be able to find a solution



later on, but I do not see one immediately: how are we going to group together and work under one administration a State-managed railway and a Company-managed railway? I leave it at that for the moment. Any one who takes a map of India and studies it and attempts to group railways will see how that difficulty stares us in the face. I do not say that it is not possible, but I say that I do not see any solution of it. But I can tell the House that we are not leaving this matter to rest, and we are looking into it very carefully. Now, Sir . . . . .

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** I do not want to interrupt the Honourable Member, but I might say that paragraph 87 of the Incheape Committee's Report deals with it very fully, although it may be very short.

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley:** I remember paragraph 87 very well; I think it is distinctly short.

I do not know if I shall be in order in taking up the question of re-organization of the Railway Board and decentralization,—I do not find it exactly falls under this motion, but, if the Honourable the President considers that I am in order, I will just make a few remarks. The re-organization which has been undertaken has been explained as fully as we could do it in the Budget Memorandum. It has been designed to meet the work which the Railway Board have to deal with. It has been designed in order to carry out the very definite recommendations of the Acworth Committee that the Members of the Railway Board should be to a large extent free from the routine work of the office in order to devote themselves and their energies to the larger problems of railway administration. That is the basis, Sir, on which the re-organization has been designed. The only criticism which has been brought against this now is that we have for the time being abandoned the suggestion of the Acworth Committee that we should have the country divided up into three or four divisions and put each of these divisions under a Divisional Commissioner. This, Sir, has no real connection with the question of the grouping of railways which was referred to by other speakers. The intention of the Acworth Committee, I think, was that there should be a division of work in the Railway Board by territorial considerations instead of by 'subject' considerations. That is to say, we should have had a territorial Member of the Railway Board for the different sides of India and put under his charge a large number of railways. Well, Sir, we went into that matter very carefully. I gave the matter very considerable thought, and the Government of India considered the matter very carefully indeed. It was decided eventually that, having regard primarily to economy and efficiency, it was advisable that the work within the office should be divided between the Members by subjects and not by territories. This is a matter, Sir, which those of us who are acquainted with the details of administrative work can perhaps appreciate more readily than those Members who are not in close touch with administrative work. I can give one instance of the difficulties that would arise in the case of territorial Commissioners, one of the difficulties within our own office. Take the case of what we call "establishment," that is the question of dealing with staff. Each Commissioner under Sir William Acworth's scheme would have to deal with staff of all kinds and all grades under certain rules. His brother Commissioner on the other side of India would have a similar kind of staff and similar problems and they will be working possibly on different lines and without close co-ordination. This is a matter which, I can tell the House, would cause very considerable difficulty within the

[Mr. C. D. M. Hindley.]

office and probably very much larger staff and also difficult administrative problems outside. That is one of the difficulties. Another point that I was specially insistent upon in regard to this was that having a territorial Commissioner between the Railway Board and the Agent would tend to delay business, to delay work, delay references and delay the issue of orders. We are now in direct touch with the Agents and we can issue orders direct. Under that scheme we should have to issue our orders through the Commissioner. He would in fact either become a post office or he would become a super-Agent. That is the difficulty. That was why it was accepted that we should have two Members, instead of three, and divide the work in the office by subjects. As has been already noticed, this matter is to be reviewed after one year, and no doubt with the experience gained we shall be able to come to a correct judgment after one year's work. I do not think that there are any other detailed criticisms that I need answer at this moment. I would only like to again point out that you cannot effect economies certainly and surely by making cuts in the Budget. You cannot by the rough and ready method of making large cuts ensure that money will not be spent or that money will not be spent wisely and economically. What happened last year was that we did effect economies by making a rough and ready cut, but, Sir, the result very shortly has been that, while we have made economies, we have deferred renewals and we have deferred maintenance again. We have added something like 4½ crores to our arrears of renewals which were last year stated to be 18½ crores. I just mention that as showing the extreme difficulty of effecting any true economy by the rough and already method of hewing away a portion of the Budget. I would ask the House to leave it to me and to the Financial Commissioner by the methods which I have very broadly indicated to do all that we possibly can to go on and with the assistance, which we are getting, of all railway administrations, to go on with progressive economy in every portion of the railway administration.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** I do not propose, Sir, at this late hour to indulge in any general observations upon the subject of high finance of Indian Railways. I propose, Sir, to confine my attention to only two points that have been indicated, from the financial point of view, as bearing upon the Budget and on the Finance Bill which we may have to consider next week. We are told, Sir, that the result of the adjournment of the question of the separation of Railway finance from General finance has been that the figures have been revised in the manner indicated in a Memorandum which has yesterday been presented to us. We have been, in this Memorandum debited, as the House will see, with the sum of Rs. 80 lakhs in order to write down in the book value of depreciated stores over a long period to current market prices. There is also a sum of Rs. 115 lakhs which has been taken to the debit of Programme Revenue expenditure. Honourable Members will see this from Statements II and III of the Finance Member's Memorandum where it is stated:

"These two items have been debited to revenue all these years upon a more or less arbitrary principle."

We have been told in a footnote to Statement III:

"The figure for Working Expenses is 1,45,00,000 less under the proposed (separation) system, than under the present system because:

- (i) As an integral part of the proposed system the allocation of expenditure on renewals between Capital and Revenue will be revised; and with the revised allocation 1,15,00,000 is expected to be charged to Capital next year, which, under the present system must be charged to Revenue."

I ask, Sir, whatever might happen to this question of separating Railway from General finances, if it is sound finance to charge to Capital expenditure this 115 lakhs from next year, that is, the moment this House assents to the proposition of separation, why it should not be sound finance to do so this year, apart from settling the general question of separation? This sum, I say Sir, has been put into the Revenue expenditure of this year to swell the total expenditure, so that the salt duty may be maintained at Rs. 2.

Then, Sir, the second item is the sum of Rs. 30 lakhs. On that we have this explanation:

"Under the present system, 30 lakhs must be charged to Working Expenses next year, in order to write down to market prices the value of stores in stock, and to write off out of Revenue the loss involved in the sale of surplus and obsolete stores. Under the proposed (separation) system this charge will be met from the Railway reserves."

Why should that, again, I ask, Sir, be charged this year to revenue? If these surplus stocks or stores have depreciated in value, why should they not be charged to Capital account of the Railways?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** They have been.

**Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar:** If so, it should on the same basis be added to the capital liability of the railways, amortised on the same system of amortisation of debt, which the Finance Member has explained, on the 80 years' principle.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** Is it productive capital?

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** The amortisation of the liability has to be made during a period in any case. The reserve fund that is required to meet the loss on the depreciation of stores can as well be met out of a 80 years' reserve than out of a 5 years' reserve. There is no reason why you should adopt a smaller period rather than a larger period. That is, Sir, my observation as regards the manner in which the Budget of Railway expenditure has been framed. I do not know, Sir, whether on the figures disclosed by my friend, Mr. Rama Aiyangar's analysis, we really are not spending very much more on Railways than we ought to spend. Certainly, the figures that he has given has set everybody here furiously to think, that after all this Railway Budget has been a most bloated Budget in this country. Then, again, Sir, much has been said about the utility of the separation of Railway from General finance, and, as this subject has been adjourned to September, I do not want to say more upon it. But I will say this much, that if the object of the separation is to take away the general management of railways from the control and scrutiny of this Assembly (*Voices:* "No"), this Assembly will certainly not assent to it. But apart from that, Sir, I do not see, so far as the powers of this Assembly are concerned, how railway finance could escape the Budget scrutiny which it is the inherent right of this Assembly to bestow. I take it, Sir, that if this Railway Budget forms part of the General Budget of the country,—and I have no doubt that it does—it cannot escape the sanction that it must have for all the demands for expenditure under the several heads of the Railway Budget.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** It is not at all correct to assume that anybody presumed that it should escape attention.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** I assume therefore that every demand for the Railway Grant will be put before the House and its sanction obtained. If that is so, Sir, then I do not understand how this House can assent to a proposition by which a definite part of the total revenue realised from railways is not to be granted by a specific appropriation in this House to a specific purpose, but should be kept as a reserve to be spent by the Railway administrations in the way they think best. If that is done, Sir,

5 P.M. that would be a means of taking away from the power of this House and I would only refer to clause 4 of the draft Resolution which was submitted to this House.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** I rise to a point of order, Sir. I did not rise before because I did not know whether the Honourable Member intended to deal with the question of separation of the Railway Finance from the General Finance. Is he now in order in dealing with that question, because the motion which we are discussing now relates to the reduction in the charge for general administration of the Railways?

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** Sir, I am only answering the assertion that the Government did not claim power to deal with these reserves so that they may have a large amount of discretion in spending one and a half crores every year as they thought best by taking certain sums without specific appropriation out of the railway revenues. I do not understand why this House should be asked to give its assent to such a proposition of railway finance. It is certainly within the powers of the Honourable the Finance Member to present the Railway Budget.

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is now getting out of order.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** Very well, Sir, I shall not pursue that topic any further. Of course we will have it again before us in September next. I say, Sir, that this Budget of railway expenditure should be revised and put on a proper basis so that this House is not asked to assent to the extra taxation which the Finance Member has asked the House to accept.

**Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians):** Sir, I have no desire to enter into the higher ethics of railway finance nor do I wish to give an opinion as to the advisability of separating Railway Finance from the general Budget. My only reason for rising at this late hour is to voice before this House and to put very forcibly before the Government certain views regarding the community which I have the honour to represent and which is very largely employed or used to be employed on the railways. It was about 8 months ago, Sir, that I asked a series of questions in this House on Anglo-Indians and the Indianisation of Railways—and I would invite any Honourable Member to produce any replies that were given to him by Government which are as unsympathetic as those which the Commerce Member gave to my questions. On that occasion I put before the Government a certain position which affected my community and which I submitted was very largely due to a misinterpretation and misuse of the term Indianisation of railways as applied by various Railway Agents. In one of my questions I asked the Member in charge to lay on the table any correspondence that had passed between him and the Agents of various railway lines about Indianisation of the Railways and the employment of Indians. The reply I got was that certain demi-official correspondence had taken place but could not be placed on the table and I was asked to be satisfied with that. I should like to again:

ask the Member in charge to place that demi-official correspondence on the table of this House. It is not out of idle curiosity that I ask for this correspondence nor with any desire to dispute the natural aspirations and claims of the Indians to a larger and increasingly larger share of employment on the Railways. Sir, if I thought that the demand, as put forward by Mr. Raina Aiyangar, would help me in achieving the object I have at heart, i.e., the protection of my community on Railways, I would give it my support. But two wrongs do not make a right. At the same time I wish to place before this House very forcibly that a precarious position has arisen on the railways so far as the employment of the domiciled community is concerned and one which I submit demands from the Government of India and the Railway Department either an explanation or a remedy. And, again, I wish to impress on my Indian friends in this Honourable House that I do not deny their claims for increasing employment on the railways. What I do object to is that many members of my community, who are employed on some of the railways, are now being turned out and dismissed on the slightest pretext and for crimes for which in former times, that is, before Indianisation became the fashion, they used to be fined two or three rupees only. The object which evidently prompts Railways to do this now is very patent. It is Indianisation with its so-called economy and this economy is being exercised and effected under the guise of dismissals because they want to replace Anglo-Indians by Indians. I call this not "economy" but "ingratitude." I am sure that every Indian Member of this House will support me when I say that this is not the intention of or the correct interpretation of the term Indianisation of railways. If the members of the domiciled community, whose forefathers created the railways in India, are not included in the term Indianisation and are not to have employment under railways they must be frankly told so by Government, as also under what category they come for such employment. If we come under the category of statutory natives of India, then give us the same rights, claims and privileges that the Indians enjoy. I submit that railway Agents have not a correct idea as to what is really meant by the term Indianisation of railways. They are, practically speaking, supplanting Anglo-Indians by the Indians, who one sees today are being thrown out on the streets with very little, if any, consideration. (Mr. C. D. M. Hindley: "No.") I say "Yes" and I am intimately connected with this situation. I do not talk from the snow peaks of Simla. I talk from the heat of Calcutta. I am one of the members of the Committee looking after these unemployed men, and I have His Excellency the Viceroy's support so far as remedying this state of affairs is concerned. I say the various Agents of railways are misinterpreting and misusing the phrase 'Indianisation of railways' and I wish the Government of India to explain to this House whether they have made any attempt to correct them in their attitude. It is their duty to do so. But instead of checking this misuse of the term Indianisation of services it is encouraging it and you must not be surprised if at no distant date you find yourself faced with great trouble due to our discontent and resentment against this treatment. Another point I say with all respect to the Member in charge that there are to-day in existence on the East Indian and other Railways marked distinctions between Anglo-Indians—I am talking of the coloured Anglo-Indians—and Europeans. The fair Anglo-Indian comes under the category of a European. The fact is that there are distinctions and these distinctions lead to discontent. I say it again that if any good were to come out of this demand I would certainly support it. But I feel that no good will

[Lieut.Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

come out of it, and I therefore cannot support it with my vote but I take this opportunity however of informing the Government of India that they have created a situation which has thrown on the streets of India to-day thousands of Anglo-Indians who, if they cannot claim their former ratio of employment on Railways, at least deserve something more than the unsympathetic treatment accorded to them by the Commerce Member in his replies to my July questions. I submit for the serious consideration of the Government that Anglo-Indians, whom they have every reason to remember with gratitude for their past services and who still have to look to Government for some support, are being thrown overboard to-day and that this is the main reason of the unemployment from which the community is to-day suffering to such an appalling extent.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Sir, I am still rather in the dark as to what the exact point is that we are discussing. The actual motion before the House was that the head of General Administration be cut down by Rs. 179 lakhs. I should like to explain to the House what this head covers. It includes supervising officers, subordinate supervising staff and clerical staff, but does not include staff actually engaged in the running of trains or the working of stations. That accounts for the fact which has been brought to notice by Honourable Members that while in the Appendix we have shown that there has been great retrenchment in the staff of railways, the effect does not appear under this head. It appears under the head "Operating Expenses other than fuel". Now, Sir, I admit that in the Budget for 1924-25 we are making provision for an extra 12 lakhs under this head "General Administration". The reason why we are making that provision is partly that we have an incremental scale of pay. The pay of most of our officers and clerks goes up year by year by fixed sums, and naturally we feel the effect of those increments each year. Another reason is that there are certain new appointments. These new appointments are partly due to the fact that we have had to strengthen our watch and ward staff, owing to the tremendous increase of pilfering which has taken place upon Indian railways. We have had to meet that evil by re-organising the watch and ward staff and increasing the supervision of that staff. Another reason for new appointments is that in the course of the coming year we hope to open certain new lines both in India and Burma. These are the reasons why we are asking for this increase of 12 lakhs under the head of "General Administration", which head my Honourable friend opposite asks the House to reduce by 180 lakhs. I cannot possibly agree to reduction of that kind. Our General Administration charges represent only 8 per cent. of our gross receipts. The Honourable Pandit has suggested that these charges have been greatly swollen by the fact that we employ on Indian railways foreigners instead of Indians. Sir, we employ on Indian railways between 650,000 and 700,000 men. The number of European supervising officers we employ is 1,428. The pay of those 1,428 men is the merest fraction of our total working expenses. As I shall show later, we have no reason to fear comparison in the matter of working results with railways of almost any other country in the world. If I can show that the financial results of our working are satisfactory, I hope that the Honourable Pandit will try and give some credit to these officers who come from a far country and who spend the greater part of their lives in an uncongenial climate in the service of this country. It is perfectly true that those officers are liberally paid, but I ask the Honourable Pandit if the pay we get makes up to us

for what we sacrifice when we come to India. I ask the Honourable Pandit to remember that many of us never see our children for years together. We give up everything that makes life worth living to the service of India, and what gratitude or reward do we get from the country? (Hear, hear).

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** I am sorry my Honourable friend has thoroughly misunderstood me. I have sympathy with every one who has any grievance, and I can very well understand the condition of those who have to come out to serve in this country. I am sorry that they should suffer any inconveniences. It is not owing to any want of sympathy with them that we wish the situation to be examined. All we want is that Europeans should not be brought in to the extent to which they are employed to-day in India.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I was just coming to the point which the Honourable Pandit has raised. The policy of Indianization is laid down in the Preamble to the Government of India Act, and I claim that we in the Railway Department are carrying out that policy as faithfully and as honestly as any other Department of the Government of India. Sir, the other day I worked out for myself the railway establishments of State Railways, the actual figures of recruitment in certain gazetted branches of State Railways. I find that in the Engineering establishment since January 1st, 1916, we have recruited 88 permanent Assistant Engineers, 19 of whom have been Indians. We have recruited 15 Assistant District Traffic Superintendents, and of those 9 have been Indians. In the Stores Department we have recruited 7 Assistant Controllers, 3 of whom have been Indians. The figures of course are not so good in the Locomotive and Carriage and Wagon Departments, owing to the fact that facilities for training Indians in those branches are practically non-existent in India. Wherever we can we have most faithfully carried out the policy of Indianization which has been laid down in the Government of India Act. Then, Sir, let me refer in this connection to what Colonel Gidney has just said. I see that the Honourable Member is not in his place (*A Voice*: "Yes, he is here.") Colonel Gidney, Sir, practically accused the Indian Railways of having flung a large number of the domiciled community out upon the world. He accused us of having supplanted them with Indians and laid at our door a great amount of responsibility for that unemployment which unfortunately exists among Anglo-Indians in Calcutta. We have given in an appendix to the Budget Memorandum the figures supplied to us of the number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indians who have been discharged in the course of the past year, and I do not think those figures substantiate the accusation of the Honourable Member. He asks me to declare my policy. As Mr. Rangachariar said the other day, there is not the slightest doubt that Anglo-Indians have a very particular and a very peculiar aptitude for certain branches of railway work, and that is the reason why in the subordinate Traffic Department you will find most of the positions held by Anglo-Indians. I have myself made inquiries on this subject amongst Agents in recent years and they say that for that class of work they like the Anglo-Indian, because it is the sort of work which suits him. The Indian of the same education does not like the hard out-door work, and the irregular hours which have to be faced when you first enter the subordinate Traffic Department. That is what every Agent in the country has told me. The view I take about that matter is this. I say that you have got to give the Indian an equal chance with the Anglo-Indian, but once they have been given that chance, let the better man win.

[Sir Charles Innes.]

I will not be a party to any other policy. Let the Anglo-Indian and Indian compete and let the best man win. (Hear, hear).

Now, Sir, let me go back—since the debate has traversed such wide ground—to the point where I began. I often wonder, Sir, with what view the Indian public regards the Indian railways. It often seems to me, judging by the criticisms of the work of Indian railways in the press that people in India are apt to regard railways as a gigantic instrument for the torture of third class passengers. It is nothing of the sort. This House knows the Indian railways are the most gigantic business proposition in the country, and the whole commerce, the whole industry of India depends upon those railways being in an efficient state, and being kept in an efficient state, and that is the whole reason why we ventured to put before the House at the beginning of this Session our proposals for the separation of the Railway Budget. Now, Sir, as I have said, Indian railways are a gigantic commercial proposition. In the last two weeks, according to our returns, we have earned for the revenues of India no less than 429 lakhs of rupees. I would just like people to think what that means, and how are you to judge a huge concern of that kind? As Mr. Hindley says, it really does not help us if, when we put our estimates for the year before you, you take individual items and say this is too high and that is too high. What we really should like the House to get more and more into the habit of doing is to judge us by the working of our railways during the year that is past, just like shareholders of a company, because I believe that that is the only fruitful way in which we can be kept up to the mark. Now, Sir, in 1922-23, Indian Railways paid their interest charges and in addition paid Rs. 122 lakhs to general revenues. That is to say, taking the gross capital charge at Rs. 622 crores, we earned 4.4 per cent. on a capital charge at the end of the year. In the year that is just passing we expect to pay all our interest charges and in addition to pay 628 lakhs to general revenues. On a gross capital charge of 646 crores, we expect to secure a return of 5 per cent. In the year that is coming, on a gross capital charge of 676 crores our return will drop to just under 4.3 per cent. It drops for the reason that this year we hope not to be starved for programme revenue expenditure. Last year we got our 5 per cent. owing to the fact that we cut down our programme revenue by 8½ crores, that is to say, we merely postponed expenditure which must, sooner or later, be faced. This year we do not want to have those restrictions placed upon our programme revenue expenditure. We hope that the House will agree with the provision we have made in the Budget for that expenditure, for it is the provision certified by the Financial Commissioner to be necessary for the execution of the rehabilitation capital programme which has already been approved. Now, Sir, there are very few countries in the world . . . .

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** May I ask the Commerce Member (it will help the House to know it), how it is that in Japan they are able to earn such high net profits on their railways:

In 19 6-17	they earned	7.2	per cent.
In 1917-18	..	8.3	..
In 19 8-19	..	7.8	..
In 19 9-20	..	7.7	..
In 1920 21	..	7.0	..

I shall be obliged if the Honourable Member will help us to understand why we cannot earn such high profits here.



**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I will give the Honourable Member the answer in one word, it is because Japan has been wise in her generation and has separated the General Budget from her Railway Budget. If the Honourable the Pandit will take other countries, he will find that the return which the Indian railways have been making during the past three years compares very favourably indeed with almost every other country in the world.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Only during the past three years?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I have got all the figures here, but I was only taking the past three years. Our returns are better than the returns of the railways in the United Kingdom, which are supposed to be among the most efficient railways in the world. I do hope, Sir, the House will bear these facts in mind, and that they will remember that upon Mr. Hindley and myself and the other officers does lie a most enormous load of responsibility. We are assisted by very capable Agents in every part of the country and by very hard-working and efficient staffs; but, Sir, the spending of 66 crores of rupees and the earning of 97 crores of rupees is really a very gigantic task, and that is one reason why we ask for this separation, because we believe that it is only by separation of that kind, we believe it is only by laying upon the railways the responsibility of earning fixed dividends and giving the railways a prospect that, if they can earn that dividend and a little more besides, that little more will go to the railways themselves, we believe that is the only sure way of insuring and enforcing economy in railways.

But Sir, let me come back to the actual motion before the House, namely, the motion that Rs. 179 lakhs should be cut off our general administration. Sir, this means that the House is asked to cut away from us a great portion of the staff which we consider to be necessary for supervising the various branches of our railways, all of whose energies will be needed for the earning of this vast sum of money.

**Mr. President:** I observed this morning that the House did not quite appreciate the manner in which I put the question. I propose to put it as a motion for simple reduction in this case. The question therefore is:

“That the provision under the head ‘General Administration, State Railways,’ be reduced by a sum of Rs. 1,79,47,000.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** What about motions 31 and 32?

**Mr. President:** I put the Honourable Member's motions. They are already covered by a great deal of the original speech, and he cannot embark on the same kind of argument for each subject. The Honourable Member's original speech covered the whole of his reduction.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** That only related to the 8 crores.

**Mr. President:** Very well, if the Honourable Member wishes to *move* it

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** The motion that I beg to place before the Assembly is:

“That the provision for Ordinary Repairs and Maintenance be reduced by Rs. 3 crores.”

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

Sir, it was a pity that I had not the right to reply, and therefore I have not been able to place before the Assembly the views that I have formed after I have fully heard the statement made on behalf of the Government. Before I deal with that, I have also to explain, Sir, that my friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas has apparently not fully recollected what he and the other members have written in their Report. Actually they have not given effect to all the reduction that they recommended there. They actually took up three items, 2½ crores under programme revenue and about Rs. 50,000 under wagons and other items, and a small amount under locomotives, so that for that year they only cut out 4 crores, and of course under Fuel one crore had been agreed to be reduced by the Department itself. Altogether they cut out four crores, but in the course of their report remarked under various heads that considerable reductions were feasible. For example, at page 69 they say:

“ We consider that if energetic measures are taken to effect economies in the use of locomotives, large savings may be effected in running expenses during 1923-24.”

They have not given effect to that in their 4 crores reduction. There are about ten remarks of a similar kind where they point out how the matter should be controlled but do not give actual figures as to the amount we should get towards the reduction. I know, Sir, I have been placed at a great disadvantage in pressing for a big cut like that, but I want to contend that that is quite feasible and I have no doubt after I have heard from the Honourable Mr. Hindley that he will be able to effect a large reduction. I have worked out these tables probably as well as any officer in his office has done. I have seen his table No. 15 and I have studied it thoroughly. I have seen table No. 16 with six branches A to G. I have studied every one of them but I can tell him immediately they do not show that they have clarified the position. Probably you will do it this year, and before I came to this Assembly I sent a question asking for information as to what has been done under each of these heads, and the answer given was that everything was in a state of uncertainty. That is the reply to my question but what I am told now shows that they propose to exercise considerable control.

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley:** Are exercising, not proposing to exercise.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I stand corrected; are exercising considerable control. But what I expect of him is to give a few crores below 64 arrived at by the Incheape Committee. If he had said that he had put away any extra money for any particular purpose, I could quite understand it. Now the Honourable Sir Charles Innes jeered at me. I am accustomed to such jeers from the bureaucracy. I have already had them in another Council, and after 8 months I know the jeering was withdrawn and compliments paid to me. I dare say the Honourable Sir Charles Innes will come to the same position. But I may remind him that if as a civilian officer he could do so much, certainly we people who work at these things can also do as much, and I do not believe there is any difficulty at all. I have no doubt that amidst the pressure of business Sir Charles Innes is not able to pay attention to this matter—to pay even as much attention as a non-official can, though he is not paid for it and does it voluntarily, as I am doing; otherwise he would not have dealt with the statement I gave him in the way he did. Neither Mr. Hindley nor Sir Charles Innes took note of that statement. Indeed, if I had placed it in the hands of every Member of this House, I would have been in a better position. As a

matter of fact, my tables are much better than yours. Your tables do not enable you to come to any conclusion; my tables do. If you send your tables to your Agents, they will be in utter confusion; if, on the other hand, you send my tables to them, they will be able to see what the position is. Have you arranged the expenditure under each of the 5' 6" railways, the expenditure under each of 3' 8" railways? If you had given me a detailed statement in the form in which the Honourable the Finance Member gave it to us under the other heads of expenditure, I would have been able to criticise the figures more effectively. But you do not give a proper detailed statement to the House. You only put before us a general statement which does not tell us what the different items are. I am perfectly satisfied from the way you say you are working the railways that you should be able to reduce this 10½ crores without any difficulty.

Sir Charles Innes referred to expenses in Great Britain and other countries. I do not see how those remarks are relevant. I do not know how many bombs and battle-fields had spoiled France, Germany, England and even Switzerland. Are we to take into consideration all that? In India I do not know of a single line of railway that has been disturbed by the war. I know the "Ermden" destroyed some customs houses and some oil tanks; but has any portion of the railways been really injured by the war? Are you spending any extra money for any particular purpose that you can bring to our notice? I know that for two or three years after the war things were a bit unsettled, but can you say to-day—and I am talking of to-morrow—that you cannot go back to the old rate of expenditure? Add to that rate 1 per cent. Well 1 per cent. means 1 crore. 97 crores is what you are aiming at. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes just told us that the whole of that establishment does not cost more than a crore. One crore will do to give you all the extra establishment that you want. Can you really take away 22 crores without explaining to us how it is going to be spent! What is the extra efficiency you speak of? You have built so many coaches, you say. Now if I tried to cut down programme revenue, if I had said so, you would have had some ground to attack me. But, as I said, I was not speaking of that at all. Did I interfere with your programme revenue; have you really provided extra money for programme revenue? While you provided 12 odd crores when the Inchcape Committee worked it out, you provide only 9.80 crores. Now I really do not know why Sir Charles Innes waxed eloquent over the programme revenue he was providing. That was not at all before the House. It is only creating confusion of ideas and I do not think the whole thing has been met properly by the Government side. I ask for the position to be fully understood. I stand as a responsible person here. I have studied the question as much as anybody. There may be difficulties; there may be points to explain; there may be extra expenditure on particular lines, or at particular centres. Put it all in the form of plain figures showing so much more is needed under each head. Give me the exact permanent recurring expenditure. Give me the exact non-recurring expenditure separately. If you do not frame your Budget like that, you cannot expect us to admit that what you say is all correct. I refuse to admit that you cannot give us those figures. Since the Retrenchment Committee reported it is now about 18 months. Are you not able to tell us what is the recurring portion of the expenditure? In the administrative report for 1920-21 you have referred in four paragraphs to the recurring portion of the expenditure and the non-recurring portion of it under each head without saying how much it affects the real total which has been spent. Having started that inquiry in 1921-22, why

[Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar.]

did you give it up in 1922-23? Where is the paragraph in the report of 1922-23 which shows the exact figures of permanent and non-permanent expenditure for the year? Without doing that you bloat the Budget, you place 70 crores before us. And here is my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas who probably three years back worked with great energy at this subject, who now thinks that what I ask for is not proper. And yet, if he were only to read his own report and to go through every sentence and work it all out, he would find that actually it is not 10½ crores that can be reduced but 22 crores. If one year is not sufficient, you may take two years; or even three years, but honestly point out to this House which expenditure is recurring and which is not recurring. We will give you any amount of money that you may require. My friends and I would be very glad to vote for any amount of money you may ask for. I am not one of those who would grudge to support a demand if it is really needed, but certainly I shall not permit myself, so long as I am here, to be told that you have a lump sum figure and the Assembly ought not to go into minute detail. That was the argument of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes. He must think and ponder over it again. He says that, when Government give us 60 crores, we should not expect them to give all the details. I ask you, Sir, why are we here? What is the power that you have given us? How are we to control you? Why do not you put forward a detailed Budget? Why should you leave matters for us to guess and point out to you where the mistake lies? If you had only given me a detailed Budget, I could at once say "So much is temporary and so much is permanent, so much is necessary and so much is not necessary; which railway has got more officers and which railway wastes more." I am quite prepared to give you figures, certainly . . . . .

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member had better speak on the motion moved by him—that is, ordinary repairs and maintenance,—and not on the general question.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I am sorry, Sir, I did not know I was going wide of the mark.

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member has moved a reduction by 3 crores, Ordinary Repairs and he should therefore confine himself to that motion.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** Then, I say the item of ordinary repairs and maintenance is almost a permanent factor. We have got a very large mileage requiring repairs and maintenance. You must distribute the repairs throughout the year; all the 365 days of the year you have to look to these repairs, and probably once in so many years you attend to the repair of the whole line. You must have some programme. You must definitely tell us how many miles you do every year and every day. You must be able to tell what is the recurring expenditure, and how many miles in each railway you have repaired every year. Do we not say in our District Boards that so many miles or so many furlongs of our roads are to be maintained or renewed every year? Why do not you give us your exact programme. If you have extraordinary repairs, put that item separately. I can understand it. I want to raise my voice against this. Under ordinary repairs and maintenance you put 16 crores 86 lakhs. Only in 1922-23 you had agreed to cut down the total expenditure by 4 crores before the Retrenchment Committee. You now want 6 crores extra to be handed over this

year, in spite of all the work you have been doing after the Retrenchment Committee's report and for all the attention these extra officers appointed recently pay to the subject. Am I to believe it?

However, there is also another point about which I have some complaint. There is the Retrenchment Committee to which certain figures were given under certain heads. There is nothing in this report to show how the money is divided among the several heads. I have been racking my brains over it to find out how those figures really have been distributed, and I have not been able to get at those figures. But whatever it is, that you should still require 5 crores and odd within 13 months of the Retrenchment Committee's Report is a thing which I simply cannot understand. The Government Member must explain how and why this extra expenditure is required. They do not explain it here. Would it not be fair on the part of the Government that they should show all this explanation when they attach a special Memorandum to the Railway Budget? How much reduction have you actually effected in accordance with the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee? Give us the details and then tell us how much extra provision should be made. I have to grope in the dark, but I am perfectly certain from what I have been able to gather from these statements and figures, that that expenditure is not necessary. If you say that you require extra money for a particular purpose, I can quite understand it, and I will not object to it. Let all my friends vote in any way they like, but I will do what I think proper, and tell this Assembly that I will not be satisfied till the Government Members tell me what the regular expenditure is and how much extra they hope to save under this head.

**Mr. President:** Amendment moved:

"That the provisions for Ordinary Repairs and Maintenance be reduced by 3 crores."

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Sir, I think the Honourable Member did not understand quite correctly the recommendations of the Incheape Committee's Report. That recommendation was that 8½ crores should be cut off from the Budget for 1923-24 under the head of 'Programme revenue'. They have made no suggestion under the head "Ordinary Repairs and Maintenance". Ordinary repairs and maintenance, as the Honourable Member who has studied the subject evidently knows, is different from the programme revenue expenditure.

Now, Sir, during the past year we have kept the expenditure down under this head by 19 lakhs below the Budget estimate and by 43 lakhs below the actuals for 1922-23, and the increase of 55 lakhs in 1924-25 is for the following reasons. The increase is distributed mainly over the Bengal Nagpur Railway, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the North Western Railway and the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway. On the Bengal Nagpur Railway we have been compelled to make special provision for the painting of bridges and signal stations all over the line. The painting was very much in arrears, and, as every one knows, if you do not keep bridges properly painted, you lose money in the end. On the G. I. P. Railway and the other three railways, we are making special provision this year for ordinary maintenance, ordinary repair of our rolling stock and of our permanent line. That, Sir, is the reason why we have been compelled to ask for this additional grant under this head for next year's Budget.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

"That the provision for Ordinary Repairs and Maintenance be reduced by 3 crores."

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. President:** Does the Honourable Member wish to move his next motion?

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** I should like to have full explanation as to why the figure under the head Operating Expenses has been increased also.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I am very glad to give the Honourable Member the information he asks for. The increase under this head Operating Expenses other than fuel is Rs. 109 lakhs. Out of that 30 lakhs is required for the purpose of writing down stores, as has already been explained. That leaves a net increase of 79 lakhs of rupees. This increased provision is due partly to our increased train mileage. We expect to have an increase of five million train miles next year, and naturally operating expenses must go up. That also makes an increase in our receipts. Finally, the increase is also due to the annual increments in the pay of the running and station staff. That is the explanation of the 79 lakhs increase. I might explain at once why we are asking for an increase of 88 lakhs under the head fuel. It is partly due to the increased train mileage of five million miles which means an increase in the consumption of fuel, and partly also to the increase in price which under our existing contracts has to be paid in the coming year.

**Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar:** Has any reduction been made by the department after the Incheape Committee's Report in the Operating Expenses?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Thirty lakhs.

(At this stage the President vacated the chair, which was taken by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad.)

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Sir, it is late now and we feel somewhat tired, and I think the House ought to be adjourned.

**Mr. Chairman:** You had better make up your mind whether you want to move your motion or not.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** If you insist, Sir, on continuing the debate . . .

**Mr. Chairman:** I have asked you to move your motion, if you want to move it.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Sir, I move:

"That the demand under sub-head Great Indian Peninsula Railway be reduced by Rs. 100."

My object in making this motion is not to deprive the Great Indian Peninsula Railway administration of the sum of Rs. 100, but to draw the attention of the House, although the House is very thin just now, to a serious grievance of the Indian subordinate employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company. Sir, these subordinate employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway have many grievances and most of them are also very serious. I do not mean to suggest that the employees of the other railways have not got similar grievances, but I have taken the Great Indian Peninsula Railway because these grievances are found to a

greater extent on that railway than on the other railways. Sir, the first grievance of the employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway is that they are denied the right which the employees even of the Government of India have been given, namely, the recognition of their Association by the Great Indian Peninsula Railway administration. Even by an International Convention the Governments of the world have now agreed that the Associations of employees must be recognized by the employers. Sir, on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway there are at present two Unions . . . .

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:** May I rise to a point of order. I do not know that there is any international convention that an association of employees must be recognized by the employers. Would the Honourable gentleman quote his authority?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Sir, although there may not be a convention, the principle was recognized there. The Honourable Member knows that the right of association is recognized by the International Labour Conference.

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:** That is quite a different thing.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** They recognize the right of association of employees, and not to send replies to their representations is tantamount to not giving the right of association. Therefore, I deliberately use the words the right of recognition of the association. You do not certainly give the right of association to any employees if you do not even show them the courtesy of sending a reply to their letters. Sir, there are two unions of employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. One is the union of the employees in the workshops in Bombay; another is the union of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway staff. It is called the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Staff Union. Some years ago, when these unions made representations, they were given some kind of reply by the Great Indian Peninsula Agent, although the replies were not altogether satisfactory. But the employees had the satisfaction at least of knowing that their letters were received by the Agent. Some time back, however, this practice was stopped and the present Agent refuses even to acknowledge the letters of the employees. I do not know, Sir, whether this practice of not answering the letters of employees by their employers will be tolerated by this House. The practice, as I have said, is of recent origin. I do not know what his justification was for introducing this practice. I am told that, although the Agent is not willing to recognize the Unions, still he is thinking of starting what is called a Joint Council. Sir, I have studied the literature on this subject. These Joint Councils were recommended by a Committee appointed in England under the Chairmanship of Mr. Whitley and these councils are called Whitley Councils. But, Sir, the Whitley Report makes it quite clear that, if these Joint Councils are established not in consultation with the unions of the men but as a substitute for the unions, they will never succeed. I have brought this fact to the notice of the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway but he does not give any weight to the conclusions of the Whitley Committee and still persists in not acknowledging the letters of his employees and I think, therefore, this House should express its opinion on this matter. Sir, we all know that, if the union of the men is not recognized, the consequences which follow are very serious, both to the men as well as to the public treasury. Only recently I mentioned a fact in this House, but I want to mention it again. Sir, a few days ago there was a strike of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway men in Bombay. I am quite sure that, if the union of the men had

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

been recognized, that strike would have been averted. But as the men's union was not in touch with the Agent, the only course open to the men was to go on strike as they wanted their grievances redressed. There is absolutely no other way left open to them but to go on a strike, which is a very dangerous weapon. It inflicts loss on the public treasury and it causes the greatest misery to the workers. There are people who think that the working classes go on strike with a very light heart. I do not think anybody here will endorse that statement after the results of the recent strike in Bombay. Working class men have lost their lives during the strike and they know that that is always probable besides incurring loss of wages and they do not go on strike very light-heartedly. But, when their employers do not leave them any other way of getting redress of their grievances, they have to resort to strikes and no body can blame them for doing so. Therefore, in the interests of the men of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, as well as in the interests of public economy, I press this House to express its opinion and tell the Great Indian Peninsula Railway administration and the Railway Board that they do not approve of the action of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Agent in not recognizing the union of his men. Sir, if the Agent of that railway

8 P.M. wants to start Joint Councils, he will have our hearty sympathy as well as co-operation, but we want him to start Joint Councils in the spirit in which the Whitley Report has asked that Joint Councils be established, namely, with the co-operation of the Union and not as a substitute for the Union.

Sir, I also want to suggest to the Railway Board, that they should take legislative steps at a very early date to establish some machinery by which the grievances of the men will be considered and reported upon before they are finally decided. Otherwise, if there is no machinery for considering the grievances of the men except an appeal to the Railway Agent or to the Railway Board, I think, Sir, you are thereby encouraging strikes of the men and causing great misery to them as well as a great loss to the public purse. I therefore suggest to the Government of India to introduce some legislation by which machinery will be created to consider the grievances of the men whenever they have such grievances. Sir, only recently I heard the Governor of Bombay saying that he did not believe in the policy of intervention between the employers and their employees.

**Sir Campbell Rhodes** (Bengal: European): Sir, on a point of order. Is there a quorum present. This is a very important discussion but there does not seem to be a quorum present.

(At this stage Mr. President resumed the Chair.)

**Mr. President:** As a quorum is now present, the Honourable Member may proceed.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Sir, what I was saying is this. The Bombay Government believe that it is not their duty generally to intervene between the employers and their employees. But I think, Sir, the very recent experience of the present strike situation in Bombay has clearly proved to them that they cannot go on with the policy of non-intervention in this matter. Only a few days after the Government of Bombay had announced their policy of non-intervention, a strike took place. The Government waited for a few days, but very soon they found that they had to intervene. Unfortunately, they intervened too late. I therefore want to im-



press upon the Government of India that at a very early date they should bring into existence some machinery by which the grievances of the men will be taken into consideration without resort to strike. Sir, I do not want to speak more on this point.

There is another grievance of the employees of the G. I. P. Railway which I want to place before this House, and that grievance is caused by the retrenchment policy of the Government of India. Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member has stated in one of his reports that 5 per cent. of the total subordinate employees of the railways have been sent away on account of the policy of retrenchment. Sir, this policy of retrenchment has caused great hardship to the employees of the railways and I say especially to the employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. I want the Railway administrations to be more considerate in making retrenchments. The Great Indian Peninsula Railway have shown no consideration to the claims of their employees. But they have not been even fair in making the retrenchments. The Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration had appointed a Retrenchment Officer, and as far as my knowledge goes, that officer had recommended certain retrenchments in the higher posts as well as in the lower posts; but the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration accepted all the recommendations made with regard to the subordinate staff but did not accept all the recommendations made as regards the higher staff. Sir, it was with the object of finding out the facts in this matter that I had put a question asking the Government of India whether they would publish the report of the Retrenchment Officer, and the Government of India refused to publish that report. I am, therefore, unable to verify the statement made by me, but, as far as I know, if the Government of India will make inquiries, they will find that the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration, although they ruthlessly made retrenchments in the subordinate staff, did not accept the recommendations of the Retrenchment Officer as far as the higher officers go. I think, Sir, this policy of the Government of India or of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Administration has caused a great deal of discontent among the subordinate staff of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and I hope the Government of India will give up that policy: if you want to make retrenchments, deal equally with all.

Then, Sir, there is one more matter to which I want to refer as regards the grievances of the employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and that is the racial discrimination. Sir, it is a very delicate subject to speak about, but unfortunately as long as we have got racial discrimination, it is difficult for a Member of this House to perform his duty without sometimes referring to it. Sir, there is racial discrimination in our Government services, but the racial discrimination that exists in the railways surpasses the racial discrimination shown in other Departments. On railways there are different rules regarding the grant of free travelling passes as well as regarding leave, for different races; if an Indian subordinate draws a certain salary, he gets a third-class pass, but if the employee belongs to some other race, irrespective of his salary, he must get a free pass of a higher class. Sir, how long is this sort of racial discrimination to continue? The same kind of racial discrimination exists as regards the leave rules. If an employee is an Indian, he gets leave according to one set of rules. If he is an Anglo-Indian, he gets leave according to another set of rules; if he is a European, he gets leave according to some third type of rules. Sir, I want to know how long this discrimination also is going to continue. If

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

you want to give certain higher privileges to your higher class of servants, although I do not approve of your doing even that, I can at least understand your doing so as that discrimination is also made elsewhere. But I cannot understand how you can make a distinction between employees of the same class but of different races. I want this difference to be removed. If a European or an Anglo-Indian requires leave for some months in a year, an Indian also requires the same amount of rest. I do not for a moment intend to say that the leave privileges of the Europeans and Anglo-Indians should be cut down. But I want the Indians, the Indian employees of the railway companies, to enjoy the same privileges which these two other classes enjoy. I do not want levelling down; I want levelling up. Sir, I want this racial discrimination as regards leave to be done away with. Take salaries. If an Indian is a driver he gets a certain salary. But if a European drives the same engine, on the same route, and on the same train, he will get at least double or treble the salary. Now, Sir, on what ground is this to be justified and how long are the Government of India going to justify this injustice by some argument which will not convince anybody? Sir, I want this House to express its opinion by voting for my amendment on this matter.

Then, Sir, I wanted to say a few words about the opportunities Indian subordinates get to rise to higher positions. I do not want to speak on the whole subject of Indianisation. But still it is a fact, which the Railway administrations will not deny, that very few Indians get a chance of being employed in the higher ranks of the Railways and especially of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. The Great Indian Peninsula is the worst Railway in this matter. These Railways employ Europeans for what are called technical services. I was told by the Honourable Member in charge of this subject that there are no opportunities of sufficient training for railway working in this country.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I said in particular kinds of railway working. I was referring to the Locomotive Superintendents and the Carriage and Wagon Superintendents.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Sir, I am quite prepared to leave these two departments, because we do not make locomotives in India and we do not also make railway wagons on a large scale. But take the other departments. Why should we not have facilities for training officers for the other departments and why should not the other departments have been Indianised long before this time? We in India possess one of the largest railway systems in the world, and this country possesses facilities for training the railway employees more than any other country. But unfortunately Indians do not get an opportunity of rising to the higher ranks. That is the whole grievance. As soon as the Government change their policy and try to give opportunities to Indians to rise to higher ranks, the Government of India will very soon find that there are more than enough men in the country to occupy these higher posts.

Sir, I do not want to speak on this point very long, because the House is tired and I am also tired. But, Sir, there is one more point which I shall touch upon before I sit down, and that is about the Advisory Committee on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. I am told that the Advisory Committee is in course of formation and the grievance that I want to place before this House is that the employees are not represented on this Advisory Committee. In a Railway

management, there are, in my opinion, three interests which should be represented on any bodies to be formed—the tax-payer who has put his money in the Railway, then those people who make use of the Railways, namely, the passengers, and, thirdly, those employees of the Railway whose life and maintenance depends upon the efficient working of the railway. In the railway administration the tax-payer has some voice: the railway passengers to the extent to which they are represented by the tax-payers have got some voice. But what about the railway employees? These railway employees have a great stake in the efficient management of the railways. But they do not seem to be represented on either the Central Advisory Council or on the Great Indian Peninsula Advisory Council. I want to know the reason why these employees should not be considered to have sufficient interests in the efficient management of the railways to be given any representation on the Advisory Committee of these railways. Sir, the Railway Board is represented on the Advisory Committee, Central as well as Provincial. The Railway Board is represented on the Central Council and the Agent is represented on the Provincial Advisory Council for the line, I mean the Great Indian Peninsula line. I want to know how the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway or the members of the Railway Board are more responsible persons than the subordinate employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. From my point of view the subordinate employees of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway are more responsible than the Agent or even the Members of the Railway Board, for this reason that, if the Railway administration is not managed efficiently, these subordinate employees will be asked to go home without any pension. But that is not so with the Agent, neither is it so as regards the Members of the Railway Board. Even if the railways are inefficiently managed, still they will get their salaries, and if they are asked to retire, they will get proportionate pensions. Sir, how can these people, whose salaries are guaranteed by the Government of India and the Secretary of State and whose pensions are also guaranteed, be considered to be more responsible and should have representation on these representative bodies, and a subordinate staff, who from my point of view are more responsible than even these officers, because their maintenance, their livelihood depends on the efficient management of the railways, should not be regarded as fit for representation? Sir, these employees have a great stake in the proper administration of railways. It is, therefore, necessary that the employees of the Railways should be represented on the Central Advisory Council as well as on the Advisory Councils formed for the lines. Sir, the proposition which I am advocating now may not find favour with some people. I may be told that they cannot give representation to the employees on such representative bodies, because they are servants. But, Sir, there are other servants who have these rights. If the higher servants can sit on representative bodies, these smaller servants have also equal rights to sit on those bodies. Therefore I feel, Sir, that the Government of India should put representatives of the subordinate railway employees on the Central Advisory Council as well as on the Advisory Council on this line. Sir, I have placed before this House six grievances and I want this House by its vote to tell the Government of India that it wants these grievances to be redressed without delay. For the convenience of the House I shall only repeat my grievances in a very few words. My first grievance is about the recognition of the Union. My second grievance is about starting legislation either for conciliation or arbitration. My third grievance is about the unequal retrenchment. My fourth grievance is about racial discrimination. My fifth grievance is about the Indianisation

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

of services and my sixth grievance is about the Advisory Councils. I hope, Sir, the House will by its vote tell the Government of India that it wants these grievances to be redressed without delay.

**Mr. President:** Amendment moved:

"That the demand under sub-head Great Indian Peninsula Railway be reduced by Rs. 100."

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley:** Sir, I congratulate Mr. Joshi very heartily on his being able to compress his grievances into the small sum of Rs. 100. I do wish to convey to him my thanks and the thanks of my Department for having put before the House what he had to say in a very reasonable way and coupling it with a perfectly nominal reduction of Rs. 100. We shall not, however, take any less notice of the grievances which Mr. Joshi has put forward because the amount is so small as Rs. 100. He has brought forward, Sir, certain matters about which I have had the honour and pleasure of talking to him on many occasions. I therefore know a good deal of what is in his mind but I would like to join issue with him on one or two points. In the first place, he mentioned that there was an International Convention under which employers were bound to recognise the Unions formed by their employees. (*Mr. N. M. Joshi:* "I did not say employers.") I think Mr. Joshi distinctly said that there was an International Convention by which employers were bound to recognise the Unions formed by their employees. Mr. Joshi was corrected by the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee and eventually whittled down what he had said to a position which is known of course to every one, namely, the recognition of the right of association. Now, Sir, that is a position which Mr. Joshi understands as clearly as I do. It must be left to the employer, especially in the case of an employer like a railway administration which has a very large number of employees, to decide whether a certain Union of his employees ought to be recognised by him or not. We cannot, I think, quarrel with the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway if he has for good reasons not actually recognised either of these two Unions to which Mr. Joshi has referred. (*Mr. N. M. Joshi:* "Has he recognised any other Union?") Recognition is a word which has a very wide meaning. It may also have a very narrow meaning. (*Mr. Joshi again interrupted.*) Am I, Sir, in possession of the House? (*Mr. N. M. Joshi:* "You are.") Recognition is a word which is liable to be used very loosely. Mr. Joshi asks why the Agent did not answer all the letters sent to him by this Union. If the Agent had replied to those letters, would Mr. Joshi consider it to be a recognition? I do not know. I am not aware of the exact reasons why the Agent has not answered certain representations sent to him by these Unions. But I do know that the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway has a very sincere wish to deal with and to meet the grievances of his employees. I am quite certain that if he had believed that either one or the other of these Unions were properly representative of the employees of his railway he would have had no hesitation in dealing with them. I think Mr. Joshi is aware, though the House may not be aware, that the Great Indian Peninsula Railway has at the moment under formation, if not already formed, a system of District Committees, not strictly speaking the Whitley Councils to which Mr. Joshi has referred, but a completely co-ordinated system of Committees where the employees will be able to meet their officers regularly round a table. I do not propose to go into the details of this scheme. Mr. Joshi knows the scheme perfectly well. It is,

I believe, a scheme under which the employees will be able to see their officers and represent their grievances and will be heard. It is to some extent an experiment, though we have a somewhat similar organisation at work on other railways. It is a scheme which will require a good deal of tentative work before it can be made successful. It has, however, I think the elements of success and it has a possibility of enabling a system of free discussion about the grievances and conditions of work to grow up between the officers and their employees which I for myself am perfectly certain will, in effect, knock out a great many of the small disputes which cause labour disturbances and strikes. I would commend the study of that system, which is now about to be established or has already been established on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, to Mr. Joshi and I would ask him whether he does not himself sincerely believe that that system is one of the very best systems and one of the systems which is probably most applicable to the conditions prevailing in this country for enabling the employees to get into touch with their officers and to enable the officers of the railway to ascertain what their employees are thinking about. The system of these Committees is in no way antagonistic to the normal, steady and healthy growth of trade unions and Mr. Joshi I think will find that there is no antagonistic feeling at all (*Mr. N. M. Joshi*: "There is.") on the part of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway towards these Unions. Provided these Committees are given a fair chance, my own belief is that, if there is anything in the future for the trade unions to which Mr. Joshi has referred, they will be able to grow and do good work (*Mr. N. M. Joshi*: "In spite of yourself"). Mr. Joshi mentioned to the House that the representations from these Unions to the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway had not been replied to. He went on to say—I cannot remember his words exactly—that the men having got no reply to their grievances went on strike. Now, Sir, I do not know the exact details of the last dispute on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. But I would like to ask Mr. Joshi whether it is true that this strike occurred in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway workshop because the Agent did not reply to a representation from certain Unions. I challenge Mr. Joshi, Sir, to say that a strike occurred in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway workshop because the Agent did not reply to certain representations from the Union.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi**: May I correct the Honourable Member? My statement was that strikes took place on account of the non-recognition of the Union. Nobody will write to the Agent if he finds that letter after letter is not acknowledged at all. They have some self-respect left not to write to the Agent when he has not sent them a reply.

**Mr. O. D. M. Hindley**: Mr. Joshi comes from Bombay and knows about the strike better than I do, so I will leave it at that. As far as my information goes, the strike had no connection whatever with the want of recognition of the Union.

I will take Mr. Joshi's other point as briefly as I can. Mr. Joshi referred to retrenchment. He said he believed that the Retrenchment Officer had made certain representations regarding the reduction of superior officers which had not been accepted by the Railway but that the railway had accepted in full the reduction in respect of the subordinate and lower paid employees. I am sorry I have no information on which I can either agree to that statement or refute it, except that afforded by the figures put before the House in the Memorandum on the Railway Budget. I do not think that a study of those figures would warrant any such suggestion as

[Mr. C. D. M. Hindley.]

that made by Mr. Joshi. I do not for a moment believe that the Agent would adopt any such course. Whatever the specific recommendations of that officer, the House is in a position to see clearly from the statement presented that a certain number of officers have been reduced and a larger number of subordinates and a much larger number of lower paid staff.

I would like to mention briefly the question of racial discrimination. I did not altogether catch what Mr. Joshi said in regard to passes on railways. I could not further understand his particular difficulty about leave rules. I would like to ask him whether the European in this country, doing hard work out of doors, is in need of more or of less leave, than the Indian in his own country. Mr. Joshi wishes us to level up. Mr. Joshi wants us to give to every Indian working in this country the same leave that Europeans have to enable them to keep their health. I ask if that is a reasonable proposition. The Railway Board and the Railway Department have no intention whatever of giving to Indians working in their own country the same long leave privileges as are found to be necessary in the case of Europeans working in a tropical climate.

Then, Sir, Mr. Joshi spoke about Indianization and opportunities for training. His bringing up this subject at this late hour takes me by surprise. I have not a mass of figures with which I could overwhelm him, but I would like to mention some figures in regard to the Traffic Department of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. I have the very latest figures of the men employed in the Traffic Department. Officers 24, 25 per cent. of whom are Indians; Goods Inspectors, 67 per cent. Indians; District Inspectors, 100 per cent. Indians; Passenger Traffic Inspectors, 100 per cent. Indians; Claims Inspectors, 100 per cent. Indians; Ticket Inspectors, 50 per cent. Indians; Heads of sections, 96 per cent. Indians; District Officers clerks, 100 per cent. Indians. That is my answer in brief to Mr. Joshi's complaint about racial discrimination and promotion.

As regards opportunities of training, Mr. Joshi struck a perfectly sound note, and one with which I am in complete sympathy, when he said that there is difficulty about getting opportunities for training in technical work on the railways. I am glad to be able to tell him that the Agent of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway informed me recently that he hopes to start a traffic school on similar lines to the one which I had pleasure in starting myself in Asansol a few years ago, and which is now making great strides. What I am impressing upon all railways is that the staff should be trained so as to do better work and fit themselves for higher appointments. We are taking very definite steps to do this now.

Lastly, Sir, Mr. Joshi mentioned the composition of the Advisory Committee. I think I need not dwell very long upon this. The local Advisory Committee which is now being formed on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway is similar to that formed on other railways. It has nothing to do with the staff. It has practically to do with affording the Agent the advice of those who are interested in the work of the railway and who use the railway. It is a means of bringing the Agent into close touch with the needs of the trades and of passengers, and there is no question at all about putting representatives of the staff on the Committee. Mr. Joshi has misunderstood the meaning of the title Advisory Committee. The Committee has nothing to do with the handling of the staff or with the discipline of the staff.

I think I have answered every one of Mr. Joshi's points as well as I am able to do. I hope he will realise that we are giving these points proper attention and that he will not ask for a vote of censure on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway administration in respect of the matters which he has referred to.

**Mr. Ohaman Lal** (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadian): I most respectfully suggest that, as the subject under discussion is a very important one, it might be better to postpone discussion until to-morrow, but, Sir, if you do not agree with me, I shall certainly proceed with my speech. I suggest that we might adjourn the proceedings to-day as it is a very important question and it is already very late. Everybody seems very tired. But if you do not agree with me, Sir, I have no alternative but to proceed. I would like to have your ruling on that point.

It seems to me that the Honourable Member over there is very much in the same position as that of the young lady who was being courted by two lovers and could not make up her mind which she loved most. He has been wooed by the workers and the authorities and does not know whether he should make up his mind about Union recognition or not. What I would put to him is this, why do you fight shy of Union recognition? What is there so terrible in trades unions that you do not want to recognise them? Why cannot you force every one of your employees on the G. I. P. Railway to join the Union, if it is properly conducted? I suggest that the Honourable Member would reply that it is not his business or the business of the authorities to form trades unions in India and that he will leave that task to me or to my Honourable friend to the left. If it is the Honourable Member's business to form Whitley Councils, why cannot he go a step further? I heard the Honourable Member saying that there was no opposition in Bombay, no opposition from workers, to Whitley Councils.

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley**: I did not make any such remark. I do not know if that applied to me; I made no such remark. This is the first time I heard of any opposition.

**Mr. Ohaman Lal**: I am very glad I misunderstood the Honourable Member. I may inform him that these Whitley Councils have no life in them. They are conducted by the authorities and it is impossible to expect that the workers will come forward voluntarily with their grievances in order to have those grievances redressed. The only method known in the civilized world of getting the grievances of workers redressed is through a properly constituted trade union, and you have been doing your level best in India to hamper our work in forming properly constituted trades unions. You have not given us the slightest assistance and you have tried to break the trades unions formed in India by every method known to you. I myself have had the privilege of settling a strike or two on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and I must confess that, when it comes to the point of wanting assistance from outsiders in order to settle strikes, the authorities are very willing to get their assistance, but when it comes to getting the grievances of the workers redressed, then questions of principle are raised, and it is contended that outsiders have no business to be inside a trade union, that political agitators are trying to exploit the workers, and so on and so forth. I do appeal to the Honourable Member, who, it is time, I believe, ought to make up his mind whether he is going to recognise trades unions or not on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. I may instance the

[Mr. Chaman Lal.]

fact that on the North Western Railway there is a trade union of the workers which I believe is recognised to-day by the Agent. My information is that this union is recognised. Certainly there was a time in 1920 when that union was recognised by the Agent and official correspondence used to pass between the workers and the Agent. If that was possible on the North Western Railway, why cannot it be possible on the Great Indian Peninsula? If it is possible in England for railway workers to combine and gain recognition, why is it not possible in India? I believe it was in July last that His Excellency the Viceroy told us in his speech that very shortly a Bill known as the Registration and Protection of Trades Unions Bill would be introduced in the Assembly. It was not very long ago in the House of Commons that Mr. Montagu gave an assurance that such legislation would be taken in hand very early in India, but I find that no such legislation has been introduced. I think there is no inclination on the part of the Government benches to introduce such legislation. I find when I put a question on that subject I am informed that the Government have no intention of introducing legislation of that nature at present.

**The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee** (Industries Member): Sir, may I rise to a point of order. I never said, in reply to a question that was put to me by the Honourable Member, that the Government had no intention of introducing this legislation. That is an entire perversion of what I said. All I said was that I could not give any undertaking as to when the legislation would be introduced.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** Sir, the Honourable Member is very finicky about words. I take his statement to mean he is not going to introduce that legislation this session. If he intended to introduce it and carry out the intention of His Excellency the Viceroy's speech, he could have introduced that legislation this session. Because he has given me no undertaking that he will introduce that legislation, I take it the Government are not minded to introduce legislation of that nature. Sir, the question is a very serious one for us who have been fighting for the workers in this country. We have done our level best in India to form trades unions for these workers. I see the Honourable the Home Member does not agree with me. Naturally I cannot expect him to turn a trade unionist in a day. The time may come when the Honourable the Home Member may probably be the first Labour Minister of a Swaraj Government.

**Mr. President:** I have allowed the Member enough latitude. He must now discuss, as his predecessor discussed, the question relating to the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and no other question.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** Sir, the question I am discussing is claiming recognition for the Great Indian Peninsula Railway workers and related to that is the question of principle of trade union recognition. If I have gone beyond that I certainly apologise, but I do want to confine myself to the grievances of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway workers in this particular behalf, namely, trade union recognition. It has been stated by Mr. Joshi that when letters are written on behalf of the workers, the Agent does not think it the correct thing to do to send a reply to the workers or their representatives. I do think that that is not a very courteous way



of dealing with the problem. There have been occasions when grievances have been represented to the authorities and the authorities have refused even to reply to the representations of the men, and that particular attitude of mind has led to strikes on the railways. It may be that other grievances had more to do with such strikes than the mere refusal to reply, but I do assert that it is not courteous, it is not decent. It does not work for a better understanding between the workers and the officials that such an attitude should be adopted by responsible officials. I think, Sir, it is perfectly plain from what Mr. Joshi has stated that the whole principle underlying the lethargy of railway officials in this matter, the whole principle underlying the refusal of the Great Indian Peninsula officials and of the Agent to deal with the men direct instead of through the Whitley Councils, is wrong. The time has come when that principle should be altered, when you should extend your hand to the workers and say: "We are prepared to help you to form your unions and recognise those unions."

The next question that cropped up was the question of racial discrimination. I am absolutely appalled at the reply the Honourable Member gave to Mr. Joshi's remarks. Mr. Joshi said an average European driver is often paid twice or three times as much as an Indian driver merely because he happens to be a European driver . . . .

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley:** I did not say anything of the kind if the Honourable gentleman is referring to me. I made no such remark.

**Mr. Ohaman Lal:** I may remind the Honourable Member of the remark he did make. His remark was this, that the average needs of a European in this country are greater than those of an Indian . . . .

**Mr. C. D. M. Hindley:** I was referring to leave, Sir, nothing else.

**Mr. Ohaman Lal:** If it was merely to leave, I have no grounds for contention in this matter. The fact is a European driver does get more in pay, more in allowances than an Indian driver. You cannot justify that on any ground whatsoever. If you think the wages given to an average European are sufficient, you should also consider that those wages ought to apply to an Indian worker on the railways. If you say his standard of life is lower, it is up to you to raise that standard of life. It is not for you to say the standard of life of a European is higher and that of an Indian is lower. It is deliberately putting a premium on the lower standard of life. It is deliberately introducing a principle in the working of this Department which principle stands condemned by the unanimous voice of India. We in this country are not going to permit that kind of racial discrimination. You had a Committee, but it seems to me on the railways the recommendations of that Committee have not been carried out. I have had numerous letters from various parts of India complaining about this particular matter of racial discrimination, and I do believe that the sooner you take steps to do away with any racial discrimination of that kind, the better it will be for this country.

I come to the third question, the question of retrenchment. I opened a paper called the North Western Railway Weekly the other day and I discovered various complaints from the workers as regards retrenchment. They complained that hundreds of them had been thrown out of employment and no provision made for them. A similar state of affairs prevails

[Mr. Chaman Lal.]

on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and, as Mr. Joshi pointed out, it is true that hundreds of workers have been thrown out of employment on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. The Honourable Member does not possess the facts. I think it would be better if he were to collect the facts and place them before this House.

**Mr. O. D. M. Hindley:** May I rise to a point of explanation? The facts are clearly stated in the Memorandum which I have placed before this House in black and white.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** The facts are, Sir, that the grievance is a real one. The Honourable Member concludes from those facts in "black and white" that the grievance is an unreal one. I would like him to go deeper into the matter and get real facts, that is, statements from the workers themselves who have been dismissed in Bombay to see whether the grievance is real or unreal. We contend it is real. In India you have no system of unemployment insurance; you have no system of labour exchanges, and hardship of that kind is of a worse nature in this country than in any other country. And when you are, without any sufficient notice, dismissing hundreds of men from the railways, you surely cause very deep resentment in the minds of those workers—not only resentment, but you cause a great deal of hardship to them.

Then, Sir, we come to the last question. The Honourable Member mentioned the question of percentages. He said that in a particular department Indians were 87 per cent., and in another department 100 per cent., to show that there was really no question of a grievance on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. I dare say, if he were to consider the facts, he would find that the coolies on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway are all Indian coolies—that Indians form about 100 per cent. of the total establishment. I dare say he would find that among the sweepers Indians number 100 per cent. They are all Indians; but it was not the coolies or the sweepers or lower grade employees that we were talking about. We were discussing at that particular moment the higher grade officials. We were discussing those particular positions on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway which are practically the monopoly of Europeans.

**Mr. O. D. M. Hindley:** May I rise to a point of explanation again, Sir. If the Honourable gentleman had listened to what I read he would have seen that I gave him figures of all grades of the railway administration from officers down to clerks on Rs. 160. I was not talking about sweepers or menial staff; I was talking about all grades of the traffic department from officers down to office clerks on Rs. 160 per mensem.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** I wish the Honourable Member had not made that explanation because it simply supports my own argument—it justifies my remarks. You take the whole department in a lump, but you know perfectly well that the higher posts are only a few in number and mostly all filled by Europeans.

**Mr. O. D. M. Hindley:** I did not take the whole department in a lump. I gave the Honourable Member detailed percentages of the different classes of the staff from top to bottom. I am afraid the Honourable Member was not listening when I read out my statement.

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Honourable Member tell me whether the Agent is an Indian? Will he tell me whether appointments from the Agent downwards are all occupied by Europeans or Indians? How many Indians are there and what percentage of posts goes to Indians in that particular department? If he were to do that he would find that his remarks are absolutely out of order. We consider that the appointments in the higher grades ought to go to Indians, immediately, in substantial number; then gradually you could, without any injustice to the Europeans now holding positions, Indianise the staff entirely. But what do we find now? We find a stone wall facing us. We find facts and figures given us which are no facts and figures. We find that in practice all the higher appointments in the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the best, the choicest, are not in the hands of Indians but in the hands of others. That is the grievance, and it is because we desire to ventilate that grievance that this particular reduction was brought to your notice. I do not know what the Honourable Member's intentions are and whether he wishes to press his motion or not. I leave that to him; but I say the Railway Department to-day have had notice of the fact that the grievances of the workers on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway are indeed legitimate, and that this attitude of indifference on the part of the Railway Administration will not conduce to peace on the railway. There have been occasions when workers have gone on strike and their grievances with proper treatment could have been settled, as I know from personal experience, within a day or two. You can avoid all that bitterness, you can avoid all that resentment, you can avoid all that misery and sorrow if only you extend your hand in fellowship to the workers.

**Mr. President:** The question is:

“That the demand under sub-head ‘Great Indian Peninsula Railway’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The motion was negatived.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** The clock shows seven, and I wish, Sir, before I speak on my motion to ask if it is the pleasure of the Chair that at this late hour the House may be adjourned. If your decision happens to be otherwise, and if it is permissible to take the opinion of the House by a division, I think I may make bold to say that it is time that the labours of the day should stop at this late hour.

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is aware the Standing Order says the House is adjourned by the President. He was one of those who was most outspoken in the demand that more time should be given to the discussion of these Votes. The offer of time is not in the hands of the Chair except by sitting late.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** I am quite prepared to carry on, Sir.

**Mr. President:** I am prepared to carry on but I am not prepared to insist that the House shall carry on.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** May I make a suggestion? If we must go on to-night, let us get away for two hours and let us begin work again at nine o'clock.

**Mr. President:** I have sympathy with the demand made that more time should be given. That is not in my hands; but I can assist Honourable Members by sitting late, though I hesitate to impose upon myself and upon the non-official or official Members the burden and strain of a night sitting which would result if I were to adopt the Honourable Pandit's suggestion. Therefore, I think I shall be meeting the wishes of all if I now adjourn the House.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 12th March, 1924.

---