

26th January, 1925

THE

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

SECOND SESSION

OF THE

SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1925



SIMLA

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS

1925

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
<b>Friday, 20th February, 1925—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Resolution <i>re</i> Appointment of two Members of the Assembly to the Governing Body of the Lady Hardinge Medical College, Delhi—Not moved ... ..	1307
The Obscene Publications Bill—Passed, as amended ... ..	1307-21
<b>Monday, 23rd February, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	1323-31
Unstarred Questions and Answers ... ..	1331-35
Statements laid on the Table ... ..	1335-44
Bills passed by the Council of State laid on the Table ...	1344
Message from the Council of State ... ..	1344
The Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factories Bill—Report of the Select Committee presented ... ..	1344
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (Age of Consent Bill)—Report of the Select Committee presented ...	1344
Railway Budget—General Discussion ... ..	1345-1406
<b>Tuesday, 24th February, 1925—</b>	
Election of Panels of Standing Committees ... ..	1407
Questions and Answers ... ..	1407-21
Ballot for Panels of Standing Committees ... ..	1414
Public Accounts Committee—Final Report laid on the Table	1421-23
The Prisons (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	1423
The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	1424
The Cantonments (House-Accommodation Amendment) Bill—Introduced ... ..	1424
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Considered ... ..	1424-52
Resolution <i>re</i> Legislative Council for Ajmer-Merwara—Negatived ... ..	1452-79
<b>Wednesday, 25th February, 1925—</b>	
Members Sworn ... ..	1481
Questions and Answers ... ..	1481-82
Railway Budget—	
List of Demands—	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board. (Motion for omission of Demand—Negatived) ... ..	1482-1545
(i) Pay of Officers of the Railway Board ... ..	1516-33
(ii) Appointment of an Indian on the Railway Board ... ..	1533-45
<b>Thursday, 26th February, 1925—</b>	
Election of Panels of Standing Committees ... ..	1547-48
Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i> ... ..	1549-1611
(iii) Appointment of a Rates Tribunal ... ..	1549-51
(iv) Reduction of Third Class Railway Fares ... ..	1551-65
(v) New Branch Line Policy ... ..	1555-86
(vi) Reduction of Coal Freight ... ..	1586-97
(vii) Attitude of the Railway Board with reference to the grievances of the general public ... ..	1596-1610

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 26th January, 1925.

---

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

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

**Mr. President:** We omitted Mr. Bray's questions the other day which we will take up now. Question No. 126.

### QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE.

126. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** With reference to Government reply to starred questions from 1918 to 1925, asked in the last September session of the Assembly, will the Government be pleased to state whether the inquiry from the Local Administrations has been completed and if completed to lay the information on the table for the information of the House?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** I am sorry, Sir, that the questions were not answered in the ordinary course on Friday last owing to my indisposition and oversight on the part of my office.

(1) The replies to questions Nos. 1918 to 1925 asked by Makhdum Syed Rajan Baksh Shah in the September session have been furnished to him direct.

(2) The questions to which my Honourable friend refers are largely concerned with the affairs of the little township of Kulachi, and I am afraid their public interest is not so great as to justify the cost of printing the answers. Should, however, any particular question be considered to have a wider appeal I will have the answer laid on the table of the House.

### RIOTS AT KOHAT.

161. \***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether any inquiry has been undertaken by the Chief Commissioner of the N.-W. F. Province, regarding the Hindu Muslim riots at Kohat and also to place the report if any submitted by that Officer to the Government of India, on the table?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the annexures to Government Resolution No. 598-F., dated the 9th December, 1924.

DEPUTATION OF THE HONOURABLE SIR CHARLES INNES TO INQUIRE  
INTO THE KOHAT RIOTS.

162. \***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons which led to the deputation of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes to inquire into the Kohat disturbances and also to place the report if any forwarded by him to the Government of India on the table?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** As explained in a communiqué at the time, His Excellency the Viceroy requested the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, to confer with the Chief Commissioner on the results of his inquiry into the Kohat disturbances, and on the progress of his efforts for the resettlement of the Hindus and the restoration of harmonious relations in Kohat. Sir Charles Innes embodied the result of his discussions in a note submitted to His Excellency. It would not be in accordance with practice to publish a note of this character, but I may say that Sir Charles Innes' general conclusions coincided with those of the Chief Commissioner as set forth in his report which was annexed to the Resolution on the subject.

RIOTS AT KOHAT.

163. \***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the value of the property that has been lost in the Kohat disturbances and the value of the property that has subsequently been recovered?
- (b) whether the local officials took any and what steps to prevent the looting of the property during the disturbances and whether any and what portion of the looted property has been recovered from the possession of the police in Kohat and from other local officials; if so, what is the extent and value of the property so recovered?
- (c) whether the Government are satisfied that the local officials have taken proper steps to prevent the disturbances and to prevent the looting of the properties?
- (d) the terms of the settlement, if any, that has been brought about between the Hindus and the Mohammedans and also to state the number of Hindus that have gone back to Kohat in consequence of such settlement?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** (a) to (d). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to Government Resolution No. 598-F., dated the 9th December, 1924.

As regards (a), the damage to house property has been estimated roughly at nine lakhs of rupees. Other losses and the value of property recovered cannot be accurately calculated.

As regards (d), a copy of the terms of settlement made by the leaders is laid on the table. So far few Hindus have returned to Kohat, but many are making arrangements to do so.

*Agreement among the Muslims, the Hindus and the Sikhs of Kohat.*

We, the representatives of the Muslim, Hindu and Sikh communities of Kohat, being desirous of effecting a settlement of all matters among the various communities connected with the Kohat disturbances of September 1924, hereby agree as follows :

- (1) All criminal cases connected with the Kohat disturbances of September 1924 be dropped and given up, and no criminal cases of any sort be put forward in the guise of a civil suit against one another either individually or as a community.
- (2) Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims will raise no objection and put no obstacle in the way of restoration and re-construction of their respective places of worship which existed before the disturbances provided that the Gurdawara at the springs near the Fort shall be re-constructed "Kacha", single-storied, on its old site and no encroachment or extension shall be made in its area. In future the building and use of this Gurdawara shall be subject to the orders which already exist.
- (3) Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs will give each other full and genuine assistance in restoring to its owner any property seen and clearly identified by the owner to be his, and for which he can offer clear and legitimate proof.
- (4) Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs sincerely assure one another that there will be no organised boycott due to the disturbances on either side either in Kohat city or its suburbs and that every effort will be made to maintain friendly relations with each other.

*Notes.*—1. The case of the pamphlet under sections 153-A. and 505 I. P. C., already taken up by the Government is left at the justice of the Government.

2. Case Crown through Muid. Afzal Khan of Garhi, Nawaz Khan *versus* Jalal, Nisar, Naqshband, etc., of Bezadi Chikarkot and Kharmatu, under section 307 I. P. C. is excluded from this agreement and this case may be decided by a council of elders.

(*Sd.*) N. E. REILLY,

*Deputy Commissioner,*  
and by *the Representatives of the*  
*communities.*

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** May I ask, Sir, whether the Government have taken notice of the conduct of any local officials who have had in their possession some of the property which has been lost in the disturbances and to whom the property has been traced?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** If, I understand the Honourable Member aright, he is referring to certain members of the constabulary and police. Action has been taken against them.

**Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha:** What action has been taken against them?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** The Honourable Member will find it in the Annexures to the Resolution. They have been put on their trial.

DECREASE IN THE EXPORT OF INDIAN YARN.

185. **\*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Is it a fact that the exports of Indian yarn by sea from British India to foreign countries during the five months, April to August 1924, were 18,000,000 lbs., as compared with 18,000,000 and 29,000,000 lbs., in the corresponding period of 1923 and 1922 respectively?

(b) If so, will the Government please state the cause of this steady decrease?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** (a) Yes.

(b) The cause is the same as it was on September 10th last when I answered a similar question from the Honourable Member.

ADMINISTRATION OF SHIPPING, LIGHT HOUSES, MAJOR PORTS AND  
QUARANTINE.

186. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Is it a fact that Central subjects include Shipping, light houses, major ports, and quarantine?

(b) Is it a fact that these are at present administered by Local Governments as agents of the Government of India.

(c) If so, will Government please state whether they are prepared to administer these subjects directly?

(d) If not, will they please give reasons?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) and (d). The question of taking under the direct administration of the Central Government the subjects mentioned by the Honourable Member is at present under the consideration of the Government of India.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** May I know when the decision on that matter will be reached?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I am, afraid, I am not in a position to answer that question.

HOLIDAYS FOR MOHAMMEDAN OFFICERS IN THE SURVEY OF INDIA.

187. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the letter published in the issue of the *Forward* of the 18th November 1924, page 9, under the heading "Grievances of Mohammedan Officers"?

(b) If so, do they propose to remove the cause of the grievances of the officers concerned?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** (a) Yes.

(b) The holidays referred to by the Honourable Member are special holidays and are additional to the ordinary public holidays enjoyed by all communities. The Government of Bengal themselves do not give special holidays to certain offices such as those of the Collector of Customs, Shipping Master, Collector of Stamp Revenue, etc., on account of exigencies of public service, and the Honourable Member will therefore recognise that they cannot be treated as of universal application. The Muhammadan employees of the Calcutta offices of the Survey of India, are largely occupied on map-printing, handling of machinery or similar other work and cannot be spared from it without necessitating a general closing for the day or days involved. Nevertheless, the Government of India have, after careful consideration, decided to instruct the Surveyor General to grant to these Muhammadan employees one day each for the *Akhiri Chakar Shamba* and *Shab-i-barat* and one additional day for *Id-us-suha*.

**STRENGTH AND COST OF MAINTENANCE OF THE REGULAR FORCE LOCATED AT RAZMAK.**

188. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** With reference to the despatch of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary dated Delhi, the 18th November 1924, para. 23, will the Government please state:

- (a) the strength of the regular force located at Razmak (Waziristan);
- (b) the annual cost of the maintenance of the force so located?

**Mr. E. Burdon:** (a) 150 British Officers, 1,200 British other ranks, 7,000 Indian officers and Indian other ranks, and 1,050 followers.

(b) Rs. 82 lakhs approximately.

**BRITISH EMPIRE EXHIBITION.**

189. \***Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the entire expenditure incurred by the Government of India and the Local Governments on account of the Empire Exhibition?

(b) Do the Government propose to continue the Exhibition or has it closed the part of India in the said Exhibition?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state the benefits reaped by India by the said Exhibition?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state how many of the Indian articles exhibited there will be manufactured in the British Empire outside India and what will be the protection for the Indian industry in respect of such articles?

(e) What amount do the Government expect to recoup by the sale of materials used for the stalls, etc., at the Exhibition?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** (a) Figures of total actual expenditure are not yet available. The total estimated gross expenditure on the British Empire Exhibition for the three years ending 1924-25 from Central Revenues is as follows:

In England	...	...	...	£196,000
In India, including the	estimated	gross		
expenditure on account	of various	Rail-		
ways	...	...	...	Rs. 5,05,000

The total estimated expenditure incurred by various Local Governments is as follows:

				Rs.
Madras	...	...	...	8,08,500
Bombay	...	...	...	72,058
Bengal	...	...	...	8,51,000
United Provinces	...	...	...	8,70,000
Burma	...	...	...	18,00,000
Punjab	...	...	...	8,50,000
Bihar and Orissa	...	...	...	50,000

Except in the case of Madras and Bihar and Orissa the above figures represent gross expenditure and take no account of recoveries.

The following recoveries have so far been made on behalf of the Government of India on account of rent, etc.:

In India	...	...	...	Rs. 4,00,000
In England	...	...	...	£ 80,000

(b) The question has not yet been finally decided.

(c) Reports show that most of the private exhibitors have been well satisfied with the result of their enterprise and several have applied to take part in this year's Exhibition. Some have opened branches in London, where previously they were not represented. Others have extended to the Continent. Many report a stimulation in interest in Indian products. The exhibits of the larger and better known products also attracted much attention and stimulated inquiries. The Honourable Member is referred for more details to the reports of Directors of Industries in the Provinces.

(d) The Honourable Member cannot possibly expect me to be able to answer to this question.

(e) The Government are not yet in a position to furnish the information.

**Mr. E. K. Shanmukham Chetty:** With regard to the question of India's participating in the Exhibition for the year 1925, will Government give an opportunity to this Assembly to discuss that matter before they come to any conclusion?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** I am afraid, I cannot give any undertaking on that point.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW MEASURED RATE SYSTEM BY THE MADRAS TELEPHONE COMPANY.

190. **\*Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether the Government of India have given their sanction to the new Measured Rate System proposed to be introduced by the Madras Telephone Company?

(b) Whether before giving their sanction they gave an opportunity to the public and to subscribers to express an opinion on the proposed charges?

(c) Whether it is a fact that bodies which represent the Indian public, such as the Southern India Chamber of Commerce and the Madras Corporation have passed resolutions disapproving of the new scheme?

(d) Whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the numerous protests appearing in the columns of the *Swarajya* of Madras?

(e) Whether the Government are aware that only in July last the subscription rates were increased and that it is felt by the public that the Madras Telephone Company is abusing its monopoly by periodically increasing the rates to the great detriment of the telephone using public?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra:** The answer to (a), (b), (c) and (d) is in the affirmative.

(e) No. Presumably the increase in the rates of subscription referred to is that which came into effect as from January 1st, 1923. This increase in rates was duly authorised by Government in an agreement, dated 10th October 1922, supplementary to the Company's license. Prior to this agreement being entered into between the Company and the Government,



the terms of the agreement were referred to the Madras Government, the Madras Chamber of Commerce, the Southern India Chamber of Commerce and the Madras Trades Association, all of whom approved of the conditions of the agreement.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NEW MEASURED RATE SYSTEM BY THE MADRAS TELEPHONE COMPANY.

191. **\*Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the correspondence between the Government of India and the Madras Telephone Company on the subject of the introduction of the Measured Rate System?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra:** The correspondence is bulky and Government do not propose to lay it on the table. I shall be pleased to show it to the Honourable Member in my office, if he so desires.

MEASURED RATE SYSTEM FOR TELEPHONES.

192. **\*Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether such a Measured Rate System for telephones is in vogue in any other part of India?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra:** A Message Rate System is now operative in Calcutta.

THE MADRAS TELEPHONE COMPANY.

198. **\*Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state who are the Directors of the Madras Telephone Company?

(b) Its subscribed share capital?

(c) How much of the share capital is subscribed by Indians?

(d) How much is subscribed by shareholders resident out of India?

(e) What are the dividends declared so far from the starting of the Company?

(f) Whether any grants or special privileges have been granted by the Government?

(g) What is the kind and extent of control which the Government exercise over the working of the Company?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra:** (a) Sir James Simpson, M.L.C., Mr. C. E. Wood, Dewan Bahadur Govindose Chathurbhujadoss, Mr. Hajee Mahomed Ebrahim Sait and Mr. G. W. Bromhead.

(b) Rs. 16,04,197-8-0.

(c) and (d). The Government have no information.

(e) 6 per cent. for the year 1923.

(f) and (g). The Company works under a License from the Government of India, dated 17th March, 1903, and also under two agreements, supplemental to the License, dated 10th October, 1922, and 10th October, 1924, respectively.

Copies of this License and the Agreements are placed in the Members' Library and the Honourable Member will be able to gather from them the kind and extent of the control which Government exercise over the working of the Company.

#### INTEREST-FREE HOUSE-BUILDING LOANS TO GOVERNMENT SERVANTS.

194. \***Shaikh Mushir Hossain Kidwal**: (a) Is it a fact that the Government of India used to lend money *without interest* to public servants for building houses, etc., but the concession of interest-free loans has been stopped lately?

(b) Are the Government aware that it was mostly *Indian* officials who profitted by the above mentioned concession of interest-free loans for building houses?

(c) Do the Government propose to reconsider the question of reverting to the old practice of advancing interest-free money to officials for building houses, etc.?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett**: The answer to the first part is in the affirmative and to the last part in the negative.

With regard to the second part the Government have not the required information. These advances are sanctioned by various authorities.

#### ARRESTS UNDER BENGAL REGULATION III OF 1818 AND THE BENGAL CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ORDINANCE, 1924.

195. \***Mr. Kamini Kumar Chanda**: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a resolution said to have been passed at a meeting of the Calcutta journalists and published in the *Forward* of the 19th November, to the effect that the persons arrested under Bengal Regulation III of 1818 and the Bengal Ordinance are subjected to a severe cross-examination at the headquarters of the C. I. D. and that improper influences are brought to bear upon them to make incriminatory statements, and the remarks said to have been made by Mr. Nirmal Chandra Sen, Editor of the *Labour*, whose brother has been arrested under Regulation III and is said to have confirmed the same to his brother who interviewed him in jail?

(b) Under what provision of law can the police remove any such prisoner from their place of confinement to the C. I. D. Headquarters or to question them at all after their arrest?

(c) What remedy have the prisoners against such removal and cross-examination?

(d) Are the Government prepared to give them an opportunity of making their complaints, if any, to a mixed body of officials and non-official visitors?

(e) Have the grounds of determination by the authority of the Governor General in Council that the persons recently arrested under Regulation III should be placed under personal restraint otherwise than in pursuance of some judicial proceedings, been communicated to them in order that they may "be allowed freely to bring to the notice of the Governor General in Council all circumstances relating to either the supposed grounds of such determination or to the manner in which it has been executed", in

accordance with the requirements of the Preamble to the said Regulation? If so, when and in what shape were the said grounds communicated to them and have they been allowed to make any submission?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** (a) Government have seen the statement which in some respects is entirely incorrect and in others a distortion of facts. No persons arrested under Regulation III have been removed from jail custody to be examined by police officers. Persons detained under the Ordinance have been examined with a view to the passing of orders either for their release or for further action under the Ordinance. No pressure of any sort has been placed upon détenus in order to obtain incriminating statements.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the rules published with the Local Government's Notification No. 10569-P., dated the 25th October 1924.

(c) The orders of the Local Government are, subject to the provision of the Ordinance, final, but détenus are at liberty to make representations to the Local Government.

(d) Non-official visitors are specially appointed to visit the détenus who are free to make to these visitors any statements which they wish to make.

(e) Yes; in the form of written specific charges. Opportunities of making submissions have been afforded to the prisoners, most of whom have not availed themselves of them.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** May I know whether any complaints have been received so far and how they have been dealt with?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** I have received no complaints.

#### INCREASE OF STAFF IN THE RAILWAY BOARD OFFICE.

196. **\*Mr. Kamini Kumar Chanda:** (a) Is it a fact that a large number of new appointments have recently been made at Delhi by the Railway Board and increments given to the staff who are not called upon to work more than they used to do—on the ground of increase of work for separation of railway from general finance?

(b) Is it a fact that in one department work which was done by seven men has now been distributed amongst twenty-two with 4 officers and an array of stenographers in addition?

(c) Will the Government say how many such appointments have been made, the qualifications of the persons appointed, stating if they have passed the examination of the Staff Selection Board, their previous service (if any), and the salaries on which they have been appointed?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). No.

(c) The reorganised Finance Branch of the Railway Board's Office consists of 24 posts of which 16 previously belonged to the Board's establishment and 6 were created for the performance of work transferred from the office of the Accountant General, Railways.

Only one additional officer has been appointed. Apart from the men taken over from the Accountant General, Railways, three persons were newly appointed to the Railway Board's establishment; particulars relating to the qualifications, etc., of the men are laid on the table.

*Particulars of new subordinate appointments made in the Finance Branch of the Railway Board's Office.*

Name.	Examinations passed.	Service.	Previous	Pay	REMARKS.
			pay.	on which appointed.	
			Rs.	Rs.	
(1) A. N. Shaspari (Assistant).	Bachelor of Arts, Punjab University. Has also passed the Staff Selection Board Examination for Upper Division of the Secretariat.	Two years in Army Headquarters (Q. M. G.'s Branch), Army Department and Military Finance.	100 p. m.	180 p. m.	Selected on account of his knowledge of financial work in the Military Finance Department. The pay given is the minimum pay of the grade to which he has been appointed.
(2) Jai Narain (Clerk).	Matriculation of Punjab University.	1½ years in a Bank . . .	45 p. m.	75 p. m.	Selected on account of his experience in commercial accounting work in a Bank. The pay offered is the minimum pay of the lowest grade.
(3) Abdul Rahim (Stenographer).	Ditto. Has also passed Staff Selection Board Examination for Lower Division of the Secretariat and also as a stenographer.	4 years and 7½ months as under:— Office of District Sessions Judge, Gurdaspur . . . 8 months. Mesopotamia . . . 4 years. Home Department, Government of India . . . ½ month. Office of Director of Public Information . . . 2 months.	150 p. m.	150 p. m.	The pay offered is the minimum pay of the grade of stenographers.

ANNUAL AVERAGE VALUE OF EXPORTS AND IMPORTS FOR THE YEARS 1909-1913, 1914-1918 AND 1919-1923, RESPECTIVELY.

197. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Will the Government please make a statement showing the annual average value of exports and imports during the five years immediately preceding the war, namely, 1909 to 1913, during the war, namely, 1914 to 1918, and during the succeeding five years, namely, 1919 to 1923, respectively?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: A statement is laid on the table.

*Statement showing the annual averages of the import and export trade of British India in merchandise (private and Government) for the years 1909-13, 1914-1918 and 1919-1923.*

	1909-1913 (average).	1914-1918 (average).	1919-1923 (average).
Imports . . . . .	Rs. (lakhs). 1,47,71	Rs. (lakhs). 1,58,33	Rs. (lakhs). 2,64,15
Exports (including re-exports) . . . . .	2,19,24	2,22,33	2,96,55

POSITION OF INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

198. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** With reference to Government reply to (1) and (2) of the question of which the Honourable Dr. Sir Devaprasad Sarvadhikary had given private notice and which he asked on the 23rd September, 1924, in the Council of State *re* "Position of Indians in South Africa," will Government please state:

- (a) Whether they have received the text of the speech of the Secretary of State for the Colonies?
- (b) If so, whether they have taken or propose taking any action in the matter?
- (c) If so, what is that action?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** (a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b) and (c). Government are in communication with the Secretary of State for India in the matter.

USE OF HEAD LIGHTS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

199. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the letter published in the issue of the *Statesman* of the 26th November, 1924, page 13, under the heading "Head Lights"?

(b) If so, will they please state if the statement made therein is correct.

(c) If correct, do they propose to instruct the Eastern Bengal Railway authorities to see to the matter referred to?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). On the broad gauge 3 and on the metre gauge 21 engines are already fitted with electric head lights. It is proposed gradually to fit head lights on all engines employed on the mail and passenger services.

INDIAN TRAFFIC INSPECTORS (TRANSPORTATION) ON THE NORTH-WESTERN, OUDH AND ROHILKHAND AND EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAYS.

200. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** With reference to Government reply to question No. 428 asked in the Council of State on the 22nd September 1924 *re* "Indian Traffic Inspectors (Transportation) on the North Western, Oudh and Rohilkhand and Eastern Bengal Railways" will the Government please state:

(a) Whether the inquiry has been completed?

(b) If completed, will they please communicate the result to the House?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). The result of the inquiry referred to by the Honourable Member was to the effect that since the Honourable Rai Bahadur Lala Ram Saran Das's Resolution was adopted by the Council of State, 7 permanent vacancies of Traffic Inspectors (Transportation) have occurred on the 3 State Railways. Of these 7 permanent vacancies, 5 have been filled by Indians. In addition, an Indian was appointed to one officiating vacancy.

## THE NATAL BOROUGHS ORDINANCE.

201. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: With reference to my starred question 2039, asked in the last September session of the Assembly, re "The Natal Boroughs Ordinance", and the reply of Government, will Government please state:

- (a) if the Bill has received the assent of the Governor, or is still waiting for his assent?
- (b) the result of their communication with the Union Government on the subject?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore**: (a) The Bill has received the assent of the Governor General.

(b) The matter is still the subject of correspondence.

## OFFICE FURNITURE AND FITTINGS OF BUILDINGS IN NEW DELHI.

202. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: Will Government please state if it is a fact that all the office furniture and fittings of buildings in New Delhi at Raisina are being made in Delhi and that the legislative buildings are to be panelled with ply wood made up in the plant at the Forest Research Institute at Dehra Dun?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra**: The furniture is being made in India, but not all in Delhi. All fittings required which are made in India are being obtained in India, but not all in Delhi.

The ply panels required for the Central Buildings are being made up in the Economic Section of the Forest Research Institute.

## EXPENDITURE ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW DELHI.

203. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: Will Government please state:

- (a) if the total gross estimated expenditure on the entire scheme of the construction of New Delhi at Raisina is Rs. 1,372 lakhs, and that as much as Rs. 1,000 lakhs has already been expended?
- (b) if the provision for the Government House is Rs. 140 lakhs, for the Secretariat Rs. 160 lakhs, and for legislative buildings Rs. 83.5 lakhs?
- (c) the correct figures, if those given in (a) and (b) are not correct?
- (d) by what time the Government House, Imperial Secretariat and the legislative buildings are likely to be completed?
- (e) by what time the Government are likely to remove to New Delhi?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra**: (a), (b) and (c). The amount of the sanctioned gross estimate for the construction of the New Capital is Rs. 1,384 lakhs and of the net estimate Rs. 1,325 lakhs. The question of the revision of these figures is now under consideration.

The probable gross expenditure to the end of March, 1925, will be Rs. 1,136 lakhs and the net expenditure Rs. 1,102 lakhs.

The sanctioned provision for Government House, including the buildings on the Estate, is Rs. 147 lakhs; the provision for the Secretariats is Rs. 168 lakhs and for the Council Chamber Rs. 83.5 lakhs.

(d) It is hoped that, unless unforeseen difficulties supervene, the New Secretariats will be completed by the 1st November, 1925, excepting the Porte Cochieres Domes and Towers which will not be completed until 1926.

It is anticipated that the New Parliamentary Buildings and the New Government House will be ready for occupation by the autumn of 1926.

(e) The winter of 1926-27.

#### INDIAN PILGRIMS TO THE HEDJAZ.

204. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Will the Government be pleased to state the number of Indian pilgrims that proceeded to the Hedjaz during the last Haj season and the number that have returned to India?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: The number of pilgrims, who proceeded from India to the Hedjaz, during the last Haj season was 18,060. The number of pilgrims who returned to India during the same period was 15,758.

Khan Bahadur W. M. Hussainally: May I know, Sir, what number of pilgrims was expatriated from the Hedjaz during the last pilgrim season?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: I must ask the Honourable Member to give me notice of that question.

#### HARDSHIPS OF INDIAN PILGRIMS TO THE HEDJAZ.

205. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Will the Government please state if Indian pilgrims to the Hedjaz had to suffer any hardships owing to the occupation of Taif and Mecca by the troops of Ibn Saud Sultan of Nejd, and if so, what kind of hardships had they to suffer?

Mr. Denys Bray: No authenticated cases of serious injury to them have come to the notice of Government. In fact the majority had left the Hedjaz before the capture of Taif.

#### REVISION OF RULES RELATING TO PAY, LEAVE, ETC., OF RAILWAY SERVANTS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

206. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to Government reply "The Rules relating to pay, leave, etc., are being revised on State Railways with the object of removing racial discrimination" to unstarred question 435 (a) asked in the Assembly on the 22nd September, 1924 *re* the scales of pay of European and Indian Loco running staff on the Bengal Nagpur Railway, will Government please state:

(a) if the Rules referred to have been revised?

(b) If so, will they please lay them on the table?

Mr. G. G. Sim: (a) Arrangements have already been made to eliminate racial distinctions in respect to rates of pay in all scales of the staff on the lines referred to in the reply previously given. No discrimination is made

in respect to regular leave. Inquiries have further been made in regard to all distinctions remaining in the rules and conditions of services based on racial considerations.

The inquiries show that very few distinctions and those of a minor character still remain and efforts are being made to get rid of them as soon as possible.

(b) It is not understood what the Honourable Member desires me to lay on the table.

207. (Answered on the 23rd January, 1925.)

#### KOHAT RIOTS.

208. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: (a) Has the settlement of differences which gave rise to the disturbance in Kohat been arrived at?

(b) If so, will Government please make a statement showing what the differences and causes were which gave rise to the disturbances?

Mr. Denys Bray: (a) It is hoped that the agreement just concluded by the leaders of the two communities will prove the beginning of a lasting settlement.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the Government Resolution on the subject.

#### GRANT OF A LOAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PORT OF CHITTAGONG.

209. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to Government reply to unstarred question 336 (b) and (c) in the Council of State on 3rd September, 1924 *re* "Grant of a Loan for the development of the Port of Chittagong", will Government please state:

(a) if the exact terms of the loan have now been finally agreed to?

(b) If so, will they please state what those terms are?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) No. The terms for the loan proposed by the Government of India have been accepted by the Government of Bengal but they have yet to be accepted by the local Legislative Council.

(b) Therefore does not arise.

#### VIZAGAPATAM AND COCHIN HARBOUR SCHEMES.

210. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to question 337 in the Council of State on the 3rd September 1924 *re* "Vizagapatam and Cochin Harbour schemes", will Government please state what further progress with regard to them has been made?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The proposals of the Government of India regarding the Vizagapatam Harbour Scheme have been formulated and have been referred to the Secretary of State for India. As regards the Cochin Harbour Scheme the report of the Expert Committee referred to in the reply to question No. 337 in the Council of State on the 3rd September last has been received and is at present under the consideration of the Madras Government.



CREATION OF NEW POSTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE SEPARATION OF RAILWAY FINANCE.

211. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to state whether any and what posts are newly created in connection with the separation of Railway Finance and the amount of salaries fixed and names of persons appointed and their respective qualifications?

**Mr. G. G. Sim**: A statement giving the information asked for is laid on the table.

*Statement showing particulars of posts newly created in connection with the separation of Railway Finance.*

New posts created.	Pay fixed.	Name of person appointed.	Qualifications.	REMARKS.
(1) Deputy Director of Finance.	Rs. 1,500—60—1,800 plus an allowance of Rs. 300 per mensem when an officer appointed to the Indian Audit and Accounts Service before the 4th of August 1920 is obtained on loan as Deputy Director.	Mr. A. M. Hayman, O.B.E.	Officer of the Indian Audit and Accounts Service.	This post is in replacement of the previous post of Joint Secretary to the Railway Board on Rs. 1,800—100—2,000 which, pending the reorganisation of the Finance Branch, lapsed on 1st April 1924.
(2) Assistant Director of Finance.	Rs. 1,000—50—1,250	Rai Sahib B. D. Puri.	Officer of the Railway Accounts Department.	Attention is invited to the reply to the question on this subject asked by the Honourable Mr. Kamini Chanda to-day.
(3) One Assistant				
(4) One Stenographer.				

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LEE COMMISSION.

212. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to place on the table the views expressed by the Government of India on the recommendations of the Lee Commission after the adverse vote of the Assembly and the orders issued by the Secretary of State thereon?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman**: The Government of India do not propose to place on the table their correspondence with the Secretary of State on the recommendations of the Lee Commission. The orders passed by the Secretary of State have already been published.

**Dr. K. G. Lohokare**: What about the Medical Services? Can the Government of India give any information on that?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman**: That is not really my Department and I would prefer the Honourable Member to put down a question.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** May I know with reference to the clauses of the Secretary of State's Rules depriving this Assembly of its powers in regard to passages and other matters, whether any opportunity will be given to this Assembly to discuss the position.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** I am not quite sure that I have understood the Honourable Member's point but he is aware of the rules and orders which enable Resolutions to be tabled.

PROTECTION AFFORDED BY THE STEEL PROTECTION ACT, 1924, TO THE  
STEEL INDUSTRY.

213. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) how far the protection given by the Steel Protection Act has been helpful to the steel industry in India?
- (b) how much the country was taxed for the protection already given?
- (c) whether the bounty now proposed by the Government of granting 50 lakhs annually is compensated by ameliorating the condition of the operatives in the Tata Steel Industry?
- (d) whether the Tata Industry has effected any economy in reducing the salaries of highly paid officials and substituting Indians for aliens wherever feasible?
- (e) what profits were made after the inauguration of protection and whether the Tatas are prepared to give to the Government a reasonable share in excess profits when realised?
- (f) whether any and what other firms received benefit by this protection duty?
- (g) whether any and what improvements were effected by the Tata Steel Works in cheapening the cost of production?
- (h) whether the whole product of Tatas Company was purchased by the Railways or the Government and if so, to what extent since July last?
- (i) whether the Government appointed anybody, and, if so, whom, to watch the economic working of the Tatas Company?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** (a) This question is examined in the "Report of the Indian Tariff Board regarding the increase of the duties on Steel" which the Honourable Member has no doubt studied.

(b) Roughly 71 lakhs up to 31st December 1924.

(c) The conditions on which it is proposed to give the bounty are contained in the Resolution of which notice has already been given.

(d) The Honourable Member is referred to paragraph 55 of the Tariff Board's first report.

(e) The Honourable Member is referred to the Tariff Board's recent report, from which he will see that it is not a question of excess profits. The Government make no claim to a share in any ultimate profits.

(f) The Government have no information—presumably any firms which make the classes of goods which were protected in June last.

(g) This is a matter for the Company.

(h) No, not the whole.

(i) No.

THE KENYA IMMIGRATION BILL.

214. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: Will the Government be pleased to state in what stage the Kenya Immigration Bill is?

Mr. J. W. Bhow: The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to my reply given on the 16th September, 1924, to Sir Hari Singh Gour's question No. 2021 on the same subject.

UNIVERSITY FOR RAJPUTANA.

215. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to Government reply to question 839 in the Council of State on the 8th September, 1924, re "University for Rajputana", will the Government please state if any further progress has been made than that indicated by the Government reply to the above question?

Mr. Denys Bray: The scheme is still under consideration locally. The Agent to the Governor General suggested in August last to the Darbars concerned that it might be desirable to ascertain more fully the conditions of affiliation with the Delhi University. It was also proposed that a representative deputation might be sent to wait on the University authorities. The replies of certain Darbars are still awaited.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: Will Government undertake not to set up any more Universities in directly administered areas until equipment of the Delhi University has been brought up to a reasonable standard? (Laughter.)

RETRENCHMENT IN AJMER-MERWARA.

216. \*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan: With reference to Government reply to starred question 2355 (b), re "Retrenchment in Ajmer Merwara", will the Government please state:

- (a) if they have arrived at any decision on the question?
- (b) if so, will they please communicate the result to the House?

Mr. Denys Bray: (a) Yes.

(b) A statement giving the information is laid on the table.

Statement showing the savings effected or anticipated in connection with Mr. Campbell's recommendations regarding Ajmer-Merwara.

	Savings effected.			Savings anticipated.		
	Rs.	A.	P.	Rs.	A.	P.
(i) Ajmer Treasury . . . . .	8,503	8	0	...		
(ii) Honorary Magistrate's Court, Ajmer . . . . .	1,464	0	0	...		
(iii) Education . . . . .	1,440	0	0	3,795	0	0
(iv) Medical . . . . .	2,198	0	0	...		
(v) Public Works Department (Civil Works, Ajmer-Merwara). . . . .	41,247	0	0	...		
(vi) Jails . . . . .	3,000	0	0	...		
Total . . . . .	57,850	8	0	3,795	0	0

## STRANDED MADRAS COOLIES IN ASSAM.

217. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** With reference to Government reply to question re "Stranded Madras Coolies in Assam" in the Council of State on the 11th September, 1924, page 1008, will the Government please state—

(a) if they have received the reply of the Local Government?

(b) if so, will they please give the required information?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra:** (a) Yes. \*

(b) The information was given in this House by the Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee on the 15th September 1924.

## ADMINISTRATION OF PORTS BY THE RAILWAY BOARD.

218. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Will the Government please state if the Acworth Committee advised that the administration of ports should be entrusted to the Railway Board?

(b) If so, has the recommendation been carried into effect?

(c) If not, are Government prepared to take the matter into their consideration?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The question of bringing the major ports into closer touch with the Government of India is at present under consideration.

## AMENDMENT OF THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX ACT, 1922.

219. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** Will the Government please state if they are prepared to consider the desirability of amending the Income-tax Act, 1922, in order to admit of appeals to the Privy Council against the decision of High Courts on matters referred to them under section 66 of the said Act?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** The Government are awaiting the result of an application to the Privy Council for leave to appeal against a decision of a certain High Court.

## THE SUKKUR BARRAGE.

220. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state how far the Sukkur Barrage Scheme in Sind is carried out?

(b) What amount has already been spent and what it would cost when completed and how many acres of land would be brought under new cultivation and the cultivation of how many acres would be vastly improved?

(c) Whether it is a fact that it would cost 18 crores of rupees and irrigate  $8\frac{1}{2}$  million acres of new land to be brought under cultivation and 2 million acres of land would have improved facilities for irrigation?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra:** (a) Good progress has been made with the survey work and investigations which must necessarily precede the construction of a large project, and the alignment of the canals, branches and distributaries is being settled. Some of the buildings required

in connection with the scheme are in hand, and the preparation of plans and estimates for others is well advanced. Proceedings for land acquisition are in progress, work on the railway communications and quarry sidings is progressing satisfactorily, and plant and machinery are being received and erected.

(b) Rs. 62 lakhs had been spent up to the end of September last, the latest date for which figures are available. The remainder of this portion of the question is correctly answered by the Honourable Member himself in part (c).

REDUCTION OF POSTAL RATES.

221. \*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju: Will the Government be pleased to state the actual income and expenditure as far as figures are available of the Postal Department:

- (a) since the postal rates have been increased as compared with the accounts for a similar period prior to the increase;
- (b) the number of letters and postcards posted during the aforesaid period;
- (c) whether it is not possible to reduce the postal rates to the old level or even on the alternative of  $\frac{1}{2}$  anna postal card  $\frac{1}{2}$  anna for half a tola and one anna for  $2\frac{1}{2}$  tolas without impairing the condition that the Postal Department should be self-supporting?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: I lay on the table a statement giving the information asked for in parts (a) and (b) of the question. In regard to the figures of expenditure relating to part (a), I may explain that the figures are those appearing in the published accounts of Government, but that they do not make full allowance for items like interest on capital, pensionary charges, provision for a depreciation fund, etc., which should correctly be debited to a commercial concern. The financial result of the Post and Telegraph Department according to accounts prepared on a commercial basis will be brought out in connection with the Budget for 1925-26.

The reply to part (c) of the question is in the negative.

*Statement showing the information asked for in parts (a) and (b) of the above question.*

	Year.	Income.		Expenditure.	
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
(a)	Prior to the increase made from 24th April 1922.	{ 1920-21 .	5,35,68,686		5,88,06,049
		{ 1921-22 .	5,82,74,673		6,41,27,154
	Since the increase made from 24th April 1922.	{ 1922-23 .	6,56,61,076		6,30,87,237
		{ 1923-24 .	6,78,54,237		6,55,16,139
(b)	Year.	Letters.		Postcards.	
Prior to increase . . . . .	{ 1920-21 .		612,213,587		630,401,432
		{ 1921-22 .	618,921,337		618,470,932
Since the increase . . . . .	{ 1922-23 .		512,851,067		523,623,419
		{ 1923-24 .	519,939,442		531,906,206

## REVENUE FROM CUSTOMS EXPORT DUTY ON JUTE.

222. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state what is the amount realised from the customs export duty imposed on Jute manufactured and unmanufactured during the last three years as far as figures are available?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** The Honourable Member is referred to the monthly Accounts relating to the Sea-borne Trade and Navigation of British India which are available in the Library.

## ABANDONMENT OF THE ANDAMANS AS A PENAL SETTLEMENT.

223. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state when do they propose to abandon the Andamans as a penal settlement and whether alternative accommodation had been constructed in India to accommodate all those who had been and who will be sentenced to transportation?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** It is impossible to fix any date from which the Andamans will cease to be a penal settlement. The process of transformation is in progress. The transportation of convicts has been practically closed. The number of the convicts in the Settlement on the 31st March, 1919, was 12,471, and the number on the 1st November, 1924, 8,297. Of this number 2,564 men and 215 women were self-supporters, i.e., agriculturists, shopkeepers, village functionaries or menials (and also convicts in private service). They are for all practical purposes free. Of the remaining 5,518 there were (a) 1,288 "Government self-supporters", i.e., men and women working in the different departments on a cash wage and freed from many restrictions, and (b) 4,230 labouring convicts. Men belonging to the latter class are still grouped in labour battalions and are rationed, clothed and housed by Government. The majority of them have fixed duties to do under the different departments. The rest are classed as "disposable labour" and employed on whatever task is most urgent from day to day.

The construction of alternative prison accommodation in Indian jails is a matter primarily for Local Governments, but the necessity for proceeding with it as quickly as possible has more than once been urged on them.

**Mr. W. S. J. Willson:** Is there any other penal settlement where prisoners can be practically free?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** Not in India, as far as I am aware.

## EXPENDITURE ON THE POLICE.

224. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state the gross expenditure on the Indian Police for the two years 1922-23 and 1923-24 as compared with 12½ crores in 1920-21 and 18½ crores in 1921-22 and whether this expenditure was taken into account when considering the expenditure for defence as it was stated by the Government when the Police Department was organised in India that it would materially diminish the military expenditure?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** The gross expenditure on the Indian Police Force in the years 1922-23 and 1923-24 amounted approximately to 18.4 and 18.1 crores. I am not aware of the statement referred

to by the Honourable Member as having been made by Government, but I feel that I am perfectly safe in replying that police expenditure was not taken into consideration when the expenditure on defence in the years 1922 to 1924 was determined.

**INCREASE OF CONTRIBUTION TO THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE FAMILY PENSION SCHEME.**

225. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state in view of the statement of Earl Winterton that the Government contribution to the Indian Civil Service Family Pension Scheme was increased by 25 per cent. from January, 1920, subject to reconsideration after 31st December, 1923, whether any subsequent increase was made and if so, at what rate and what was the amount of additional charge on that account?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** The 25 per cent. temporary increase of pensions from the Indian Civil Service Family Pension Scheme granted in 1920 was sanctioned by the Secretary of State subject to reconsideration after the 31st December, 1924, not 31st December, 1923.

The question of a further increase is under consideration in connection with the India Office Actuary's valuation report on the scheme as at 31st March, 1923, and meanwhile the Secretary of State has sanctioned the continuance of the 25 per cent. temporary increase for a further period of six months, that is to say up to 30th June, 1925. Any increase in the benefits from the scheme, whether permanent or temporary, that may be made as a result of the Actuary's valuation will be met entirely from the balances of the Scheme and will not involve any charge on Government.

**MANUFACTURE OF OPIUM IN INDIA.**

226. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state the number of chests of opium manufactured in India in the opium year ending 31st October 1922-23 and 1923-24 as far as figures are available and how many chests were for export and how many for consumption in India and the area under poppy cultivation during the said period as compared with 5,800 chests for export 6,724 chests for internal consumption and the area 116,500 acres under poppy cultivation in the year ending 31st October, 1924.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** A statement giving the desired information is laid on the table.

*Statement showing the area under poppy cultivation and the number of chests of provision and Excise opium manufactured during the opium years 1922-23 and 1923-24.*

	Area under poppy cultivation (Excluding failures).	NO. OF CHESTS MANUFACTURED.	
		Provision opium.	Excise opium.
1922-23	2,25,220 Bighas	8,025	5,516
1923-24	2,13,629 „	9,000	5,490

NOTE—The standard Bigha is  $\frac{1}{16}$ ths of an acre.

## LEGISLATION FOR THE REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADE UNIONS.

227. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to state when the Government of India propose to bring in a measure relating to the registration and protection of trade unions and whether the Local Governments expressed their views on the proposed measure and whether they would be circulated to the Members of the Assembly at an early date?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra**: The Bill has already been introduced in this House. Government intend to circulate the replies received from Local Governments to Members of the Assembly.

## STATISTICS RELATING TO COTTON PRODUCTION, ETC.

228. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to state how many bales of cotton were grown in India in the years 1922-23 and 1923-24 as compared with 36 lakhs grown in 1920-21 and 44 lakhs 64 thousand grown in 1921-22 and whether there are any statistics to show what quantity was utilised in India and how much was exported out of India during these years?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore**: A statement giving the information desired by the Honourable Member is placed on the table.

*Statement showing the production, export and consumption of raw cotton during the years 1922-23 and 1923-24.*

(Figures are in bales of lbs. 400 each.)

Years.	Production estimated.	Exports (by sea and land).	Balance left for use in India.
1922-23 . . . . .	50,75,000	33,68,360	17,06,640
1923-24 . . . . .	50,75,000	37,62,936	13,12,064

## TOTAL PUBLIC TAXATION.

229. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to state the total public taxation of India for the year 1923-24 Imperial, Provincial and local without excluding the working expenses of railways, irrigation, postal and telegraphs and whether it would be accurate to say that the total would amount to about 300 crores, about 190 crores Imperial, 90 crores Provincial and 20 crores local and if not, what is the correct figure?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett**: From the reference to the inclusion of working expenses of commercial undertakings owned by the State, I gather that the Honourable Member wants the figures of aggregate gross public revenues, which obviously is quite different from the gross public taxation. The total gross revenues are as follows:

Central Government (excluding provincial contributions) . . . . .	188 crores.
Provincial Governments . . . . .	88 "
Local bodies (including Government grants) . . . . .	24 "



The two former include receipts from such sources as land revenue which is not strictly speaking a tax, gross receipts from State-owned commercial undertakings, sale proceeds of public property, profits of note circulation, interest on loans, etc. As regards tax revenue the latest available figures of actual receipts are those for 1922-23 in the case of the Central and Provincial Governments and for 1921-22 in the case of local bodies. The Central, Provincial and local taxation amounted in these years to 67, 31 and 13 crores respectively excluding land revenue and 67, 66 and 13 crores respectively including it.

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** May I ask, Sir, whether the Finance Member is aware that the East India Company and Lord Salisbury as Secretary of State for India wanted this Government to treat land revenue always as a tax?

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member should treat the Finance Member as a Finance Member, not as a historian.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** I should have liked to have given the Honourable Member the historical information.

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is quite at liberty to do so.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** But I should have had to have looked it up.

#### REDUCTION OF UNPRODUCTIVE DEBT.

230. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether the Government have in contemplation any scheme for the gradual reduction of unproductive debt which amounts to more than 200 crores and if so, whether it would be published at an early date, and whether sinking funds created would afford any adequate provision for rapid reduction of unproductive debt or whether it is the policy of the Government to keep the unproductive debt on a high level so as to distribute the war burdens on future generation as well?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the Finance Department Resolution No. F.-13-II-F., dated the 9th December, 1924, which has appeared in Part I of the Gazette of India of the 13th *idem*.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO PERIODICALS BY EUROPEAN MEMBERS OF THE SERVICES.

231. **\*Mr. T. C. Goswami:** (a) Do Government employ their various means of securing information to find out when and which European members of the Services contribute to periodicals in and outside India and are engaged anonymously in literary or journalistic propaganda on behalf of the European Association, the Indo-British Association or other Associations?

(b) If so, have Government ever punished any such offending official? If not, are Government prepared to consider specific cases brought to their notice with *prima facie* evidence?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** The relations of Government servants with the Press are regulated by Rules 17 to 20 and 24 of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules, which are duly enforced. They do not, as the Honourable Member appears to suppose, prohibit anonymous

contributions to the Press which are not in themselves contrary to the public interest or inconsistent in other respects with the duties of a Government servant.

#### INDIAN TRADES CENTRE IN LONDON.

232. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraph published in the issue of the *Englishman* of 1st December, 1924, page 7, under the heading "Indian Trades Centre in London"?

(b) If so, will they please state if they are prepared to consider the advisability of discussing with the Provincial Governments the possibilities of such an enterprise in the interest of Indian trade and its development as suggested?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: (a) Yes.

With your permission, Sir, I will answer part (b) of question No. 232 and question No. 242 together.

The Government have not as yet taken the proposal into consideration.

#### PROTECTION OF WORKMEN AGAINST FINES.

233. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: Will Government please state:

(a) if Truck Acts have been in force in England since 1831?

(b) if there is any legislation in India to protect the workmen against the arbitrary power of inflicting fines vested in the hands of the employers?

(c) If not, whether Government intend introducing any such legislation?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra**: The answer to part (a) of the question is in the affirmative and to parts (b) and (c) in the negative.

#### INDIAN EMIGRATION AND LABOUR CONDITIONS IN MAURITIUS.

234. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraph, published in the issue of the *Statesman* of the 2nd December 1924, page 12, under the heading "Indian Emigration" "Labour conditions in Mauritius"?

(b) If so, will they please state if the facts stated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the paragraph are correct?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore**: (a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b) Yes: the communication published in the *Statesman* is a copy of the Press Communiqué issued by the Government of India.

#### CONTRACT FOR WAGONS FOR THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

235. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: Will the Government please state:

(a) if it is a fact that Messrs Cammell, Laird, and Co., have received for their wagon-building works at Nottingham a contract to supply 775 four-wheeled all steel open goods wagons for the East Indian Railway Company?

- (b) if it is also a fact that the contract was obtained against keen foreign competition?  
 (c) whether any Indian firm competed?  
 (d) the number and names of the firms that competed?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) Yes.

(b) Government have no information, but they can assure the Honourable Member, that no tender for stores can be accepted by the Boards of Company lines without the prior approval of the Government Director, who is in a position to ensure, and does ensure, that all contracts are placed in the most favourable markets having regard to price, quality, conditions of delivery, and other relevant considerations.

(c) and (d). Government have no information, but these 775 wagons were the balance of 1,320 required, and were ordered abroad, after orders had been placed in India up to the full capacity of the wagon building firms in this country.

#### SALE OF COUNCIL BILLS.

286. **\*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraph published in the issue of the *Statesman* of the 5th December, 1924, page 5, under the heading "Sale of Council Bills"?

(b) If so, will they please state if the facts and figures quoted therein are correct?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** (a) and (b). The reply to both parts of the question is in the affirmative.

#### INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

287. **\*Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraph published in the issue of the *Statesman* of the 5th December, 1924, page 7, under the heading "Indians in South Africa" "Mr. J. H. Thomson Proposes a Conference"?

(b) If so, will Government please state if the facts stated in the paragraph are correct?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** (a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b) Mr. Thomas made such a suggestion in a speech which he delivered at a Civic Reception at Pietermaritzburg. The Government of India have no other information on the subject.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** With regard to the position of Indians in South Africa, will Government be pleased to give us an early date for the discussion of the subject?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** That question does not, I submit, arise.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** May I know if it is in the province of any Government Member to say whether a certain question does or does not arise?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** I made a submission to the Honourable the President.

**Mr. President:** What Mr. Bhore intended was that he required notice.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** Are Government aware of the attitude taken up by the Government of South Africa regarding the suggestion made by Mr. Thomas?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** No, Sir.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** Do not Government think it necessary to find out for themselves what attitude the Government of South Africa and the Colonial Office have taken in this matter?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** I think the Honourable Member was present on the opening day of this Assembly when His Excellency the Viceroy made reference in his speech to South Africa. I think His Excellency pointed out that the question of South Africa was under correspondence and was being actively pursued. In these circumstances, I can add nothing more and trust that the Honourable Member will not press me for any further information in the matter.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Will the Honourable the Home Member kindly say if he will afford facilities for the discussion of the subject?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** What is the subject?

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** The position of Indians in South Africa.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** I am afraid I must have notice of that.

#### MEDICAL OFFICERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

238. **\*Mr. C. S. Rang Iyer:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state how many wholetime medical officers drawing above Rs. 500, were employed in the E. I. Railway before its amalgamation with the O. & R. Railway?

(b) Will the Government be further pleased to state how many of the said officers are of pure Asiatic descent?

(c) Under the amalgamation, how many medical officers drawing Rs. 500 or above, of pure Asiatic descent, are to be employed?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** (a) The amalgamation of the East Indian Railway with the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway has not yet been effected. There are, however, 12 wholetime medical officers on the East Indian Railway drawing above Rs. 500.

(b) So far as Government are aware two are of Asiatic descent.

(c) No statement can be made as regards the future except that it is proposed to retain the services of those already in East Indian Railway employ.

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIANS AS SECRETARIES TO COMMITTEES.

239. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Indian was appointed as Secretary to any Committee appointed by the Government of India since the inauguration of the Reforms and, if so, to what Committee and why an Indian was not appointed to other Committees?

- (b) whether the Government are prepared to declare the policy of appointing an Indian generally to any Committee that may be appointed hereafter?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman:** (a) and (b). An Indian was appointed as Secretary to the following Committees:

- (1) The Calcutta and Bombay Committees on Government Securities.
- (2) The Tariff Board.
- (3) The Civil Justice Committee.
- (4) The Indian Law Reports Committee.

Information regarding Committees appointed in connection with subjects dealt with by one Department is not complete but additions, if any, to the above list will be communicated to the Honourable Member in due course.

In the case of all Committees the most suitable person available, whether Indian or European, is selected to act as Secretary and the Government do not consider it necessary or desirable to depart from this principle.

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIAN CONSULS.

240. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any Indian was appointed in any Consular service and if not will Indian Consuls be appointed in all countries wherein India has important trade relations?
- (b) has the attention of the Government been drawn to the fact that want of a proper Indian Consul either in Sydney or Melbourne is causing difficulties in furthering the trade relations between India and Australia and New Zealand?

**Mr. Denys Bray:** (a) The Honourable Member is, I think, under a misapprehension. Consuls are of course only appointed to foreign countries, and an Indian Consul at Sydney or Melbourne would be as much a contradiction in terms as an English Consul in Bombay or Calcutta. The Honourable Member is presumably referring to Trade Commissioners. A Trade Commissioner is stationed in London and he had an Indian Assistant until he had to be retrenched. No other Trade Commissioners have so far been appointed and it is not contemplated to extend the service at present.

(b) No, Sir.

#### REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

241. **\*Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether the labours of the Reforms Inquiry Committee are finished and whether the report is ready and whether the Assembly will be given the chance of expressing its view before the Government make up their minds what to do in the matter?

#### REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

325. **\*Maulvi Muhammad Yakub:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House the opinions of the Provincial Governments and Governors received by the Reforms Inquiry Committee?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state if the Legislative Assembly will have an opportunity to discuss the Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee before the Government of India's recommendations on the said Report are communicated to the Secretary of State for India?

## REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

397. \***Sir Hari Singh Gour**: (a) Will the Government be pleased to publish to the Members the Report of the Indian Reforms Inquiry Committee presided over by the Home Member?

(b) Do Government propose to give the Members of this House an opportunity to discuss it?

## REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

431. \***Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao**: Will the Government be pleased to state when and whether the Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee will be published and the approximate date on which the Government will afford facilities for the discussion of the Report in this House?

## REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE.

516. \***Mr. T. C. Goswami**: When will the Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee be published and submitted to the Assembly for discussion?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman**: I propose, Sir, with your permission, to reply to questions Nos. 241, 325, 397, 431 and 516 together. The Committee finished its labours on the 3rd December and the Report has been received by Government. It is hoped to publish it within a few weeks and before final orders are passed the Indian Legislature will have an opportunity of discussing the recommendations of the Committee.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar**: May I know, Sir, whether an opportunity will be given to this House to discuss the recommendations of the Committee in this session?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman**: I am not prepared to give any undertaking on that point.

## INDIAN TRADE CENTRE IN LONDON.

\*242. †**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to state whether the Government of India propose to establish a properly equipped permanent trade centre in London and, if so, whether an Indian would be in charge of it?

## AMENDMENTS IN THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL RULES.

243. \***Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju**: Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Provincial Councils were consulted regarding the changes introduced after Rule 20 of the Legislative Council Rules of every province?

(b) whether the Government considered the effect of a Recommended Bill in the sphere of Transferred subjects and the spirit of Reforms and the modicum of responsibility granted to the Legislatures being negatived virtually?

(c) what was the urgency of making these amendments in the Rules?

**Mr. L. Graham:** (a) No.

(b) The Honourable Member's apprehensions are unfounded. New rules 20B and 20C regulate the procedure where the Governor has used the power of recommendation conferred on him by section 72E. As that power extends only to Bills relating to a reserved subject, it follows that the rules also apply only to Bills relating to a reserved subject.

(c) The question of framing rules for the provincial Legislatures was taken up in the ordinary course of business after the corresponding rules under section 67 had been made. The Honourable Member will remember that those rules which relate to the procedure in the Indian Legislature on recommended and certified Bills were published in the Gazette of India on the 18th March, 1924.

PROVISION OF QUARTERS FOR INDIAN GUARDS OF THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY IN CALCUTTA.

244. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that Indian guards stationed in Calcutta have not yet been provided with quarters? If the answer be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state when the Calcutta Indian guards are going to be accommodated in railway quarters?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The question of the provision of quarters at Sealdah for E. B. Railway employees is a large one and presents difficulty as suitable sites are not easy to find in the vicinity of railway premises and land is costly. The difficulty of providing quarters is not confined to the case of Indian guards only; there is a large number of other classes of staff whose duties require them to live close to their work and for whom quarters have not yet been provided. The question is under the active consideration of the E. B. Railway authorities.

REMOVAL OF THE OFFICE OF THE GOODS SUPERINTENDENT AT SEALDAH TO A SAFE SITE.

245. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that the Goods Superintendent at Sealdah has recently shifted his office to a new building which is so situated as to cause danger to clerks and officers under him who have to cross the line frequently during shunting operations in the discharge of their duties? If so, do the Government propose to take suitable action so that the office of the Goods Superintendent be removed to a safe position?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** The goods shed office was formerly located in the goods shed and was under the control of the Assistant Traffic Superintendent, Sealdah, whose office was in the goods shed. This post has been abolished and the work has been placed under the District Traffic Superintendent, Southern, whose office is in the General Office Buildings to the north of Sealdah main station. The Supervisor's office has not been shifted. Government are informed that there are proper roads and an overbridge heading from the goods shed to the District Traffic Superintendent's

office and that no trespassing over railway lines is necessary in passing from one to the other building for the discharge of official duties. In these circumstances Government do not propose to take any action in the matter.

DISCHARGE BY THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY OF EMPLOYEES FOR ALLEGED MALINGERING.

246. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that the E. B. Railway authorities have discharged men from service on the plea of malingering even when the period of sickness was duly supported by certificates of qualified railway doctors? If the answer be in the negative, will the Government be pleased to inquire if any such cases are pending with the E. B. Railway authorities?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** The answer to both parts of the question is in the negative.

QUARTERS FOR THE STATION STAFF AND RUNNING STAFF, LALMONIRHAT, EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

247. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that the E. B. Railway authorities have constructed quarters for accommodating clerks of the new District Loco. Superintendent's Office, Lalmonirhat, although the station staff and running staff of the Locomotive Department, Lalmonirhat, have been suffering for want of quarters for a long time? If the answer be in the affirmative, are the Government prepared to allocate those quarters to such as have a prior or better claim?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** Quarters were built for 12 clerks and 5 workmen of the District Loco. Superintendent's office in 1923-24.

10 units mistry and artisan type and 20 units workmen type quarters were also provided in the same year for the station staff and running staff of the Loco. Department.

The re-allotment suggested by the Honourable Member is not practicable, but the whole question of providing staff quarters is, as I have said, under investigation by the E. B. Railway authorities.

GRANT OF CALCUTTA LOCAL ALLOWANCE TO ALL EMPLOYEES OF THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY SERVING IN CALCUTTA.

248. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that only the officers and ministerial of the E. B. Railway in Calcutta are allowed Calcutta local allowance? If so, will the Government be pleased to state why this privilege is denied to other railway staff serving in Calcutta?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** No. Officers are not allowed Calcutta Local Allowance. Ministerial staff who are engaged in office work in Calcutta are granted a special local allowance of 10 per cent. in addition to the rate of pay in the mofussil. Of other staff in Calcutta who are not granted the allowance certain classes are given free quarters or house allowance.

The question of the grant of a local allowance to other classes of staff will depend on the result of the investigation now being made into the whole question of provision of quarters.



PROMOTION OF INDIAN GUARDS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

249. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that the E. B. Railway authorities have appointed Anglo-Indian guards on the maximum pay of Class "A" ignoring the claims of Indian guards who are in service and are eligible for promotion to Guards List? If it is a fact, do the Government propose to take suitable action?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** No such appointments have been made to permanent vacancies. The temporary vacancies arising in the busy season are, however, filled as far as conditions permit by temporary promotions of permanent qualified staff, Indian and European, supplemented when necessary by temporary appointments of qualified applicants.

ALLEGED BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

250. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that complaints of bribery and extortion have been brought to light against certain clerks of a District Officer of the E. B. Railway, in charge of the establishment section? If the answer be in the affirmative, what do Government propose to do?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** The Honourable Member has not specified any particular District Office, but if he refers to an alleged case which occurred at Katihar and which formed the subject of question No. 1801 by Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan in the Legislative Assembly on the 11th September, 1924, his attention is directed to part (b) of the reply given.

INDIAN GUARDS ON THE EASTERN BENGAL RAILWAY.

251. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Are the Government aware that Indian guards employed in the E. B. Railway have very often to work "under rest" and in consequence they fall sick very frequently?

(b) Are the Government aware that during the last two years six guards died, two became invalid and many lost their health in the Lalmonirhat District of the E. B. Railway for working "under rest" and in bad climates? If the answer be in the negative, will the Government be pleased to inquire if any temporary hands are still working in the Lalmonirhat District and for what period?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) No. From information received from the Administration it appears there is no ground for the statements made.

(b) No. Four guards have died and one was invalided during 1923 and 1924. These were normal casualties and were not due to any special cause such as mentioned. There are no temporary hands at present employed in these District guards.

EMPLOYMENT OF ANGLO-INDIAN GUARDS AS SUPERVISING ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS OF SPECIAL CLASS STATIONS.

252. **\*Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Are the Government aware that Anglo-Indian and European guards are employed to officiate as supervising assistant station masters of Special Class stations superseding the claims of "Indoor" Indian station masters of the stations who have more experience than the guards? If the answer be in the affirmative, are the Government prepared to put a stop to this practice as early as possible?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** The Honourable Member does not mention which particular Railway he refers to, but speaking generally appointments of the nature referred to are necessarily made at the discretion of the local railway authorities in accordance with the qualifications of the staff concerned. The Honourable Member is referred in this connection to the reply given to Mr. Joshi to a somewhat similar question on the 17th September, 1924.

CONSTITUTION OF THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY LOCAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

253. **\*Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the constitution of the Advisory Board of the South Indian Railway;
- (b) whether all members thereto are elected; and if so, by what bodies and under what conditions;
- (c) whether the Government intend to urge upon the S. I. Railway to elect a representative of their own as in the case of the Advisory Board of the M. and S. M. Railway;
- (d) whether there is now any member on the Advisory Board who is supposed to represent the interests of the Third Class Passengers;
- (e) whether the Government intend to urge upon the S. I. Railway administration the desirability of allowing the Railway Passengers' Associations to elect a representative to sit on the Advisory Board of the Railway?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). For information regarding the constitution of the South Indian Railway Local Advisory Committee and the members thereof the Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in this Assembly on the 2nd June, 1924, to Mr. N. C. Kelkar's question No. 1192.

(c) and (d). There is a member of the Committee, who was selected by the Agent from the names submitted to him by the various local Passengers' Associations.

(e) In view of the reply given to (c) and (d), no action on the part of Government appears necessary.

THE VILLUPURAM TRICHINOPOLY RAILWAY.

254. **\*Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Madras Chamber of Commerce has submitted a memorandum to the Railway Board to the effect that the construction of the chord line should run from Cuddalore to Trichinopoly and not from Villupuram, as proposed by the S. I. Railway;
- (b) whether the Madras Chamber of Commerce made this proposal for the reason that as a result of the chord line running from Villupuram, the Port of Cuddalore would suffer to the advantage of Pondicherry, a French port;
- (c) whether the Government have received any representation from the Government of Madras on this matter and if so, to what effect;

(d) whether the Government have consulted important commercial communities and public bodies in South Arcot District as to the effect of the proposed chord line on the trade of the Port of Cuddalore and if so who were the persons or trading companies and public bodies so consulted;

(e) what has been finally decided by the Government with regard to this matter?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) Yes. The Government of Madras shared the views of the Madras Chamber of Commerce and suggested, as a remedial measure, the construction of a branch line from Vriddhachalam to Cuddalore simultaneously with the construction of the Villupuram Trichinopoly Chord Railway.

(d) No, but copies of resolutions passed by the Landing and Shipping Fees Committee, Cuddalore, the Municipal Council, Cuddalore, and the District Board, South Arcot, embodying their views on the matter, have been received through the Madras Government.

(e) It is proposed to have the Vriddhachalam Cuddalore connection built along with the Villupuram Trichinopoly Railway.

DOUBLING OF THE RAILWAY LINE BETWEEN MADRAS BEACH AND  
TAMBARAM.

255. **\*Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) in what stage the proposal to double the line between Madras Beach and Tambaram by the S. I. Railway, now is;

(b) when the construction of the second line will be taken up by the S. I. Railway;

(c) and by what time the S. I. Railway hope to complete the construction of the second line;

(d) whether the Government intend to urge upon the S. I. Railway administration to take up this work of construction immediately?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) to (d). Proposals and estimates are under preparation for the provision in certain stages of increased facilities in the Madras suburban Area including additional lines and electrification. The doubling and trebling of the line between Madras Beach and Madras Egmore, and Madras Egmore and Tambaram respectively, forms Stage I of the whole scheme and is programmed to be completed in 4½ years from the time the scheme is sanctioned by the Secretary of State, but until the estimates have been prepared and considered it is not possible to state definitely when the work on the project will be started.

CONVERSION INTO BROAD GAUGE OF THE RAILWAY LINE FROM  
SHORANUR TO ERNAKULAM.

256. **\*Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether, on account of certain modifications to be made in the Cochin Harbour scheme, the original scheme of Mr. Izaat to convert the line from Shoranur to Ernakulam into a broad gauge is likely to materialize in the near future;

(b) and if there is to be any delay, will the Government be pleased to state, for how long and for what reasons?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). The survey for the conversion has recently been sanctioned, and the Agent of the South Indian Railway has been asked for a full report on the financial aspects of the conversion. The final decision will depend on the result of these investigations.

**MINIMUM COLLECTION OF EXCESS FARES BY TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY.**

257. **\*Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the S. I. Railway has recently appointed 40 Ticket Examiners and that the Company insists that every one of them should collect not less than Rs. 300 per month by way of excess fare and freight from passengers;
- (b) whether it is a fact that Ticket Examiners at different Railway stations on the South Indian Railway have been asked to collect as excess fare a sum not less than their monthly salary, on pain of their services being dispensed with;
- (c) whether the Government are aware that the action of the Railway Company insisting on a certain minimum collection of excess fare causes no little annoyance to passengers by the Ticket Examiners;
- (d) do the Government propose to draw the attention of the Railway Company to this matter?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). Appointments of additional Travelling Ticket Examiners have recently been made by the South Indian Railway, but the Agent states that it is not a fact that any such stipulations as referred to in these questions have been made.

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

**REDUCTION OF FIRST AND SECOND CLASS FARES ON THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY.**

258. **\*Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) in view of the fact that several Railway Companies have recently reduced their first and second class passenger fares, why the South Indian Railway Company has not yet effected any reduction in their passenger fares;
- (b) are the Government prepared to urge on the S. I. Railway Administration the necessity in the interests of the travelling public, of effecting such reductions in their passenger fares?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** The Government understand that the possibility of making a reduction in first and second class fares is now under the consideration of the South Indian Railway Company.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:** May I know, Sir, whether the Government are aware that the conveniences and comforts on the second and first class of the South Indian Railway are perhaps at the minimum compared to all other railways in India?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** Government are aware that this line is very much congested. But I have already explained in reply to a previous question that we have urged the Agent to expedite the estimates for providing farther facilities.

REVISED ESTIMATES OF RAILWAY RECEIPTS.

259. \***Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:
- what the revised estimates of railway receipts are for the year 1924-25;
  - what the amount of increase or decrease in railway receipts on each railway is;
  - and whether, in case of there being any surplus in receipts on any railway, the Government propose to consider the desirability of reducing the fares of third class passengers?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** I am afraid the Honourable Member must wait for this information until the railway estimates are presented to the House.

REDUCTION OF THIRD CLASS FARES ON THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY.

260. \***Mr. M. K. Acharya:** Will the Government be pleased to state:
- what the rates of third class fares on the G. I. P., B., B. and C. I., E. I., M. and S. M. and S. I. Railways are;
  - whether the Government are aware of the fact that the third class fares on the S. I. Railway are higher than the fares for the same class in any of the other above-mentioned railways; and
  - whether the Government are prepared in view of the great hardship caused to the third class passengers on the S. I. Railway by reason of the high fares, to urge on the S. I. Railway Company the necessity of bringing down their third class fares to the level of the other railway companies?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the table. From this it will be seen that third class fares on the South Indian Railway are not in all cases higher than those in force on the other railways mentioned.

(c) Government understand that the possibility of making a reduction in fares is now under the consideration of the Company.

Statement showing present third class fares on the above-mentioned railways.

Railways.	Mail.		Ordinary.	
		Per mile pies.		Per mile pies.
Great Indian Peninsula	Up to 300 miles	5	Up to 300 miles	4
	Plus for extra distance.	4½	Plus for extra distance.	3½
Bombay, Baroda and Central India.	Up to 300 miles	4	Up to 300 miles	3½
	Plus for extra distance.	3½	Plus for extra distance.	3
East Indian	Up to 300 miles	5	} Any distance	3½
	Plus for extra distance.	4½		
Madras and Southern Mahratta.	Any distance	4	} Up to 100 miles	3½
South Indian	Any distance	5	Any distance	3½

THIRD CLASS FARES ON THE SOUTH INDIAN AND MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAYS FOR CERTAIN SPECIFIED YEARS.

261. \*Mr. M. K. Acharya: Will the Government be pleased to state what the fares for the third class were on the South Indian and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways during the years

- (i) 1900-1901.
- (ii) 1910-1911.
- (iii) 1920-1921.
- (iv) 1924-1925.

Mr. G. G. Sim: Statements giving the information asked for are placed on the table.

MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.

Third Class Fares.

Year.	Gauges.	PIES PER MILE.		Distance.
		By Mail Train.	By ordinary train.	
1900-1901 . . .	5' 6" Metre 2' 6"*	2½	2½ to 2	Any.
		3 to 2	3 to 2	...
1910-1911 . . .	5' 6" Metre	2½	2½ to 2	Any.
		2½	2½ to 2	Any.
1st April, 1920 to 31st July, 1920.	5' 6" Metre	3	2½	Any.
		3	2½	Any.
1st August, 1920 to 31st March, 1921.	5' 6" Metre	3½	3	Any.
		3½	3 to 2½	Any.
1924-1925 . . .	5' 6" Metre	4	...	Any.
		...	3½	First 100 miles.
		...	3	Additional distance.
		4	...	Any.
		...	3½	First 100 miles.
		...	3	Additional distance.

\* Since transferred to South Indian Railway System.

SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY (NILGIRI RAILWAY EXCEPTED).

Third Class Fares.

Year.	Gauges.	PIES PER MILE.		Distance.
		By mail train.	By ordinary train.	
1st April, 1900 to 31st October, 1900 to 1st November, 1900 to 31st March, 1901.	All	2	2	Any.
	All	2½ (Boat mail).	2	Any.
1910-11	5' 6" Metre	2½ to 2	2	Any.
		2½	...	First 50 miles.
		2½ to 2	...	Additional distance.
	2' 6"	...	2 to 2½	Any.
1920-1921	5' 6"	3	2½	Any.
	Metre	3	2½	Any.
	2' 6"	...	2½	...
1924-25	5' 6"	5	3½	Any.
	Metre	5	3½	Any.
	2' 6"	...	3½	...

CLOSING BY THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY OF THE LEVEL CROSSING GATE ON THE POLICE COMMISSIONER'S ROAD IN MADRAS.

262. \*Mr. M. K. Acharya: Will the Government be pleased to state :

- (a) whether they are aware of the fact that one S. I. Railway Company have recently closed the level-crossing gate on the Police Commissioner's Road in the City of Madras, after the construction of an overbridge at the said place;
- (b) whether the Government are aware of the fact that as a result of the closing of the level-crossing gate, the public at large and specially pedestrians, rickshaw-wallas, coolies carrying heavy loads and men who pull carts loaded with goods are put to very great hardship and suffering, by reason of their having now to get up a steep overbridge;
- (c) whether the Government will be pleased to state what the objections of the said railway are to keep the gate open;
- (d) whether the Government are aware of the fact that the Municipal Corporation of Madras have unanimously passed a resolution protesting against the action of the Railway Company in having closed the level-crossing gate and demanding the re-opening of the said gate;
- (e) whether in view of the great hardship and inconvenience which the public in the locality are put to, the Government are prepared to urge on the Railway Company the immediate necessity of keeping the said level-crossing gate open, as before?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Inquiries made on the subject show that it was at the instance of the Corporation of Madras and to put an end to the inconvenience which it was said was experienced by pedestrians and others of having to wait at the crossing during train times that the overbridge was provided. The proposal, the design and the construction of the overbridge were approved by the Corporation as well as by the Government of Madras.

One of the conditions concerning the construction of the overbridge was that this was to be in substitution of and not in addition to, the level-crossing and this was accepted by the Corporation.

The Railway Administration object to the level-crossing being kept open in addition to the overbridge on the ground that besides the cost involved in maintaining both it would seriously affect the development of a fast and frequent suburban service.

(d) No.

(e) In the circumstances stated, Government do not propose to take any action.

#### TOTAL DEBT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

263. **\*Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** Will Government be pleased to place on the table a statement showing the total debt of the Government of India as on 31st March, 1924, or such other date as may be available, both in sterling and in rupees, specifying:

(a) The country in which it is held,

(b) The Provinces in India in which the same is held with respective amounts, giving corresponding figures for the year 1913-14,

(c) The different forms in which the debt is contracted?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blckett:** A statement giving the information required so far as it is available has been laid on the table. The figures for the 31st March, 1923, have been given in lieu of those for the 31st March, 1924, as final figures for the latter date are not yet available.

The total includes the debt incurred on behalf of Provincial Governments and treasury bills issued to the Paper Currency Reserve.

*Statement showing the debt of India outstanding on the 31st March, 1914 and 1923.*

	31st March 1914.	31st March, 1923.
	Rs.	Rs.
Ruper debt in India ( <i>vide</i> Detailed Statement I below)	1,45,68,55,700	4,11,07,10,245
Sterling debt in England (at £1 = Rs. 15) ( <i>vide</i> Detailed Statement II below).	2,65,59,71,855	3,34,88,53,235
Unpaid balance of India's war contribution (at £1 = Rs. 15).	...	29,56,19,220
Unfunded debt ( <i>vide</i> Detailed Statement III below)	34,09,97,811	62,56,45,288
Capital value of liabilities undergoing redemption by way of terminable Railway annuities (at £1 = Rs. 15).	1,05,90,13,395	91,96,87,890
	5,51,28,38,351	9,29,55,15,878



Statement showing the debt of India outstanding on the 31st March 1914 and 1923—contd.

	31st March, 1914.	31st March, 1923.
	Rs.	Rs.
<b>DETAILED STATEMENT I.</b>		
<b>RUPRE DEBT IN INDIA.</b>		
<i>Loans bearing interest.</i>		
<b>Permanent Debt—</b>		
6 per cent. Bonds, 1932 . . . . .	...	19,49,00,000
6 " " 1931 . . . . .	...	11,30,75,300
6 " " 1930 . . . . .	...	29,28,26,200
6 " " 1927 . . . . .	...	27,88,19,300
6 " " 1926 . . . . .	...	37,89,75,900
5½ " War Bonds, 1928 . . . . .	...	25,48,32,900
5½ " " 1925 . . . . .	...	3,71,00,500
5½ " " 1923 . . . . .	...	1,57,57,925
5 " Loan, 1945-55 . . . . .	...	18,49,04,200
5 " War Loan, 1929-47 . . . . .	...	22,07,96,675
4½ " Loan for Indore State Railway . . . . .	1,00,00,000	1,00,00,000
4 " Loan from Maharaja Scindhia for State Railway . . . . .	1,50,00,000	1,50,00,000
4 " Railway Loan from Nawab of Rampur . . . . .	47,00,000	47,00,000
4 " Gwalior Loan of 1887 . . . . .	1,22,00,000	14,00,000
4 " Terminable Loan of 1915-16 . . . . .	...	2,80,18,700
4 " Conversion Loan of 1916-17 . . . . .	...	9,90,01,200
3½ " Loans . . . . .	1,38,09,99,400	1,19,23,18,257
3 " Loan . . . . .	8,23,18,000	6,43,56,250
Total Permanent Debt . . . . .	1,45,52,17,400	3,79,15,78,107
<b>Floating Debt—</b>		
Treasury Bills issued to—		
	Rs.	Rs.
(i) Public . . . . .	...	21,58,90,000
(ii) Paper Currency Reserve . . . . .	...	49,65,60,000
	...	71,23,90,000
Total Debt in India bearing interest . . . . .	1,45,52,17,400	4,10,59,68,107
<i>Loans not bearing interest.</i>		
5½ per cent. Expired Loans . . . . .	...	67,28,850
Other Expired Loans . . . . .	16,38,390	13,288
	16,38,390	67,42,138
Total Debt in India . . . . .	1,45,88,55,790	4,11,07,10,245

Statement showing the debt of India outstanding on the 31st March, 1914 and 1923—contd.

	31st March, 1914.	31st March, 1923.
	Rs.	Rs.
<b>DETAILED STATEMENT II.</b>		
<b>STERLING DEBT IN ENGLAND.</b>		
<i>Loans bearing interest.</i>		
Permanent Debt—		
India 7 per cent. Stock . . . . .		4,004,474
" 5½ " " . . . . .		22,192,206
" 4½ " " . . . . .		20,000,000
" 3½ " " . . . . .	91,211,186	88,974,598
" 3 " " . . . . .	66,212,384	71,301,524
" 2½ " " . . . . .	11,806,337	11,539,986
India Bonds . . . . .	2,500,000	...
E. I. Ry. Debenture Stock 4½ per cent. . . . .	1,435,650	1,435,650
E. B. Ry. " " 4 " . . . . .	248,666	348,666
S. I. Ry. " " 4½ " . . . . .	425,000	425,000
G. I. P. Ry. " " 4 " . . . . .	2,701,450	2,701,450
Indian Midland Ry. Debenture 3½ per cent. . . . .	407,500	...
Total Debt bearing interest . . . . .	177,048,178	222,923,549
Total Debt not bearing interest . . . . .	16,584	...
Total Debt in England . . . . .	177,064,762	222,923,549
Rupee equivalent at £1 = Rs. 15 . . . . .	2,65,59,71,855	3,24,88,53,285
<b>DETAILED STATEMENT III.</b>		
<b>UNFUNDED DEBT.</b>		
<i>Special Loans.</i>		
	1914.	1923.
	Rs.	Rs.
Endowments by the late King of Oudh . . . . .	1,46,12,290	1,44,72,734
Other special loans for charitable institutions, etc. . . . .	22,31,956	22,30,696
	1,68,44,246	1,67,03,429
<i>Treasury Notes.</i> . . . . .	4,47,919	4,47,919
<i>Service Funds.</i>		
Balances at credit of—		
(1) Bengal Uncovenanted Service Family Pension Fund . . . . .	1,45,17,795	1,16,43,810
(2) Bombay Uncovenanted Service Family Pension Fund . . . . .	30,89,578	34,63,900
(3) Bengal and Madras Service Family Pension Fund . . . . .	8,77,032	9,63,329
(4) Military Assistant Surgeons' Fund . . . . .	3,55,842	3,53,817
(5) Indian Military Widows' and Orphans' Fund . . . . .	...	11,17,748
	1,83,40,297	1,75,42,399
Post Office Cash Certificates . . . . .	...	3,12,89,795

Statement showing the debt of India outstanding on the 31st March 1914 and 1923—contd.

	31st March, 1914.	31st March, 1923.
	Rs.	Rs.
<i>Savings Banks Deposits.</i>		
Bank Accounts—Balances due to the—		
(1) Post Office Savings Bank Deposits . . . . .	23,16,74,426	23,20,03,551
(2) State Railway Provident Institutions . . . . .	3,00,5,786	5,36,6,296
(3) Companies Railways' Provident Funds . . . . .	...	16,32,23,118
(4) Civil Engineers' Provident Fund . . . . .	15,85,096	9,97,603
(5) Forest Officers' Provident Fund . . . . .	5,76,345	3,67,756
(6) Police Officers' Provident Fund . . . . .	5,28,785	3,90,493
(7) General Provident Fund . . . . .	2,89,90,578	8,21,41,577
(8) Indian Civil Service Provident Fund		46,70,009
(Rupee Branch . . . . .	Rs. 19,40,229	
Sterling Branch at £1 = Rs. 15) . . . . .	Rs. 7,29,780	
(9) Cemetery Endowment Fund . . . . .	3,87,008	4,94,838
(10) Other Miscellaneous Provident Funds . . . . .	2,13,642	19,18,011
(11) Other Officers' Provident Funds . . . . .	1,06,232	1,67,607
Total Bank Accounts . . . . .	29,41,36,898	53,94,00,864
Special Accounts—Balances on account of—		
(1) Postal Insurance and Life Annuity Fund . . . . .	1,05,44,094	2,00,07,562
(2) Other Special Accounts . . . . .	6,84,857	2,45,320
Total Special Accounts . . . . .	1,12,28,451	2,02,52,882
Total Savings Banks Deposits . . . . .	30,53,65,349	55,96,52,746
GRAND TOTAL . . . . .	34,09,97,811	62,56,45,288

DEBTS OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS.

264. \*Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Will Government be pleased to put on the table a statement showing:

- (a) The debt of the various Provincial Governments as on 31st March, 1924, and
- (b) Give corresponding figures for debts incurred by Provincial Governments, if any, on 31st March, 1924?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blakett: A statement showing the requisite figures is laid on the table. I ought to mention that on the 31st March, 1914, the Provinces had no debt as such of their own, but an approximate calculation has been made for the purposes of this statement, of the amounts which may be considered as then owing by the Provincial Governments to the Government of India on account of the Provincial Loan account and Irrigation Capital expenditure.

## Statement.

[In crores of rupees.]

Province.	Debt on 31st March, 1924.	Debt on 31st March, 1914.
Madras	11.6	11.2
Bombay	42.5	10.2
Bengal	2.1	3.6
United Provinces	19.7	15.2
Punjab	25.1	20.4
Burma	...	2.6
Bihar and Orissa	6.8	6.6
Central Provinces	5.2	2.1
Assam	.1	.1
Total	113.1	72.0

## EMBARGO ON THE EXPORT OF WHEAT.

265. \***Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh:** (a) Has there been a steady rise in the price of wheat since the removal of the embargo on the export thereof?

(b) If so, do the Government propose to re-impose the embargo wholly or partially?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore:** (a) No. The removal of the embargo on the export of wheat in September, 1922, was followed by a steady fall in its price during 1923. The price has risen by about one rupee per maund during the past six months, but it is still about the same as it was in September, 1922.

(b) No.

INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION OF RESIDENTS OF BIHAR AND ORISSA ON THE CLERICAL STAFF OF THE LOCOMOTIVE DEPARTMENT OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY AT JAMALPUR.

266. \***Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh:** (a) In the overhauling of the Locomotive Department of the East Indian Railway, Jamalpur (Bihar and Orissa); do the Government propose to see that the grievance felt by the indigenous population of the province in regard to their utterly inadequate representation on the clerical staff is removed?

(b) Do the Government know that notwithstanding the fact that there is no dearth of educated Biharees or Oriyas, the number of appointments held by them on the clerical staff of the Locomotive Department of the East Indian Railway at Jamalpur is far less than the number held by non-Biharees and non-Oriyas? Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a comparative table showing the strength of the non-Biharee and Biharee elements on the said staff?

**Mr. G. G. Sim:** Government have no information in regard to the alleged grievance referred to. The Agent has been informed of the policy of Government as declared in connection with the Resolution of the Assembly in March 1923 in respect to class and communal representation in the

services. Appointments to the clerical service are made at the discretion of the Agent and Government have no reason to suppose that Oriyas and Biharees are not afforded equal opportunities with other communities in entering railway service.

APPLICATION BY AN INDIAN RADIO TELEGRAPH COMPANY FOR A LICENSE TO ERECT A BEAM STATION.

267. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the paragraph published in the issue of the *Englishman* of the 8th December, 1924, page 8, under the heading "An Indian Radio Company's Application"?

(b) If so, are the statements made therein correct?

(c) If correct, will they please lay a copy of the application on the table for the information of the members?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra**: (a) Yes.

(b) The statement that an Indian Radio Telegraph Company have applied to the Government of India for a license to erect a Beam station is correct.

(c) The matter is still under discussion, and I am not in a position at the moment to lay a copy of the application on the table.

NUMBER OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

268. \***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan**: Will Government please state:

(a) if it is a fact that there are at present 21 Trade Unions in the Bombay Presidency; namely, 8 in Bombay City, 7 in Ahmedabad, and 6 in the rest of the Presidency?

(b) if the figures quoted in (a) are incorrect, will Government please state the correct figures?

**The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra**: The figures given by the Honourable Member appear to be quoted from the Bombay Labour Gazette. The Government of India know of no reason for questioning their accuracy.

HEALTH OF BABU SATYENDRA CHANDRA MITRA ARRESTED UNDER BENGAL REGULATION III OF 1818.

269. \***Mr. Kumar Sankar Ray**: Will the Government be pleased to state whether the health of Babu Satyendra Chandra Mitra arrested on the 25th October, 1924, under Bengal Regulation III of 1818, has been examined since his arrest and whether he is suffering from diabetes? If so, what arrangements have been made about his diet, treatment and residence in a healthy locality and with what results?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman**: The health of this déteu has received constant attention since his arrest. He is suffering from diabetes and is receiving regular treatment for that ailment. His weight has increased from 137 lbs. on admission to 144 lbs. on the 21st December last, and according to the latest report his general health and condition are good.

RE-OPENING OF THE EXPERIMENTAL BRANCH POST OFFICE AT SHILMURI  
IN THE TIPPERAH DISTRICT.

270. \***Mr. Kumar Sankar Ray**: Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether an experimental branch post office which had been opened at Shilmuri in the district of Tipperah has been subsequently closed?
- (b) if so, when was it opened and when and why was it closed?
- (c) Has any subsequent representation been made to Government about its re-opening?
- (d) what is the substance of such representation?
- (e) what has been the result of such representation?

**Sir Geoffrey Clarke**: (a) Yes.

(b) Opened 1st April, 1924; closed 1st October, 1924, as the office did not show sufficient new revenue with reference to its cost to justify its continuance.

(c) Yes.

(d) The substance of the representations was that all the villages originally proposed were not placed under the office.

(e) On inquiry it was found that postal articles for villages transferred from the jurisdiction of another office to the new office were still being addressed by the public to the former office by which they were delivered. The Postmaster-General accordingly decided to re-open the office during the next official year for another trial.

THE IMPERIAL BANK OF INDIA AGREEMENT WITH THE GOVERNOR  
GENERAL IN COUNCIL.

271. \***Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar**: Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House a copy of the agreement entered into between the Imperial Bank of India and the Governor General in Council in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of the Imperial Bank of India Act?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett**: The Honourable Member is referred to pages 4673 to 4677 of Legislative Assembly Debates, 1923, Volume III, No. 76, in which the Agreement is printed.

INSTRUCTIONS ISSUED TO THE IMPERIAL BANK OF INDIA RELATING TO  
THE FINANCIAL POLICY OF GOVERNMENT, ETC.

272. \***Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar**: Will the Government be pleased to state whether any instructions, general or special, have been issued to the Imperial Bank of India in respect of any matter affecting "the financial policy of the Government or the safety of the Government balances" and if so, whether they will lay the substance of the same on the table of the House for the information of the members?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett**: No such instructions have been issued by the Government.

## ELECTION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member): I beg to move:

“That this Assembly do proceed to elect eight members to be members of the Committee on Public Accounts.”

I should explain that this Committee will deal with the accounts of the financial year 1923-24 when ready. There will be one or two further meetings of the existing Public Accounts Committee to complete the examination of the accounts for the year 1922-23. The work of the new Committee will probably begin in March.

12 Noon.  
The motion was adopted.

---

## ELECTION OF THE STANDING FINANCE COMMITTEE.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member): I beg to move:

“That this Assembly do proceed to the election for the financial year 1925-26, in such method as may be approved by the Honourable the President, of a Standing Finance Committee of the Assembly, not exceeding fourteen in number to which shall be added one Member of the Assembly to be nominated by the Governor General. The Member so nominated shall be Chairman of the Committee”.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President:** With reference to the two decisions just come to by the Assembly, I may inform the House that for the purpose of the election of these two Committees, namely, the Public Accounts Committee and the Standing Finance Committee, the Assembly office will be open to receive nominations up to 12 Noon on Friday the 30th January. The elections will take place in this Chamber on Monday, the 2nd February. The election of Members to both the Committees will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

---

## RESOLUTION *RE* GRANT OF A BOUNTY TO STEEL MANUFACTURING COMPANIES.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** (Commerce Member): Sir, I beg to move:

“That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a bounty should be paid on steel manufactured in India between the 1st October, 1924, and the 30th September, 1925, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) The bounty should be paid only to firms or companies manufacturing, mainly from pig-iron made in India from Indian ores, steel ingots suitable for rolling or forging into any of the kinds of steel articles specified in Part VII of Schedule II to the Indian Tariff Act, 1894.
- (2) The bounty should be paid on steel ingots manufactured by such firms or companies, and the bounty should be paid at the rate of Rs. 20 a ton on 70 per cent. of the total weight of the ingots manufactured in each month.
- (3) The total amount of the bounty payable under this Resolution in the 12 months ending 30th September, 1925, should not exceed Rs. 50 lakhs.”

I do not think that the House will expect me to inflict any very long speech upon them in support of this Resolution. I would remind the House that we are not reopening to-day the whole question whether or not the steel industry in India should be protected. That battle was fought in June last and the decision of the House was embodied in the Steel

[Sir Charles Innes.]

Industry Protection Act, 1924. I have no doubt that the House wishes to stand by the policy to which it committed itself when it passed that Act. But to-day that policy stands in danger of breaking down. We could have met the situation which had arisen by taking action under section 2 of the Steel Industry Protection Act, but for reasons which I shall proceed to explain to the House, we prefer to proceed in the manner suggested in this Resolution, and that is why I am again troubling the House in connection with the Steel industry.

The first point to which I have to address myself is whether our policy does stand in danger of breaking down. Here again I do not think that I need say very much. I have no doubt that Members of this House have read the recent report of the Tariff Board regarding the increase of the steel duties and I have no doubt that the House has almost made up its mind on this question already. The House will remember that what we set out to do when we passed the Steel Industry Protection Act was to bridge the gap between the fair selling price of steel in India, that is the price at which steel can be manufactured in India with reasonable profit, and the price at which steel can be imported. Now the former figure is a figure which can be determined with some approximation to accuracy and the Tariff Board devoted a very large part of their first report to discussing what a fair selling price for steel in India was. The House will remember that they arrived at the conclusion that that price was round about Rs. 180 per ton, Rs. 180 for bars and Rs. 175 a ton for structural shapes. But the other question, the question at what price steel can be imported is of course a much more difficult question. The Tariff Board forecasted that price at about Rs. 140 a ton, but it was always recognised that that figure must be an uncertain quantity and it was always a matter of doubt, apart altogether from the question of exchange, how far foreign steel could come down in price in order to counteract the effect of the new duties which we imposed in June last. As the House knows, the world steel industry at the present moment is in a very abnormal condition owing to the effect of the war, and the Tariff Board warned us in their first report that wide and sudden fluctuations in the price of imported steel were not improbable, and they warned us also that there was a danger that the Indian market might be invaded by a flood of cheap continental steel. It was on the recommendation of the Tariff Board therefore, and with the full assent of this House, that the Government took the very wide powers contained in section 2 of the Steel Industry Protection Act. Those powers, as the House knows, give us complete discretion to impose additional duties if and when we are satisfied that steel is coming into India at such a price as is likely to render ineffective the protection which the Steel Act was intended to convey. That provision was put in the Act in order to meet a contingency which, it is my case, has arisen to-day. I do not think there can be any doubt in the mind of any one present here to-day that the contingency has arisen. In the first place there has been a rise in exchange. All the Tariff Board's calculations in their first report were based upon a 1s. 4d. rupee. Exchange now stands at—I think that the exact figure is 1s. 5<sup>29</sup>/<sub>32</sub> d. At any rate for the last two or three months it has been round about 1s. 6d. Now that rise in exchange is of course a factor which affects the price at which all steel, whether British steel or continental steel can be imported into India. But apart from that common factor there has been a



drop in what I may call the c. i. f. prices of a very large part of the steel imported into India. That fall in price has not occurred so much in respect of British steel. The Tariff Board say that the price of British bars and plates is more or less now on the same level as it was in December, 1928, when they formulated their original conclusions. Structural shapes have gone down about 10 sh. a ton, but, generally speaking, it may be said that the price of British steel is much the same as it was when the Tariff Board's report was first written. The reason for that phenomenon is of course obvious. We all know that British steel is suffering from the competition of continental steel just as much as Indian steel is. They have brought their prices already down to bedrock, and I do not suppose they could have gone any lower if they wanted to do so. But the case has been very different with regard to continental steel. Continental steel has now approached very nearly its pre-war level. The Tariff Board tell us that prices have gone below the level of December, 1928, by the following amounts:

bars 35 sh. a ton;  
structural shapes 30 sh. a ton, and  
plates 24 sh. a ton.

Now that drop in the prices of continental steel has affected very greatly the calculations on which the Tariff Board made their original proposals. I have said just now that the Tariff Board forecasted an import price of 140 sh. a ton for steel. But that price was a weighted price. They had to take into account in fixing that price the price at which British steel could come into India and the price at which continental steel could come into India; and in weighting the price they took more into consideration the British steel than they did continental steel. That was because Tata steel, which is largely British engineering standard specification steel, was considered by the Tariff Board to come more into competition with British steel than with the cheap continental steel. But such a wide gap has now grown up between the price of continental steel and the price of British steel that I am afraid there is no doubt that to some extent continental steel is displacing common British steel in India. That means that the Tata Iron and Steel Co.'s steel is more and more coming into competition not with the high-priced British steel but with the low-priced continental steel, and that, as I have said, is a factor which very greatly affects the calculations on which the Tariff Board based their original proposals. And there is yet another factor. As invariably happens when a Government is talking about introducing protective duties on any particular article, all importers in India at once set to work to order steel from their suppliers in Europe in the hope that they can get that steel in before the new duties come into effect. The result of that is, as the Tariff Board have found, that there are very large accumulations of stocks of steel in India and those accumulations of stocks are tending to depress prices. Indeed, even if we increased our duties, as the Tariff Board proposed, those accumulations would prevent a rise of prices, at any rate to the full extent of the increase of duties proposed until they had been cleared off. Well, as the result of all these factors the Tariff Board have definitely found that the contingency which section 2 of the Steel Act was intended to provide for has arisen. They have found that steel is now coming into India at such a price as is likely to render ineffective the policy of the Steel Act. The Government of India accept that finding and I am quite sure that the House

[Sir Charles Innes.]

will accept it also. But before I go on I should just like to make one parenthetical remark. These phenomena that I have been describing are not in any way peculiar to India. They are not so much due to a definite attack on the part of continental manufacturers on the Indian market. It is no doubt true—in fact I saw it stated in one of the technical papers—that when we passed the Steel Act the continental manufacturers, especially the manufacturers in Belgium, realized that they would have to fight for their market. But the cause goes deeper than that. There are other countries which are suffering in exactly the same way from the cheap continental steel. For a parallel you need go no further than the United Kingdom herself, and I should like to read an extract from an article I read quite recently in one of the *Homé* papers:

“The most significant feature of the record of the year 1924 has been the import into the United Kingdom of iron and steel of a scale never before witnessed in the history of the trade. Compared with 1923 the increase is already one million tons for the first 11 months of 1924.”

The real fact of the matter, as I have had occasion to point out to this House on more than one occasion, is that the war had a very great effect upon the European steel industry. It increased the productive capacity of the steel firms in Europe by, it is estimated, some 50 per cent., and at the same time the effect of the war was to diminish the markets of that steel industry, and the result is that you have very powerful steel firms on the continent engaged in a life or death struggle for existence in a contracted market, and that naturally leads to cutting of prices. Now, Sir, I hope that I have established my first point, namely, that our policy is in danger of breaking down.

The next question is the remedy that we have to apply. Now the House knows that the Tariff Board recommended that action should be taken under section 2 of the Steel Industry Protection Act: that is to say that our protective duties should be increased. We could have done that without any reference to this House under the power conferred upon us by the Legislature. But, as soon as we saw the report, it was patent to us that the remedy lay not in action in that direction but in the manner proposed in this Resolution, namely, in the grant of bounties. It must be remembered that the Tariff Board were limited by the terms of their reference. They were asked by their terms of reference to report to the Government of India whether a case existed for action under section 2 of the Steel Act and, if so, what action they would recommend. They had not discretion to make alternative proposals to us, but as soon as we informed them that we thought that a bounty was the proper way to meet the situation the Tariff Board told us that they entirely agreed. I do not think that the House will have any doubt upon that point also. In the first place, had we accepted the proposals of the Tariff Board in their recent report, it would have meant that we should have to impose very heavy duties indeed. We should have to increase the duty on an article in such common use as steel bars from Rs. 40 to Rs. 75 a ton, on steel structural sections from Rs. 30 a ton to Rs. 65 a ton, on plates from Rs. 30 to Rs. 55 a ton, and so on. It would have meant that these new duties, had we imposed them, would have been in many cases four or five times as great as the duties which were in force only in April last. It would have meant

that we should impose duties which would have represented 50 to 70 per cent. of the value of the articles on which the duties were imposed; and as I have said, many of these articles are articles which are in very common use in India. That was our first objection to the Tariff Board's proposal. Our second objection was that we should have imposed, had we accepted these proposals, a burden on the consumer out of all proportion to the benefit which we were going to confer upon the industry. The House will remember that on page 158 (I think it is) of the Tariff Board's first report they gave an estimate of the output of the Iron and Steel Company during the current year. Now if you exclude from those figures the figures relating to rails on which a bounty is already given, you will find that on the assumption that prices would have risen to an exact equivalent of the increase in the duties, you will then find that, had we accepted the Tariff Board's proposals, the maximum benefit we could have conferred upon the industry would have been 50 lakhs of rupees. Now the Tariff Board gave us another statement in this report showing us the total estimated consumption in India of each kind of steel article. Proceeding on the same assumption, namely, that had we increased the duties as proposed by the Tariff Board and had prices risen to the full extent of the increase, the burden on the consumer, calculated in the same way as the Tariff Board calculated the burden in their first report, would have amounted to about Rs. 2 crores. That was our second objection to this proposal. It would have meant laying a burden on the consumer of something like 2 crores of rupees in a year in order to confer upon the industry a benefit of a something like 50 lakhs of rupees. Our third objection is that the Tariff Board's proposal would not have been as beneficial or as favourable to the industry as this proposal which we are making now. I have already referred to the accumulated stocks of iron and steel in the country, and I have already mentioned that until those accumulations of stock had been cleared off, prices would not have risen to the full extent of the increase of duty. That means to say that the steel industry would not have got the full benefit which the Tariff Board had in mind at any rate for some months. The conclusion we arrived at therefore was that our proposal, while it is cheaper to the country, while it places a less burden upon the consumer, is much more beneficial to the industry. I am aware that some people might say to me that I objected to a bounty in June last. That is perfectly true. I did object to a bounty in June last. But I objected for very good reasons which no longer exist. I objected to a bounty in June last because I could not see where the money to pay that bounty was to come from. It is in that very material particular that the situation has now changed. The surplus revenue, as I have just told the House in answer to a question, from these protective duties imposed in June last up to the end of December 1924, amounted to 71 lakhs of rupees. That is to say we have got 71 lakhs of rupees more from these protective duties than we should have got had we levied the duties at their old level. From those 71 lakhs of rupees of course we have certain commitments to meet. We have the bounties on wagons, we have the bounties on rails. We estimate that by about the 31st March those commitments will amount to something like Rs. 37 lakhs. But the House will see that there is a balance, and it is from that balance that we propose to pay the bounty proposed in this Resolution.

Now, Sir, let me come to the actual terms of my Resolution. The first point is that we propose that the bounty should be paid between the 1st October, 1924 and the 30th September, 1925. I should like to give some

[Sir Charles Innes.]

explanation of these two dates. The Tata Iron and Steel Company made an application to us in August last that the contingency which section 2 of the Steel Industry Protection Act had intended to provide had already arisen, that is to say they applied for the imposition of off-setting duties under that section. But the figures with which they supported this application were the figures for June, 1924, that is, of prices of the very month in which the Steel Act was passed. We thought that the Act must be given further time to declare its effect, and therefore we returned the application to them. We asked them to send it in with later figures and to substantiate it in fuller detail. They sent in a revised application on the 20th September, 1924 and in the beginning of October 1924, we referred it to the Tariff Board for report. The Tariff Board found that the application was justified: and that being so, we think that it is only fair that this bounty should take effect from the 1st October, 1924. As regards the other date, 30th September 1925, we have selected that date for the following reason. In the first place, the House must remember that we have taken this action under an emergency clause of the Act. Section 2 of the Steel Act is a section deliberately put in to meet an emergency. These off-setting duties are duties which we can take off any time we think it necessary whenever prices begin to rise again. For that reason we do not think that we should be justified in asking this House to commit itself too far ahead. We might be committing ourselves to a heavy payment to the industry which experience might show to be unnecessary. Prices might rise. Their working cost might come down. Again, if our policy proves to be effective, we may not get the compensating surplus revenue from which we are to pay these bounties. That is the reason why we ought not to commit ourselves too far ahead. On the other hand, in the ordinary course this House will meet again in September. In July and August we shall have an opportunity of re-examining the whole position, and if we think it necessary, we should be in a position to come before the House again. The first condition is intended to confine the bounty to mixed classes of steel which the Steel Act of 1924 was intended to protect. As regards the second condition, it will be noticed that we desire to pay this bounty upon production rather than sales. We have satisfied ourselves that we can pay the bounty quite easily upon production. The Resolution is so drafted that practically the bounty will be confined to the only company manufacturing steel in India. It is not, as my Honourable Colleague said a day or two ago, the Tata Company, but it is the Tata Iron and Steel Company. They are the only firm in India which are making steel on any large scale in India now. Ever since that firm has been manufacturing steel at Jamshedpur it has supplied our Metallurgical Inspector at Jamshedpur with a statement of ingots produced from each cast of each furnace. We have had those statements on record from the very beginning and there will be no difficulty in our working a system of bounties on production. Moreover, a system of bounties on production will, we think, be more favourable to the industry than a system of bounties on sales. Had we a system of bounties on sales, the industry would have had to wait until it sold its products before drawing bounties and it might have been tempted to agree to forced sales in order to get the bounties. The advantage of a bounty on production is that automatically as it produces steel the industry will get the bounty. The next point to notice is that we are paying bounty on 70 per cent. of the total weight of the ingots. The reason for that is that our records show that the ratio of the weight of

saleable steel to the total weight of the ingots is 70 per cent., that is to say, about 80 per cent. of every ingot goes back into the furnaces as scrap and comes out again. We do not want to go on paying on that portion of the ingot which is continually going back into the furnaces and that is why we propose that it should be paid on 70 per cent. of the total ingot weight. The final figure that I have got to explain is the proposal that the bounties should be at the rate of Rs. 20 a ton. I have just explained that we calculate by the method employed by the Tariff Board in its first report that it we had imposed an off-setting duty and if prices had gone up to the full extent of the increased duty than on the estimated production of 1924-25, the maximum the industry could have got would be Rs. 50 lakhs. The total weight of finished steel produced by the industry according to that estimate during the current year is likely to be 250,000 tons. Therefore, Rs. 20 a ton is calculated to give them that Rs. 50 lakhs. We do not wish by giving a bounty to do anything less for the industry than we should have done had we accepted the Tariff Board's proposal. Indeed, as I think, I have shown to the House, we are doing for the industry even more than the Tariff Board proposed. I am quite free to admit that our proposals are generous. I am quite free to admit, as I have just said, that they are even more generous than the Tariff Board recommended. We think, Sir, that this is a time for generosity. It is a matter of common knowledge—the fact has been stated quite freely in the public press—that the industry at the present moment is passing through a particularly difficult stage of its existence. In fact, it has been stated in the public press that the Directors have thought it necessary to appeal to their shareholders to agree to a reconstruction of the Company. Now, it is entirely for the shareholders, who are the proprietors of the concern, to decide whether or not they will accept those proposals. At the same time, I think that everyone in this House would agree that some reconstruction is necessary; that is certainly the opinion of the Government. I think, Sir, that the Government can claim that they have dealt with this industry with generosity. I think, Sir, that, if this House will accept my Resolution, they will also be able to claim that they have dealt with this industry with generosity. It is an industry of real national importance, and I hope that if we pass this Resolution, the shareholders, that is to say, the proprietors of the concern, will also take the view that even at a sacrifice measures should be taken by reconstruction which would place an important national industry in a position in which it will have a fair chance of winning its way through to assured prosperity.

Sir, I move my Resolution.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated: Labour Interests): Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member has admitted that the system of protection which he had adopted and which the House had approved some months back has broken down. Sir, there were some Members in this Assembly who at the time when this question was discussed had predicted that this system would break down. Perhaps the Honourable the Commerce Member did not himself see that his system would break down; but a warning was given to him that the system which he had adopted was wrong and was sure to break down. The House in adopting the system of protection which it did at that time wanted to protect the national industry. But, Sir, in adopting the method the House did not take care even to make that industry a national industry. They did not take care that the industry

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

would be owned by the nation, nor did they take care to see that even the management of that industry would be Indian. To-day, Sir, . . .

**Mr. President:** I am afraid the Honourable Member is trying to embark on the discussion of a subject which is not in order, and for the information of the House, before allowing him to proceed, I may say a word or two about amendments.

Mr. Joshi proposes to nationalise the steel industry by way of an amendment. That clearly is out of order. He also proposes to bring in the question of labour conditions and the Indianisation of the superior staff. Those are out of order as they are not within the scope of the original Resolution. The original Resolution proposes a bounty to the steel industry as at present constituted, and any further measures for nationalising, Indianisation or treating in any other way the steel industry would have to be done under some other Resolution. I am a little in doubt about the amendment standing in Mr. Sarfaraz Hussain Khan's name; as far as I can see from the way in which it is drafted, it is within the scope of the Resolution. The amendment of Mr. Das, No. 4, is in order. Mr. Joshi's No. 5 again raises Indianisation by a side issue which is clearly out of order. Mr. Sarfaraz Hussain's No. 6 refers also to Indianisation by way of condition, which is also out of order. Mr. Das' No. 7 also refers to Indianisation, which is out of order. The amendment of Dr. Lohokare, No. 8, is in respect to its first clause in order so far as I am able to understand it, and in respect of the second clause is out of order because it proposes Indianisation of the capital and not of the staff. Mr. Joshi may proceed.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I be allowed to say one word in favour of my amendment. The position is that the original Resolution is intended to meet a situation which has arisen on account of the break down of the proposals made by the Government of India by their previous Act, and the proposal of Sir Charles Innes itself is not in accordance with the Act. The Act provided that, if a certain situation arose, it should be met by increasing the duties. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes himself now proposes bounties which is a different proposal altogether. If it is open to Sir Charles Innes to make a proposal which is not consistent with the Act, it should be open to me also to make a proposal which may be different from those contained in the Act.

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is very ingenious; but I think his ingenuity defeats itself. I am not concerned here whether the proposal made by the Commerce Member is within the four corners of the original Steel Industry Protection Act or not. My only concern is whether Mr. Joshi is within the four corners of Sir Charles Innes' Resolution, and Mr. Joshi is clearly outside it.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** My difficulty is this. The principle of the Resolution is to give protection to the industry.

**Mr. President:** That is precisely what it is not. The proposal in the Resolution is to give bounties on certain productions of the steel industry within a certain date. It has nothing whatever to do with the management of the industry or with the ownership of the industry. It is the

industry as at present constituted which is to receive a bounty at the rate of 70 per cent. of the total weight produced within a certain period.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I had thought, Sir, that the object with which the bounty was to be given was a part of the Resolution. But, as you now rule, I do not wish to discuss whether my amendment is in order or out of order. No doubt your decision is rather disheartening to me and it is somewhat difficult for me to proceed with my speech. (*A Voice:* "Do not make a speech.") I shall, however, try to place my point of view before you and before the Assembly if it becomes possible for me to do so.

I do not wish, Sir, to go into the details of the question of Indianisation. The object of these bounties is to protect the industry. If the object had not been to protect the industry, I am quite sure this House would not be so generous as to give a sum of 50 lakhs of rupees to a private company. The object being to protect the industry, it is the duty of this House to see if all those elements that form the industry are protected or not. The bounty will protect the interests of those who have invested their capital in the industry. But, Sir, the investors of the capital are not the only elements in that industry. If capital is necessary for an industry, labour is equally necessary for that industry. In giving the bounty to this industry, therefore, it is the duty of this Assembly to see whether labour is protected or not. For the information of the Members.....

**Mr. President:** Order, order. The Honourable Member is proceeding to discuss the protection of the labour in the Jamshedpur industry which is beyond the scope of the Resolution. What we are discussing here is the granting of bounties to the industry as a whole to meet a certain situation which has arisen owing to the operation of persons entirely outside India.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I appeal to you, Sir, to take my view into consideration. The object of the Resolution is to protect the industry and I think you will admit, Sir, that the protection of industry does not only mean the protection of the shareholders' money. It also means the protection of the labour engaged in that industry. If that is not the object of giving the bounty, I want to know from any one in this House why 50 lakhs of rupees belonging to the public treasury should be handed over to a private company. The object clearly is that not only the money of the shareholders should be protected, but the lives of those people who are engaged in that industry should also be protected. Sir, not only the shareholders.....

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is now even more ingenious in the use of the word protection. I must warn him if he proceeds much more on that line I shall have to rule him definitely out of order and call upon some one else.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I do not know, Sir, how I should proceed, but my object is that this bounty, which is to be given by this Assembly, should serve its object. The situation which has been described by Sir Charles Innes is that the prices of steel have not risen to the extent to which he expected they would rise by means of the protective duties, and perhaps they have gone down. The result of the prices not having risen, and perhaps of having gone down, is that 1,700 employes of the Tata Steel and Iron Company at Jamshedpur have been dismissed. And, on the other

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

hand, more than 60 new European employes have been engaged. Under these circumstances I want this House to consider whether it is right for them to give this bounty to the Tata Iron and Steel Company without making sure whether the labour engaged in that industry is protected or not. If 1,700 people are dismissed up to this time, by the time the next Resolution comes, 5,000 more people may be dismissed; and if all the Indian labour engaged in that industry, or a large part of the Indian labour engaged in that industry, is to be sent away, I should like to know from any Member of this Assembly what is the object of giving this bounty to this Company. Why are they giving this bounty if not to protect the interests of those people who have invested their money as well as to protect the interests of those people who have invested their very life in this industry? Sir, I therefore think that this Assembly should not consent to the giving of this bounty without making sure that Indians engaged in that industry get fair conditions of life and work. Surely 50 lakhs of Indian money is not to be spent to find employment for a large number of Europeans in that industry? Surely 50 lakhs of Indian money from the public treasury is not to be spent without taking measures to see that a large number of Indian employes of long standing are not sent away on to the streets without any means of livelihood? Moreover, Sir, I would like this House to consider whether they have taken all the precautions for safeguarding the interests of public finance if they pass this Resolution as it is. If an industry requires help, and I admit that industries do require help on many occasions, let that help be given out of public revenues; but, Sir, when the industry makes profits, will it not be the duty of that industry to return the money to the public treasury? To give a gift to an industry without expecting that industry to return that amount is in my opinion a very mistaken policy. If you begin to give gifts, there will be a demand for further gifts because there is no danger in asking for any gifts when they are obtained without any conditions. I want this House, Sir, to consider this proposal very carefully before they adopt it. The right way in my judgment, even if Government and this House are bent upon giving this bounty, is to lay down the condition that, whenever the industry becomes prosperous, the money they receive from the public treasury should be returned. Sir, this condition is not a discovery or invention made by me. In many countries subsidies and bounties are given to industries which are new or which are losing, but the Government and the Legislature take care to put down the condition that, when that particular industry becomes prosperous, that industry will return the money which it has obtained from the public treasury. It is a very fair proposal; and this proposal is not only found in the tariff legislation of other countries, but it has also found a place in legislation passed in India. In Madras there is an Act known as the Aid to Industries Act. According to that Act help in the form of subsidies or in other forms can be given out of the public treasury to industries, but that Act makes it clear that, when the industry begins to make profit beyond a certain rate fixed by the Government, that industry must share its profits by returning the money to the public treasury. Now, Sir, this is a proposal which is absolutely reasonable and is absolutely necessary to safeguard the interests of public finance. Unfortunately, the Honourable the Commerce Member does not think it necessary to safeguard the interests of Indian finance. The Madras Bill was passed by a Minister responsible to the Legislature. It was necessary for him to take care of the interests of public finance. But, Sir, it would be uncharitable for me to suggest that the Commerce Member has not laid down that



condition here because he is an irresponsible Minister of the Crown (The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: "You have suggested it!"). Sir, when the public treasury gives a large amount of help amounting to a crore of rupees to a private company, I think it is also the duty of the Government and the Legislature to ask for some control over that industry. This is also not a new principle. When any Government give help to a private industry to any very large extent, that Government ought to take measures to see that the money which they give to that company is properly utilised, and the only way of seeing that the money is properly utilised is to ask for a share in the control of that industry. Here again I am not introducing a new principle. This principle is accepted in many countries. Not only that but I know there is a company in Bombay which had to take a loan from some foreign country. They got that large loan only on the condition that those people who gave the loan would have a director on their board of directors. Not only that but the Honourable the Commerce Member.

**Mr. President:** I must warn the Honourable Member that he has reached his time limit.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** The Honourable the Commerce Member is presiding over the Department of Railways and he knows that the Government of India has given help to railway companies out of public funds only on the condition that the Government of India shall have a director on the board of directors of these companies, and not only that, that director shall have one voice out of ten but shall have a power of veto in the board of directors. I want to know, Sir, why the Government of India have not put down that condition here. If more than a crore of rupees out of the public treasury is to be given to a private company, it is absolutely necessary in the interests of public finance that the Government of India should insist that they should have an adequate voice in the management of that company. They should also take care to see that when that company makes a profit, the money should be returned to the public treasury. Sir, there is a great advantage in this proposal. India is anxious to develop her industries; the steel industry is not the only industry that we want to develop. There are several other industries that may ask for help. If we begin to give large gifts to private industries.

**Mr. President:** I cannot allow the Honourable Member to develop that line. He does not appreciate the fact that we are here discussing the question of a bounty to a particular industry for a particular time arising out of a particular emergency. The question of principle does not arise, and the question of the association of Government in the management of any industry whatsoever, whether the steel industry or any other, cannot arise under this Resolution.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** I do not wish to take up the time of the House any longer. I wanted to put before the House only one point, that this is not the only industry that wants help; there will be several other industries that will ask for our help; and, if we now lay down a condition that when the industry begins to make a profit the money should be returned, it will be easy for us to help other industries. But if we do not ask for the money to be returned at any time, even when the industry is making very large profits, it will be very difficult for us to help many industries which we want to develop.

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

Sir, before I close, I find it very difficult to say what is my attitude towards this Resolution. I should have expressed my attitude much better towards this Resolution if I had been allowed to move my amendments. I accept the principle of protecting industries, but, Sir, I cannot accept this Resolution because it is not in the interests of the industry itself as a whole, neither is it in the interests of public finance.

**Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan** (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa : Muhammadan): Sir, in rising to move my amendment which runs as follows :

" That after clause (1) the following new clause be inserted and clauses (2) and (3) be re-numbered (3) and (4) :

- (2) The proposed bounty for the year ending 30th September 1925 to be paid only to such firms or companies which began their actual work of manufacturing steel in India in the way specified in clause (1), before the year 1922 "

I rise more to support the Resolution moved by the Honourable Sir Charles Innes than to oppose it. My amendment seeks to lay down a certain condition, that is, that firms which were in existence before the year 1922, should be paid the bounty, but not firms which came into existence after that period. My reasons are very simple. The bounty for the present year should not be given to those companies which came into existence after the question of adopting protective tariffs for India was taken up by the public, that is, which came into being after 1922; they are not in my opinion entitled to the bounty in preference to those which were in existence before the Bill was passed into an Act. Some companies have sprung up in the years 1923 and 1924, but many of them did not begin their actual work of manufacture of steel till 1924. If a bounty is to be given to such companies as well, then in my opinion injustice will be done to the old companies; the old companies have suffered losses all along owing to the unfair competition from outside. That is one reason. Further, such companies helped the country by their products when steel products could not be imported from outside the country during the war. That is another reason. These companies served the Empire during the war with munitions. The new companies which came into existence later have suffered no such loss, nor have they served the country and the Empire. So I think the companies which served both the Empire and the country have a preferential claim to the bounty; and if the bounty is divided between the different companies, then I think injustice will be done to the companies which were in existence before the Bill was passed into an

Act. So for these reasons I move my amendment which is not  
 1 P.M. a negation of the Resolution moved by the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, but only lays down certain conditions, that is to say, that justice should be done to companies which served the Empire by supplying munitions during the war. Surely, in all fairness they should have a preferential claim over the new concerns which have been started for steel manufacture as a result of the policy of protection which Government intended to give. For this reason I appeal to Members to support me when I say that the proposed bounty should be paid only to such firms or companies which began their actual work of manufacturing steel in India before the year 1922. Sir, I move my amendment.

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, the amendment that stands in my name reads thus:

“That in clause (3) for the words and figures ‘Rs. 50 lakhs’ the words and figures ‘Rs. 100 lakhs’ be substituted.”

Sir, my amendment is as simple as the amendment which the Honourable the Finance Member moved in his Currency Bill the other day to alter the figure from 85 to 100 crores. The Honourable the Commerce Member in his concluding remarks said that the steel industry is passing through a kind of distress and that it should be given a fair chance. But in proposing the bounty of 50 lakhs he has not given the industry a fair chance, but he has only given what I may call a famine dole, a famine ration, to this industry which is almost dying out. It may be that in proposing the 50 lakhs the Honourable Sir Charles Innes was reminiscent of his youthful days when he was District Magistrate presiding over a district when it was suffering from famine and floods and was doling out small sums to the thousands of people who were dying of starvation. That was perhaps the idea of Government of serving the people who suffered from famine and floods. But that idea cannot be applied to the steel industry. This is a business concern and we must tackle it from businessmen's point of view. We are going to see that the key industry of India stands on its own legs. Well, will 50 lakhs do for the purpose? The Honourable Sir Charles Innes said that Government had time to review the position of the steel industry, so also had the country as well as the Members of this House. But the Members of this House are convinced that the steel industry cannot stand on its own legs unless it is adequately protected. It may be that some of my honourable colleagues from the different provinces are looking forward to a remission of the provincial contribution from the surplus funds; it may be that my Honourable friend the Finance Member is looking forward to getting hold of a part of the surplus to meet the demand of the Lee Commission or the extra expenditure incurred in connection with the military manoeuvres recently held at Delhi by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief. The Honourable Member for Commerce intends to give protection, but the bounty of 50 lakhs which he proposes is I say not enough. . . .

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is not right in arguing about the adequacy of the bounty. The question in relation to the 50 lakhs is the narrow question as to whether the estimate of 50 lakhs is a reasonable estimate of the actual production of the steel industry on the basis of Rs. 20 a ton. The Honourable Member is moving his amendment in the wrong place.

**Mr. B. Das:** I shall explain why I propose 1 crore. In the May Session this House assured the steel industry a protection of over a crore of rupees. Exchange and dumping did not allow this benefit to the steel industry. . . .

**Mr. President:** The Honourable Member is roving generally over the question as to whether the Government are generous enough. That question does not arise on the question of Rs. 50 lakhs at all.

**Mr. B. Das:** Sir, the Tariff Board on page 8 of their report remark:

“It is not open to us, therefore, in this inquiry to discuss suggestions for the grant of bounties, or schemes by which all Government Departments and Railways should be required to use Indian steel.”

[Mr. B. Das.]

They also make similar remarks on page 19 where they say:

"Railways, Government Departments and important public bodies like the Port Trusts may also continue to use British steel, or Indian steel at approximately British prices, for some time to come."

My contention is that the Government and the House are committed to protect this key industry of India. This key industry must thrive. How can it thrive when only a little bounty is given to it? Government have taken no steps to confine their purchases to Indian steel and iron.

**Mr. President:** Order, order. I once more want to tell the Honourable Member that he is moving an amendment to increase the sum of Rs. 50 lakhs to Rs. 100 lakhs. After he has moved that amendment he has restricted the debate to the question whether the estimate made by the Government that Rs. 50 lakhs will be required in one year to pay at the rate of Rs. 20 per ton to the steel industry is correct or not. The sole question in issue, once his amendment is moved, is whether that estimate is right or not. The Honourable gentleman is now talking about generousities. It has nothing to do with generousities; it is merely mathematical accuracies.

**Mr. B. Das:** By the imposition of the duty under the Indian Tariff Act the Government will by the end of the year make a profit of about 2 crores. My contention is that the surplus profit which will accrue to the Government must go to stabilise this industry and not for being paid into the exchequer of the Finance Member. I contend that there will be at least a surplus profit of more than a crore. The industry is not in a position to thrive without protection, and I suggest that a crore should go to this industry. I hope the Honourable Member for Commerce will support me and not only the Honourable Member for Commerce but also my friend the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, the new Member for Industries. His Department exists to see that industries are adequately developed, and, if nobody else in this House supports me, I expect the support of at least the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra in this matter.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member): Sir, I regret to have to break it to my Honourable friend who has just spoken (Mr. B. Das) that I have the word of my Honourable friend Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra that he is unable to support him. The Honourable Member's purpose in moving this amendment seems to have been to get a little more. I could not gather that he had any other argument than that he would like something more for the industry that is to be protected. He was not successful in getting his amendment down in a form that was likely to give his friends any more because, as was pointed out by the Honourable the President, if he was anxious that 100 lakhs should flow in the direction desired, it would have been necessary for him to move an amendment in clause 2 of the Resolution also raising the figure from Rs. 20 a ton to something higher. It is possible that, if the production of steel goes ahead very fast in the period named, the figure of Rs. 20 a ton will produce the whole 50 lakhs and run up against the maximum limit. I hope it will be so because, if it does, it will mean that the company is doing better and is therefore less in need of the additional assistance which is proposed for it. But why the Honourable Member should think it necessary to ask for more than 50 lakhs I find it a little difficult to understand. The Tariff Board themselves asked for less and, as was pointed out by the

Honourable Sir Charles Innes, the proposals which we are making in this Resolution will give the company on the whole better terms than they would have got from the operation of the Tariff Board's proposals. The Honourable Member sought to justify his demand for something more by accusing me of getting off with the swag. The Honourable Sir Charles Innes has already stated that the extra amounts received by the Government as a result of the imposition of the protective duty on steel after the Act passed last June up to the 31st of December 1924 is a gross total of 71 lakhs. Out of that figure we have to provide 37 lakhs for the payment of bounties as arranged under the original Act. I believe there is also some small additional allowance to be made (I have not verified the figures) in respect of duty on Government stores. We have therefore in hand at the present moment a balance of something like 30 lakhs out of which to pay those 50 lakhs. Now that is up to the 31st March 1925. There will be additional bounties payable next year, and it is extremely unlikely in my opinion that the very large receipts that we were getting in the early months under the Steel Protection Act will continue. They were due first of all to the large imports that people endeavoured to make in order to avoid the operation of the Act at all, and secondly to the large imports that have been going on in the expectation of additional duties. It is extremely unlikely in my opinion that by the time the 30th September arrives I shall find that any of the swag has rested in my pocket on behalf of the tax-payer of India. Therefore, the proposal which the Honourable Member is making is undoubtedly a proposal that I should find out of the prospective surplus of my budget which has already been so sadly depleted by the Commander-in-Chief's vigorous exercises in the neighbourhood of New Delhi (I am told that he spent at least two lakhs on those operations. I have myself a secret suspicion that I am going to save money owing to those operations because a little less will have to be spent on guarding surplus munitions.) However that may be, I do not feel that I can rely on that prospect for the purpose of finding the extra 50 lakhs which my Honourable friend desires. I therefore on behalf of Government oppose the motion.

**Mr. President:** The question is that the following amendment be made :

“ That in clause (3) for the words and figures ‘ Rs. 50 lakhs ’ the words and figures ‘ Rs. 100 lakhs ’ be substituted.”

The motion was negatived.

**Mr. President:** The question is that the following Resolution be adopted, namely :

“ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a bounty should be paid on steel manufactured in India between the 1st October, 1924, and the 30th September, 1925, subject to the following conditions :

- (1) The bounty should be paid only to firms or companies manufacturing, mainly from pig-iron made in India from Indian ores, steel ingots suitable for rolling or forging into any of the kinds of steel articles specified in Part VII of Schedule II to the Indian Tariff Act, 1894.
- (2) The bounty should be paid on steel ingots manufactured by such firms or companies, and the bounty should be paid at the rate of Rs. 20 a ton on 70 per cent. of the total weight of the ingots manufactured in each month.
- (3) The total amount of the bounty payable under this Resolution in the 12 months ending 30th September, 1925, should not exceed Rs. 50 lakhs.”

The motion was adopted.

## DEMAND FOR GRANT TO DEFRAY THE BOUNTY TO THE STEEL INDUSTRY.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** (Commerce Member): I move, Sir: →

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25 lakhs 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 March, 1925, on account of the bounty which it has been recommended in the Resolution just passed that the Governor General in Council should pay on steel manufactured in India between the 1st of October, 1924, and the 30th of September, 1925."

**Mr. Chaman Lall** (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): I move, Sir, to oppose this particular Resolution. I am afraid I was taken a little un-awares when you put the first Resolution to the vote because I wanted, before you put that Resolution to the vote, to ask you to give me a ruling on a point of order. That particular ruling has been raised in this House before but it was in your absence, when you were at home. The ruling that I want you to give is on this question. Are the shareholders of Tata's, who happen to be quite numerous in this House, entitled to vote on this question of giving a bounty of 50 lakhs to Tata's, and whether it is not a question of public policy that this bounty should be voted by the shareholders? I want you to give us a ruling, Sir, whether they ought or ought not to vote. Personally, I believe they ought not to vote. Merely as a question of public policy, it is not right that they should vote. They have every right to have a say in the matter. They have every right to suggest reasons why this bounty should be given. But I do not think it is decent that they should come here in a matter of public policy and vote upon a question of this nature. First of all, Sir, I therefore submit this question to you and ask you to give me your ruling.

**Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan** (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa: Muhammadan): How does the name of Tata's come in here? (Laughter.) In the Resolution it is . . . .

**Mr. President:** Order, order. I think the Honourable Member is asking me to play the ostrich. The Honourable Member (Mr. Chaman Lall) has put to me a question as to how far the shareholders in steel companies that will benefit by this Resolution, whatever the name of the steel company may be, should or should not vote on this Resolution. That question has been settled by the established practice of the House of Commons which I think we may reasonably follow here. It has been raised in the history of the House of Commons on many occasions and is now well settled in practice. The practice is that where the individual Member of the House of Commons is actually an active partner in a business not a limited liability company, it is a misdemeanour on his part to vote; and there have been cases in recent Parliamentary history where a measure has had to be passed to indemnify a partner in a business in England from the penalties otherwise leviable upon him for having given his vote in the House of Commons on any subject, not merely on a question in which he was personally interested. The question has been settled, however, in this form that where the shareholders of any company which receive subsidies or other benefits from His Majesty's Government are Members of the House of Commons, they are perfectly entitled to register their votes either on that or on any other question, the only question being whether it is a matter of propriety for them to do so, and that that is entirely a matter for the personal judgment of the Member concerned. My Honourable friend will probably see that it will not be difficult to apply here this rule. There may

not be many Members here for instance connected with the Peninsular and Oriental Shipping Company, but there is no doubt there are Members here who are members of various firms which are connected with contracts directly or indirectly given by the Government of India or Local Governments, and therefore the rule laid down in the House of Commons is, I think, a satisfactory rule. It is only where a Member is directly and personally concerned in contracting with Government for certain services that he is not entitled to take part in the debate. I am not aware whether this point was raised before—if it was raised before during the proceedings of the Steel Industry Protection Act—I should have asked for further notice of this question in order to consult the ruling given by my predecessor. I have stated the Parliamentary practice of the House of Commons, and I think we may reasonably follow that practice and leave it to individual Members, as a matter of propriety, to decide whether their judgment is likely to be influenced or deflected from the straight line of public policy by any personal pecuniary benefit they may derive.

**Mr. Chaman Lall:** I thank you very much, Sir, for the ruling that you have given and for having clarified the issue. There was a ruling given in the May-June Session, but as nobody happened to remark on the subject, I take it that your ruling on this subject is the law on the point.

**Mr. President:** I cannot allow the Honourable Member to use the word "law". Law is one thing, a ruling from the Chair is a very different thing.

**Mr. Chaman Lall:** As far as Honourable Members here are concerned, I think a ruling from the Chair is a law.

Sir, I rise to oppose the grant of any bounties to any steel company in India, and my reasons are very simple. I will confine myself to the one particular company, the Tata Iron and Steel Company, which is the only company which is likely to benefit in regard to this bounty that you are going to give them. It is true, if you examine the facts furnished during the last few years from 1916 to 1924, that the Tata Iron and Steel Company made a profit of nearly 8 crores, 4 crores of which they distributed to their shareholders and 4 crores of which they put away in their reserve fund, on a total paid-up capital, I believe, of 3 crores. Subsequently, when they were in difficulties, after having paid out the handsome dividend of 4 crores to their shareholders, they discovered that they had to go and borrow money and they borrowed money in a foreign market by issuing debentures to the extent of 4 crores, so that, unlike any sensible company in the world, they went about distributing lavishly their dividends to their shareholders without looking forward to or taking account of the time when a depression would come and there would be need of money. When the depression came—as it was inevitable that that depression would come with the falling exchanges on the one side and the end of the war on the other, they asked for protection of the steel industry. . . . .

**Mr. President:** I am afraid the Honourable Member is a little too late for that kind of argument. This Resolution is in the form of a supplementary estimate in connection with the Budget of the present year, and for the amount required up to the 31st of March in the present financial year, and therefore the only matters in order under it are arguments designed to show that the estimate made by the Commerce Member of the

[Mr. President.]

amount required is not adequate. I do not think that on a supplementary estimate of this kind, where the House has just decided an important principle, the Honourable Member can bring up the matter or argue it again.

**Mr. Chaman Lall:** I submit to your ruling on this point, Sir. I know it is very inconvenient that I am a little too late. I just wanted to put my sentiments before the House. Honourable Members of this House are quite well aware that in the May-June Session I did say a good deal in opposition to the imposition of protective duties, but now as far as this particular matter is concerned,—the demand for the grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 25 lakhs to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March 1925,—I think, Sir, I may be able, with your permission, to say one or two words more as to why this particular amount should not be sanctioned for this particular purpose of the granting of a bounty. My reasons I have already placed before the House. I have not exhausted my reasons and I do not intend to do so. I am merely mentioning in passing in connection with your ruling on the point that Tatas do not deserve any bounty whatsoever. They have got the worst reputation imaginable in India to-day. Mulshipetta and Jamshedpur are evidence of the fact that this Company's name has become a byword instead of its being a household word. They have treated their shareholders in a fashion which is absolutely—I will not say abominable—but which is absolutely undeserved. They have broken every promise and they have broken every understanding that we arrived at with them. They have not paid the least attention whatsoever to the demands of their workers at Jamshedpur or at Mulshipetta. I think it would be not in the public interests to support this company under these circumstances.

**Mr. President:** I do not know if the Honourable Member was present here when I had a conversation with Mr. Joshi. If Mr. Joshi was out of order on the main Resolution, the Honourable Member is ten times out of order now.

**Mr. Chaman Lall:** I will therefore simply suggest that under these circumstances, for reasons which are very obvious, this grant should not be made.

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

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 25 lakhs be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st March, 1925, on account of the bounty which it has been recommended in the Resolution just passed that the Governor General in Council should pay on steel manufactured in India between the 1st of October, 1924, and the 30th of September, 1925.”

The motion was adopted.



#### NOMINATION OF MEMBERS TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE COURT-FEES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** (Home Member): Sir, may I make one slight change in the motion which stands in my name? I wish to substitute also for Mr. Fleming Mr. Naidu.



I beg to move :

"That in place of Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith, Mr. H. E. Holme and Mr. E. G. Fleming the following members be appointed to the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Court-fees Act, 1870, the Succession Certificate Act, 1889, and the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, for certain purposes and for the like purposes to repeal certain enactments amending the Court-fees Act, 1870, namely :

Mr. L. Graham,  
Mr. E. H. Ashworth, and  
Mr. M. C. Naidu."

The motion was adopted.

---

THE INDIAN MERCHANT' SHIPPING (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Sir, I beg to move :

"That the Bill to amend the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923, for a certain purpose, be taken into consideration."

I explained the purpose of this little Bill when I introduced it a few days ago. The Bill consists of one clause only. It gives us power to impose fees for inspection when wireless installations have been found out of order. In this matter we are following the practice of the Board of Trade at Home. I move my motion.

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes:** Sir, I move that the Bill be passed.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 27th January, 1925.

---