

23rd February 1927

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

Volume II

(22nd February to 14th March, 1927)

FIRST SESSION
OF THE
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1927

Chamber of Deputies 18/1/23



DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1927

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II—22nd February to 14th March, 1927.

	PAGES.
Tuesday, 22nd February, 1927—	
Members Sworn	1123
Questions and Answers	1123-28
General Discussion of the Railway Budget	1129-1190
Wednesday, 23rd February, 1927—	
Members Sworn	1191
Questions and Answers	1'91-93
The Railway Budget—	
List of Demahds—	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board	1194-1225, 1226-48
Message from the Council of State	... 1225
Thursday, 24th February, 1927—	
Member Sworn	1249
Private Notice Question and Answer	... 1249-50
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	
Strengthening the representative control by all interests concerned over Indian Railways	1251-55
Quinquennial Review of Capital Programme	1255-62
Policy followed in respect of the Purchase of Stores	1262-71
Separation of Railway from General Finance	1271-80
Form of Budget and Statistics	1280-83
Grievances of Subordinate Railway Employees	1283-1300
Friday, 25th February, 1927—	
Member Sworn	1301
Questions and Answers	1301-15
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	
Grievances of Subordinate Railway Employees— <i>contd.</i> ...	1315-42
Railway communication between Gauhati and Shillong...	1343-46
Powers and Formation of Advisory Committees	1346-60
Railway rates of freights in relation to the Indian Manu- facturer	1360-68
General control and supervision, Indianisation, regula- tion of Capital Expenditure, etc.	1368-70
Reduction of freight on Petrol	1370-74
Demand No. 2—Inspection...	... 1374-80

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	Pages.
Saturday, 26th February, 1927—	
Questions and Answers ...	1381-90
Unstarred Questions and Answers ...	1391-92
Statement of Business ...	1392-93
The Railway Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 3—Audit ...	1393
Demand No. 4—Working Expenses: Administration—	1393-1409
Appointment of Deputy Agents on the South Indian Railway ...	1409-11
Administration of the Stores Department, North Western Railway ...	1411-13
Arrangements for the Hardwar Kumbh Mela ...	1413-21
Reduction of Third Class Fares ...	1421-27
Inconveniences suffered by the Travelling Public ...	1427-31
Over-employment of Europeans in new posts created and vacancies filled ...	1431-38
Third and Intermediate Class Waiting Rooms for Indian Ladies at Moradabad ...	1438-40
Demand No. 5—Working Expenses: Repairs and Maintenance and Operation—	1440
Repairs and Maintenance charges of Rolling Stock ...	1440-50
Demand No. 6—Companies' and Indian States' Share of Surplus Profits and Net Earnings ...	1450
Demand No. 9—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund ...	1450
Demand No. 10—Appropriation from Depreciation Fund ...	1451
Demand No. 11—Miscellaneous ...	1451
Demand No. 12—Appropriation to the Reserve Fund ...	1451
Demand No. 14—Strategic Lines ...	1451
Demand No. 7—New Construction ...	1451
Demand No. 8—Open Line Works ...	1451
Demand No. 15—Strategic Lines ...	1452
Monday, 28th February, 1927—	
The Budget for 1927-28—Presented ...	1453-72
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced ...	1472
Tuesday, 1st March, 1927—	
Members Sworn ...	1473
Questions and Answers ...	1473-1505
Unstarred Questions and Answers ...	1506-24
Demands for Supplementary Grants— <i>contd.</i>	
Aviation ...	1525-73.
Thursday, 3rd March, 1927—	
Questions and Answers ...	1575-77
Message from the Council of State ...	1578
Petitions relating to the Currency Bill ...	1578
Statement of Business ...	1578-79
Appointment of the Committee on Public Petitions ...	1579
General Discussion of the Budget—Part II— <i>contd.</i> ...	1579-1643

CONTENTS--*contd.*

	PAGES.
Friday, 4th March, 1927--	
Questions and Answers	1643-1654
Short Notice Questions and Answers	1655-58
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1658-60
Motion for Adjournment--Riot in the District of Backergunj in Bengal--Not moved	1660
Petitions relating to the Currency Bill	1660-62
General Discussion of the Budget--Part II-- <i>concl'd.</i>	1661-1727
Monday, 7th March, 1927--	
Member Sworn	1729
Questions and Answers	1729-43
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1743-46
Petitions relating to the Currency Bill	1746-47
Report of the Committee on Petitions <i>re</i> Petitions relating to the Currency Bill--Laid on the table	1747
Order of the Debate on Demands for Grants	1747-48
The Currency Bill--Motion to consider adopted	1748-1815
Tuesday, 8th March, 1927--	
Questions and Answers	1817-35
The Currency Bill--Discussion adjourned	1835-95
Wednesday, 9th March, 1927--	
Questions and Answers	1897-1911
The General Budget-- List of Demands-- Demand No. 28--Executive Council-- <i>cont'd.</i>	1911-73
Thursday, 10th March, 1927--	
The General Budget-- <i>cont'd.</i> List of Demands-- <i>cont'd.</i> Demand No. 28--Executive Council-- <i>cont'd.</i>	1975
Demand No. 16--Customs	1975-2008
Paucity of Wharfingers in Karachi	1976-77
Duty on Cotton Piecegoods and abolition of the Export Duties on Tea and Raw Hides	1977-80
Revision of specific, <i>ad valorem</i> , and protective Duties-- Tax Administration	1980-86
Ruling as to assessment of Duty on Imported Paper... ..	1986-88
Invidious distinctions between Provinces in the scales of Pay of Clerks	1988-93
Export Duty on Jute	1993-99
Export Duty on Rice	1999-2002
Customs Policy--Land Frontiers	2002
Smuggling of Saccharine	2002-06
Demand No. 23--Indian Postal and Telegraph Depart- ment--	2009-24
Dearth of Post Offices in the Chota Nagpur Division.	2013-15
Low Salaries of postal clerks, peons and subordinate services and inadequate pensions to retired subor- dinates	2015-34

CONTENTS—*contd.*

PAGES.

Friday, 11th March, 1927—

Questions and Answers	2035-52
Bills passed by the Council of State laid on the table	2052
Message from the Council of State	2052-53
Statement of Business	2053-54
The General Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 23—Indian Postal and Telegraph Department— <i>contd.</i>	2054-2101
Low Salaries of Postal Clerks, Peons and Subordinate Services and inadequate Pensions of Subordinate Retired Officers	2054-83
Division of Portfolios and non-appointment of a Member for Communication	2083-92
Telegraph Censorship	2092-97
Press Telephone Rates	2097-98
Cable and Inland Press Rates	2098-99
Posting of Telegrams	2099-2100
Indo Ceylon Cables	2100-01

Saturday, 12th March, 1927—

Questions and Answers	2103-08
Statement laid on the Table	2108
Withdrawal of Instructions to Select Committees to report on certain Bills within given date	2108-09
Petitions relating to the Currency Bill	2109
The Currency Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses adjourned	2109-60

Monday, 14th March, 1927—

Questions and Answers	2161-85 ²
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2182-85
Report of the Committee on Petitions regarding petitions relating to the Currency Bill	2185
General Budget— <i>contd.</i>	
List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 18—Salt—	2186-2202
Desirability of increasing the consumption of Salt in India and of making India self supporting in the matter of Salt	2186-90
Manufacture of Salt in the Orissa Coast	2190-97
Grievances of the Miners of the Khewra Salt Mines	2197-2202
Demand No. 38—Army Department—	2202-40
Report of the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces Committee: University Training Corps	2203-14
General Policy and Expenditure	2214-40

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 23rd February, 1927.

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

MEMBERS SWORN:

Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, M.L.A. (Patna and Chota Nagpur cum Orissa: Muhammadan); and

Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh, M.L.A. (Bihar and Orissa: Landholders).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDIAN MERCANTILE MARINE COMMITTEE.

572. *Dr. B. S. Moonje: Will Government be pleased to state how they propose to give effect to the recommendations generally of the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given in this House on the 1st February last to a somewhat similar question by Kumar Ganganand Sinha.

GRANT OF STATE SCHOLARSHIPS TO INDIANS FOR NAUTICAL TRAINING IN ENGLAND.

573. *Dr. B. S. Moonje: Do Government propose to establish, at an early date, State scholarships for Indians for study in the Nautical Colleges and for practical training in training ships in England pending the formation of a Nautical College in India and if so, how many such scholarships every year?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I would remind the Honourable Member that this House on the 19th March last year decided that a training ship should be established in India, in preference to the alternative of sending Indian boys to Nautical Colleges in England. In accordance with this decision the "Dufferin" is now being fitted out as a training ship, and is expected to be ready about September next.

OPENING OF PRIMARY NAUTICAL SCHOOLS IN INDIA.

574. *Dr. B. S. Moonje: Will Government be pleased to state if it is in their contemplation to start primary Nautical schools in India to serve as feeders to the Nautical College when established and, if so, when and where?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Government of India are advised that the best preliminary training for a course at a Nautical College

is a sound general education. In their note, which is appended to Captain Sayer's report on the scheme for the establishment of a training ship in India, Captain Headlam and Mr. Richey recommended that "candidates for admission should have completed the 8th standard in an Anglo-Vernacular school and should pass a qualifying test in English, Arithmetic and general knowledge, i.e., History and Geography". This recommendation has been accepted in principle by the Government of India.

PURCHASE BY GOVERNMENT OF A BRITISH LINE OPERATING ON THE
COAST OF INDIA, ETC.

575. *Dr. B. S. Moonje: Will Government be pleased to state whether any steps are being taken to give effect to the proposal, which the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee commends as worthy of the serious consideration of the Government of India, of purchasing one of the existing British Lines operating on the coasts of India and of appointing Directors composed of a majority of Indians to control it and also to the system of licences recommended by the Committee?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I would refer the Honourable Member to the debate in this House last March on Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer's Resolution on the recommendations of the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee.

NUMBER OF COASTING VESSELS OWNED BY INDIANS. .

576. *Dr. B. S. Moonje: Will Government be pleased to supply information on the following points:

- (a) How many ships are engaged in the purely coastal trade of India?
- (b) How many of these ships are owned by companies and how many by individual merchants?
- (c) How many of these companies are purely Indian and how many predominantly Indian, how many non-Indians and how many of these individual merchants are Indians?
- (d) Nationalities of the various non-Indian companies with the number of ships each of them possess?
- (e) How many ships Indian Companies possess?
- (f) How many companies or individual merchants as the case may be are given contracts for carrying Government stores and mails and their nationalities?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) to (e). The Government have not the information necessary to answer parts (a) to (e) of this question.

(f) The information so far as it is readily available is being collected and will be communicated to the Honourable Member.

POWERS OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE TO ENACT LAWS FOR THE RESER-
VATION OF THE COASTAL TRADE OF INDIA TO INDIAN VESSELS.

577. *Dr. B. S. Moonje: In view of the doubt, raised by the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee to the effect that the British Merchant Shipping Act of 1924 may stand in the way of the Government of India

giving effect to some of the recommendations of the Committee, will Government be pleased to state if the Law Officers of the Crown have been consulted in the matter, as suggested by the Committee, to ascertain if the doubt is valid or otherwise; and if the doubt raised has been held to be valid, what steps, if any, have been taken to get the said Act suitably amended as recommended by the Committee?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Government of India have consulted His Majesty's Government and have been informed that legislation to give effect to the recommendations referred to in paragraph 46 of the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee's Report would not be *ultra vires* of the Indian Legislature.

PREVENTIVE ORDER UNDER THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE
SECURITY REGULATION, 1922, AGAINST MILAP SING, NEWSPAPER
VENDOR OF PESHAWAR CITY.

578. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** 1. Are Government aware that the Local Government of the North-West Frontier Province issued any order directing Milap Sing, newspaper vendor of Peshawar City, not to remove himself from the North-West Frontier Province except in such manner and by such route as may be prescribed by the Superintendent of Police, Peshawar?

2. Will Government be pleased to state whether the Superintendent of Police, Peshawar City, has, since the date of the aforesaid order, issued any instructions regarding the route by which and the manner in which Milap Sing could remove himself from the North-West Frontier Province whenever he would choose to do so?

3. Is it a fact that Milap Singh is not even permitted to go to his own house and see his people at Peshawar since the date of the above order?

4. Will Government be pleased to state what monthly allowance if any is given to Milap Sing as well as the members of his family for maintenance by the Local Government of the North-West Frontier Province?

5. Did the Government of India or the Local Government of the North-West Frontier Province receive any representation from the Sikh community for the removal of the preventive order against Milap Sing and, if so, what action Government have taken thereon or propose to take in the future?

6. (a) Will Government be pleased to state in detail the special circumstances which led the Local Government of the North-West Frontier Province to pass the aforesaid preventive order against Milap Sing under the North-West Frontier Province Security Regulation, 1922?

(b) Why has the Local Government persisted in keeping the same in force after the passing of the Gurudwara Act and the practical acceptance of it by the Sikhs of the Punjab in general?

Mr. E. B. Howell: Enquiry is being made from the local administration and a reply will be given to the Honourable Member in due course.

Mr. Chaman Lall: Sir, may I know whether the Honourable Member intends to answer a short notice question that I have put?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I think I have told the Legislative Department that I will try and answer it to-morrow if I get the information in time.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Expenditure from Revenue.

DEMAND NO. 1.—RAILWAY BOARD.

Mr. President: The House will now take up the Railway Budget—Second Stage.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,43,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1928, in respect of the ‘Railway Board’.”

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I beg to move:

“That the total amount of the Grant demanded under the head ‘Railway Board’ be omitted.”

My reasons for this motion can be briefly stated.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Leader of the House): Sir, there is a slight point of order here of a minor character, but I think I ought to bring it to your notice for your decision. The rules as they originally stood ran as follows—[rule 48 (2)]—

“Motions may be moved at this stage to omit or reduce any grant.”

This rule has now been changed by the omission of the words “to omit or”.

Sir, a motion to omit a Grant is merely a negative motion and, as a negative motion, cannot be moved as an amendment to the motion that the Grant be made. It is as though on a motion that the Bill be passed, an amendment was put down that the Bill be not passed. That, Sir, would be an inconvenient method of procedure to allow and to meet this the rule has been altered by omitting from rule 48 (2) the words “to omit or”. The rule now reads “to reduce a Grant”. But of course it in no way fetters the House. They can debate it on the point that no Grant should be made, and the decision of the House will of course be taken on the substantive motion that the grant be made. Those who think that the Grant should not be made may vote that it should not be made. It merely brings the procedure in regard to these Grants into line with the ordinary procedure which does not allow a negative motion.

Mr. President: The question that I would like to ask the Home Member is whether he objects to the motion on the ground that it is out of order.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I do not think it is in order to move that the whole Grant be omitted. As I say, the point is met by the provision for discussion on the major question that the Grant be made. My Honourable friend really wishes that the Grant be not made, and I do not think it is necessary for him to move that it be not made. Therefore I do not think myself that that particular motion is in order.

Mr. President: The difficulty that the Chair feels in this connection is that under the provisions of section 87 A (6) the Legislative Assembly may assent or refuse its assent to any Demand or reduce the amount referred to in any demand by a reduction of the whole Grant. That perhaps means

that the Members of this House have got a right to make a motion to reduce the amount referred to in any Demand by a reduction of the whole Grant, which practically means the omission of the whole Grant. If there is any rule which is inconsistent with these provisions, that rule is *ultra vires* in my opinion, and the proper procedure for the Government of India is to get the Government of India Act amended.

Mr. L. Graham (Secretary, Legislative Department): May I suggest that, as I understand your ruling, Sir, the effect of it is that to move for a reduction of the whole Grant is the same as to move for the omission of the whole Grant. Might I draw your attention, Sir, to the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 72D in which it is provided with reference to the Local Council that it may reduce the amount therein referred to either by a reduction of the whole Grant or by the omission or reduction of any of the items of expenditure of which the Grant is composed. May I put it to you, Sir, that the distinction between "omitting" and "reducing" is quite clearly established in that sub-section, and that if we proceed to interpret sub-section 67A (6) as if to reduce were the same as to omit, we shall be in my opinion failing entirely to recognise the distinction. To reduce is to take away part of something, and to omit is to take away the whole of something.

Mr. President: To which section did the Honourable Member refer?

Mr. L. Graham: Sub-section (2) of section 72D.

Mr. President: That section refers to the procedure to be followed in the provincial Councils, while the section I have referred to deals with procedure in connection with the Budget in this Assembly. I should like to know really what is the practice in the House of Commons on this question.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I think, Sir, I should be justified in saying that the Speaker would never allow the direct negative to be moved by way of amendment, but would permit discussion and voting on the substantive proposition. Really this is a very small point. We are not attempting to prevent my Honourable friend from discussing the question of the rejection of the whole Grant. I was merely stating what I thought on the point of order. It is open to my Honourable friend to bring forward the objects of his amendment on Sir Charles Innes's motion, that is to say, to show reasons why no Grant at all should be made.

Mr. President: Ordinarily, the normal rule is that all amendments which are the direct negative of the original motion are out of order, but I cannot get over the provisions of Government of India Act which appear to give express power to any Member of this Legislature to move for the reduction of the amount referred to in any Demand by the reduction of the whole Grant. I should therefore like to be enlightened exactly as to what the practice of the House of Commons on this question is and what is the meaning attached to the words "reduction of the whole Grant" there.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): I can say quite definitely that this sort of motion would not be in order in the House of Commons; they would treat it as a direct negative.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muham-madan Rural): May I cite, Sir, only this much from May's "Parliamentary Practice"?

"The Committee may vote or refuse a grant or may reduce the amount thereof either by a reduction of the whole grant"

[Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar.]

These are the express words of the Statute here:

"or by the omission of reduction of items of expenditure of which the grant is composed."

The Parliamentary rule is perfectly clear on the matter, Sir, and I can read the text of it.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: That is the rule, but at the same time it is perfectly true that the Speaker would not allow such a motion.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: If the Speaker disobeys the rules it is not for us to discuss that here.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: We are not on any matter of substance. It is a matter merely for your decision, Sir. If you hold that my Honourable friend is in order in moving the total omission of the Grant, the skies will not fall down. As you asked me on the point of order whether it was in order under the amended rule, I gave my opinion and I do suggest that really it is not worth while to have a lengthy discussion on it. We are not fighting on the question of any principle. In whichever way it is decided my Honourable friend will be able to bring his motion forward, and therefore, as far as I am concerned, I am quite prepared to leave the matter in your hands, Sir.

Mr. President: The point is important because the same question will again arise in connection with Demands for Grants in the General Budget, and therefore it is necessary to make the position once and for all absolutely clear. To my mind the point is not so unimportant as the Honourable the Home Member thinks. It is necessary that I should give a definite ruling once and for all for the guidance of all concerned.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Standing Order 72 remains intact and it throws a flood of light upon this question which the Honourable the Home Member raised.

Mr. President: That is merely a slip. The Government of India contemplate the amendment of the Standing Order. When they amended the rule they forgot to amend the Standing Order. That is no argument. When the Standing Order is inconsistent with the rule it is *ultra vires*.

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): If this amendment for the omission of the Railway Board Grant is carried, the rest of the amendments desiring to bring forward other points of policy on the Railway Board would, I understand, not come up.

Mr. President: That is so.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: If, however, the procedure suggested by the Honourable the Home Member is adopted, I presume these amendments will have a chance of being moved prior to the whole Demand being rejected. It would be for the convenience of Members if that procedure could be adopted.

Mr. President: The amendment involving the largest out will, according to practice, be taken up first. The next amendment on the agenda is the amendment of Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar involving a cut of the whole amount *minus* Rs. 100; and therefore even if the amendment for the total

omission of the Demand is held to be out of order the other amendment will be taken up. If that is carried, most of the amendments on the paper will automatically drop. That point, therefore, does not carry us any further.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I ask for information on this point, Sir? Sir Alexander Muddiman said that this was a small point and that really we are out here to discuss the substance of the motion that the Honourable Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar wants to move, namely, the rejection of the Demand. If so, Sir, may I enquire whether Sir Alexander Muddiman would consider sub-section (6) of section 87A:

“The Legislative Assembly may assent or refuse its assent to any demand”

The motion before the House is that the Demand be omitted. Suppose we put down a motion that the House do refuse its assent to the demand, would he consider that to be in order?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: No, Sir. The only point that I am contending is that an amendment should not be a pure negative. It is exactly the same as when, to give a concrete example, I move in the House “That this Bill be passed”. In order to oppose that an amendment cannot be put down “that the Bill be not passed.” That is the whole point as far as I can see.

Mr. President: There are so many lawyers in this Assembly and I expected them to help the Chair in this matter. It is not an easy question and I should not like to dispose of it without full consideration. The object which the Honourable Member has in view could well be served by proceeding to the next amendment, which involves a cut of the whole amount minus rupees one hundred. I hope the Honourable Member will not press me here and now to give a ruling because it is a very important question. Will the Honourable Member therefore proceed to the next motion? I should make it perfectly clear that I have given no ruling on this question at present.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Certainly I bow to your ruling, Sir.

The motion that I move is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 9,42,900.”

There is a typographical error, Sir, in the motion as typed.

Mr. President: An error on the Honourable Member's part or an error on the part of the office?

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: The office.

Mr. President: Mr. Graham, the Honourable Member suggests that the office is responsible for the error.

Mr. L. Graham: The office does not type these amendments, but they are done by the Press for which my Honourable friend Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra is responsible.

Mr. President: What I want to know is whether there is an error, no matter by whom.

Mr. L. Graham: If I get the original notice, I will be able to tell you, Sir. I will go and fetch it.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Now, Sir, the subject which is sought to be raised by this motion is of great importance. It has been twice threshed out in this House and that is no reason why it should not again be brought to the notice of the Members of this House as well as of the Government, and that is the only reason why I bring it up again. There is a tendency on the part of some to hold that if once a motion like this is carried and it is not given effect to by Government, there is no use repeating that motion. Members on this side of the House will, I hope, agree with me that that is a very bad precedent. We have got to urge our point of view again and again, both the general point of view and particular points which Members may have got in connection with a motion of this description time and again, till the Government yield to our demands. I do not therefore think that this motion will be looked upon by non-official Members in this House with anything but the sympathy which a motion of this description must deserve at their hands. And I want also to make it perfectly clear that when once according to the rules a Budget is enabled to be framed by the Government in two parts, each part under the rules must be treated as a separate Budget and dealt with according to the rules. Therefore, there is no sanctity connected with the Railway Budget as distinguished from what is known as the General Budget.

Coming to the figures in the Railway Budget, it is clear that the railway administration is responsible for controlling at least as large a revenue and as large an expenditure as are comprised in the General Budget, and the interests involved are political, administrative and economic. The implications of the railway administration are of so far-reaching and permanent importance that it is impossible that anything but a motion of this description can satisfactorily concentrate attention upon the various grievances, and above all the capital grievance as to the hopelessly unsatisfactory character of the constitution and the composition of the Railway Board. Just as a motion to omit the Demand under the Executive Government is as appropriate a way as any other of drawing attention to the imperfect system of government and the administration generally, a motion to direct attention to the grave irregularities, and more than irregularities, to the grave impropriety of continuing a Railway Board of this description is as urgently called for, as the Railway Board takes the place, under the Railway Board Act of 1905, of the Government of India. It is a thousand pities that that Act was passed, but we have got it and the Railway Board claims to be the delegate of the Government of India and as paramount as the Government of India. I do not know that there is any other occasion than this, upon which to press before the House the point of view for which I stand, namely, that the railway administration should certainly be a transferred subject in the hands of a Minister, and it should not be controlled as it is controlled at the present moment. The Railway Board, for instance, as has been repeatedly said on more than one occasion, by Pandit Motilal Nehru in 1925, and Mr. Jamnadas Mehta last year, is a wholly irresponsible body. It may be responsible to the Government of India, but it is certainly not responsible to the Legislature, and in addition to that we find that the powers are all delegated to the Government without any statutory safeguards. The gravest defects of the present system of administration and of legislation in India, which are alike applicable to the railway administration and general administration are these. Not only do we vote always more money than the Government or railway administration needs, but we allow rule-making powers to flourish unabated. Notifications are issued and rules are made by Government.

The Executive Government or Railway Board becomes a subordinate legislature directly subordinate to the Indian Legislature; but they issue rules and notifications and the whole legislation of the country takes place under the auspices of the Executive Government. Rules are not placed before the Legislature before they are adopted; notifications are not placed before the Legislature before they are adopted; superior appointments, that is, Chief Commissioner, Financial Commissioner, Members of the Railway Board, and other first class appointments are not placed before the Legislature before they are adopted by the Government. The Legislature has no opportunity of discussing questions of policy in connection with appointments. When, according to the division of functions which may be accepted, a legislature cannot directly make appointments, it does control appointments by exercising supervision over the executive. Here neither the executive nor the Railway Board can be brought up properly before it.

Mr. L. Graham: With your permission, Sir, may I, before the Honourable Member goes further into his speech, read out the original motion:

“ I beg to move :

‘ That the Demand under the head ‘ Railway Board ’ (pages 1—2) be reduced to Rs. 9,42,900 ’ .”

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: I am sorry it is a typographical error on my part. It should be “ by Rs. 9,42,900.”

Mr. President: The Honourable Member admits that it is his mistake and not of the Department or the Press.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Sir, I wish to present before the House two aspects of this railway administration. One aspect is that this Railway Board cannot be regarded, as the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, the Commerce Member, claims it to be, as a technical and expert body.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): May I rise to a point of order, Sir. What is the motion before the House? Is it to be reduced to or by?

Mr. President: By.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: It has been corrected now?

Mr. President: Yes.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: I was about to impress upon the House and Government the point that the Railway Board cannot be regarded as a technical board. What the Incheape Committee said was that the Railway Board should be treated as a business body, which is quite a different thing from its being described as a technical and expert body; but apart from these words, whether it is to be described as a technical body or a business body, it goes without saying that the centre of gravity in the railway administration is with the Railway Board. In the nature of things it is impossible that the policy can lie in the hands of the Commerce Member or the Government of India. The policy of railway administration must be entirely in the hands of this Railway Board. No doubt the same general supervision by the Government, as in the case of other departments, may exist, but that general supervision does not preclude the direct control of railway administration by this Railway Board in all matters and aspects.

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar.]

I submit also that the differentiation which is sought to be made between railway administration and other general administration, namely, that the railway administration must be treated as a commercial concern or a commercial department does not carry the Government further, for I understand that the Commerce Member represents the Department of Commerce, and Commerce comes under general administration and not under railway administration, and the fact that the railway is treated as a commercial business, the railway administration as a commercial business, does not invest it with greater immunity from the criticisms of this House, nor does it enable this House to regard the railway administration as unfettered by all those obligations which it is the duty of this House to impose upon every branch of the administration. Having regard to the fact that nearly 125 crores, as I understand, are controlled by this railway administration, and having regard to the fact that it is not in the hands of a Minister responsible to this House directly, it is all the more incumbent upon this Legislature to omit this Grant which is now demanded by the Government.

In 1925 my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru moved to omit this Grant. That motion was lost on that occasion, but a token motion to reduce it by Rs. 100 was adopted by this House on the ground that there were grievances connected with this Railway Board. Then, last year, my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta made the same motion as that for which the motion I am making is a substitute, and that motion, after a full discussion in this House, was carried. Nevertheless, after these two motions, what is the progress which the Railway Board and the Government supervising the Railway Board have made in connection with the railway administration? I do not think in any important branch of railway administration you can say that you have made substantial progress. For instance the most important matter that was urged on both occasions and that was made an integral part in the words of an Honourable Member of this House of what has been called the convention Resolution of September, 1924, was the appointment of Indians as members of the Board and the rapid Indianisation of the railway services. These two matters remain very much where they were. Even if it can be said that a few more appointments have been made in the superior railway services, I think, having regard to the total number of superior officers, it cannot be said that the increase that has been made during these years is anything but of the most negligible and contemptible description. So far as the Railway Board itself is concerned, my grievances and the grievances of this House are far graver. It was made a part of the convention that Indians should be appointed as members of the Railway Board as early as possible

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Not a part of the convention.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: I think it was a part of the convention.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: It was an annex to the convention.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Unless the Chair says otherwise, I am not going to submit to any derailment. Clause (1) of the convention, apart from the whole convention, says this Assembly further recommends that the railway services should be rapidly Indianized and further that Indians should be appointed as Members of the Railway Board as early as possible. . . .

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: That is not part of the convention.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: "Apart from the convention."

An Honourable Member: That is part of the Resolution.

Mr. President: Order, order.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: I hope I shall be able to take care of myself. Sir, I find both parts of the Resolution are, as required by the rules, mere recommendations. Clauses (1) to (9) of the Convention are only recommendations, "This Assembly recommends," and clauses (1) and (2) are also further recommendations. When you say, "Apart from the above Convention, this Assembly further recommends," it is part of the same document, and I say it is a further convention, and it was regarded as a further convention. Whether you call it an annexure, or call it an appendix or anything, it does not in the least matter, the substance of it is there and it was done at the same time and is an integral part of it

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: And it was adopted by the House as a whole, including the officials.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: I find, Sir, that the President of the Legislative Assembly put the whole of this motion as one motion:

"The question is that the amended Resolution, as moved by Sir Henry Moncrieff Smith, and as subsequently amended by the House, be adopted."

The whole of it is adopted as one Resolution and can be found at pages 3869 and 3870 of the Debates of this Assembly in 1924. Call it a proviso, call it a rider, call it another clause or a separate section, it does not in the least matter, it is as much a part of the convention. It is perfectly true that Sir Charles Innes, when this was adopted, did not raise any objection to it because I understand the whole of this Resolution was the subject of negotiation and was adopted by the House as a whole and Sir Charles Innes did say he did not bind himself to the dates. "I cannot bind myself to dates," he said. But that is the Resolution of the House. I am not concerned with what Sir Charles Innes said, I am only dealing with the Resolution of the House, which when it is adopted and the Member of Government does not vote against it, I take it is binding upon him as much as upon everybody else. Of course, even if he votes in favour of it, it is only a recommendation and can always be set at naught by the Government, but that is quite a different matter. I find the Honourable the President when he was a Member saying in the debate in 1925, on page 1509 of the debates:

"An integral part of this so-called Convention Resolution of last year was that Indians should be appointed on the Railway Board."

I have that high authority also. But, Sir, apart from this digression, I submit it is not by any technical evasions of this character that the Government can seek to escape from their obligations. That is not a right thing; that is not a proper thing; that is certainly not a just thing. Let us look at the substance of what this Resolution promised. It is true that Sir Basil Blackett promised to weight the scales in favour of Indians when the time came. No doubt he was unable to be a prophet on that occasion. He said he could not prophesy, but he would weight the scales, and we did wait, and when the next vacancy occurred we did not see any

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar.]

weighting of the scales in favour of Indians. Sir Charles Innes mentioned Sir Basil Blackett's promise to weight the scales definitely in favour of Indians when the next vacancy occurred and treated that as an assurance, and such an assurance as the House should be able to accept. Nevertheless, Sir, when the vacancy did occur, the vacancy passed by and no Indian was appointed. It was not stated that there were no Indians who could be appointed. Of course that is a proposition which we on this side of the House are never, I hope, going to accept. I do not suppose any Indian can accept that position. Can it reasonably be said that there are no Indians of experience in railway matters or in service or no Indians who are retired officials who are competent to fill these posts with considerable ability? I think this is really a matter, Sir, which requires far more attention than has been bestowed upon it. To have the House trifled with by the Government in this fashion for three years I say is certainly a matter which requires the severest possible condemnation by us of the Railway Board and of the Government. Sir, I do not agree that it is a technical body; I do agree that it is a business body. A Government also is a business body and this business body can certainly have Indians on it, and I think that it is not only one Indian that should be appointed; the majority of the Members of the Railway Board should be Indians, and unless at least half the Members of the Board are Indians it cannot be said that the railway policy is at all controlled in any way by Indians. The increasing association of Indians with the administration in all its aspects which is in the Preamble to the Government of India Act is rendered nugatory. What is the use then of giving power to this Legislature to refuse its assent to any Demand when we do not exercise that power on such an occasion as this? His Excellency the Governor-General told us the other day very properly that this House ought to assume a responsibility greater than is expressed in the Statute. Now, Sir, this responsibility is expressed in the Statute and that responsibility is to refuse assent to any Demand. The Government of India Act, therefore, contemplates that the whole of a Demand can be refused, and I submit there can be no better reasons than the reasons to which I have just adverted. For the reason that there is no sufficient number of Indians on the Railway Board and the Government have not observed—I will not say their promises because we are not concerned here with their promises—but the Resolutions of this House: they have not carried out the Resolutions of this House and for that reason they deserve censure and this is the most appropriate way of censuring the Government in that matter.

Then again, Sir, I submit the Railway Board must be regarded as responsible for the railway administration along with the Government. Now the railway administration in no aspect of it can be said to be improving. We must render our thanks for the small mercies of the Raven Committee. It has been said that the Railway Board appointed the Raven Committee, that they were very frank about it and courageous about it, but of course all this would mean further expenditure. It is easy to admit facts, it is easy to admit mistakes when there is no other way of covering up inefficiency, maladministration and gross breach of trust. According to the answer given to a question put by my Honourable friend Mr. Kelkar on the 23rd January 1927, 30,000 wagons were found to be superfluous. We heard the other day that they were superfluous only

because of the monsoon season or the non-busy season but that in the busy season all of them would be employed.

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): They did not say all.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: Some of them would be employed. The answer which is printed at page 211 of the debates is of a most unsatisfactory character; and the answer really accumulates the grievance because while on the one hand they have been spending 60 to 75 crores during the last 5 years in the improvement of marshalling yards, terminal facilities and better marshalling yards, the reduction of idle hours of wagons and the reduction by doubling of tracts and adoption of new rails and strengthening of tracts and bridges enabling the carrying capacity of vehicles to be increased, it appears that while they spent 60 to 75 crores during the last 5 years, we find that as a matter of fact, on the other hand, they have gone in for a surplus of wagons, 30,000 wagons. This shows the grossest extravagance. Now, supposing a Board composed exclusively of Indian officials were in charge of railway administration, what would have been the result? The physical approval which the rising hopes of the Government party on the other side so often manifest on the somewhat flimsy wood* of these tables would certainly manifest itself much more loudly whenever they found Indians going wrong. But is this not an occasion when the other side should see that notwithstanding their boasted efficiency, there is the grossest mismanagement spread over years when their attention is drawn to it? Is that not an indictment? Is that not a most eloquent commentary which comes to our rescue when we have got to tell them that we are as fit as they to control the railway administration? The Honourable Sir Charles Innes said yesterday that they cannot carry out any constructive work without mistakes. That is the same thing which we frequently say when we are charged with our mistakes. We say we are carrying out our constructive work and if we make mistakes we say also it is by making mistakes that one learns. But it is grotesque for a Government which claims great efficiency, which claims that Indians are always lower in efficiency than England-trained officials, which claims all this and more—I say it is grotesque for them to say that they are making mistakes. After all the experience, after all the technical knowledge, after all your mechanical engineers and your chief engineers and various other things, for you to admit that you make mistakes, after your wonderful system of auditing and your wonderful system of store-keeping—which by the way according to the Raven Committee needs the most drastic revision—after all that for you to say that you are making mistakes is the most thorough exposure of yourselves. And if the Honourable Sir Charles Innes said all these wise things, it was only because he had to make a virtue of necessity. The errors were too palpable for words, and it was impossible to camouflage them any further or any longer. I submit, therefore, Sir, that the time has come when we should again repeat our condemnation of this system and that we should ask for a drastic revision of this Railway Board and a drastic revision of its composition and also that the railway policy should be brought up by means of specific Resolutions frequently before the House and not simply during the debate on the Budget. That is the only way in which control over this railway administration can be exercised by this House. I do not propose to refer to what was referred to by my

[Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar.]

Honourable friends on this side of the House in connection with the stocks of stores. It is there in black and white at page 81 of the Raven Committee's Report. It is nothing short of a scandal that they should have thrown away stores under the pretext that they were reducing the stock for purposes of accounts. We have already had that. Not only that, but we have had many other grievances. The railwaymen's grievances are there in plenty and those grievances have brought about unusual disturbances at this time of the year when they should not. We are interested directly in preventing strikes and disturbances. It is not simply as Indians that we want railwaymen's pay increased, but we want the capital to earn money properly and if there are these unusual disturbances and the railways are dislocated then the railways lose their earnings and the capital at large loses the interest which ought to come to it. And therefore we are all the more interested in seeing that the railway administration is made far more efficient. Of course it is perfectly true that you cannot all of a sudden increase railwaymen's wages by an enormous amount; but has any serious attempt been made to deal with these railwaymen's grievances? And after all is not the contentment of the employees the best proof of the efficiency and the skill of the railway administration? And if you find that in a business season like this the railwaymen go out on strike on a large scale and traffic facilities are dislocated, is that not a reason for saying that there must be something rotten in the railway administration? I dismiss with contempt the suggestion that people on this side of the House or their friends outside the House go and instigate people to riot or to go out on a strike. I think no Indian really cares to do it, and if there are any, they must be very few indeed. Is it supposed that responsibility is confined to one side of the House and we are not responsible people as if we have no interest in the country and people who have come over here have got interest in the country? It is adding insult to injury to say that they are trustees for us and it is they alone that can look to the interests of this country. We are as much in a position to look after the interests of this country. We have an equal right to make pronouncements on our very many grievances and it is the duty of the Government, if they are really to be the executive carrying out the behests of the Legislature,—to remember that the Legislature is not here merely to register the decrees of the Executive Government. If that is the fashion in which the ordered progress of the constitution is to be marked I submit it would be a tragedy. It is quite clear that that should be the case, if my Honourable friends on the other side want co-operation from Members on this side of the House. Therefore, I would say that they must accept most cheerfully this motion which I have made and they should even welcome and vote in favour of it in order to show that that humility, that real spiritual humility which comes of grace is also not lacking in them. Then only the confession that they have made mistakes can be accepted as true, but if you say, "I have made mistakes but still I resist this motion to reduce this Grant" then we are entitled to question the propriety of a statement like that. I therefore ask the House to look at this motion in the spirit in which it is made, namely, that the Indian point of view has not been kept at all in connection with the railway administration either in the matter of the constitution of the Board or the powers of the Board, or of the powers of this Legislature, or of the way in which the railway policy is controlled. And

Indian point of view is not kept in the sorry tale of extravagance whether in the case of wagons or of stores or any other case, staff quarters for instance. The Indian point of view is not kept in the matter of the railwaymen's grievances either. Therefore, for all these reasons I say that the railway administration in India still remains a wholly foreign administration, an alien administration out of touch, out of all sympathy and it is not at all suited to the needs of this country and to the aspirations and the requirements of the people and therefore this cut which is a substitute for the motion to omit the Grant should be adopted by the House also with the concurrence of the Government. Just as they accepted the convention Resolution this should be accepted by them. This must be the convention till they put Indians on the Railway Board. To say that as early as possible they will do it and then put it off for three years as they have done is not right. I must go to some new English dictionary for the purpose of finding out the meaning of "as early as possible". Of course, the words are there, I suppose, for the purpose of concealing thought, but I am sure that my Honourable friends on the other side did not use those words when they were adopted, for the purpose of concealing thought. Therefore, they must face the facts that the Indians are aroused enough and that they will insist upon their rights and the time has come for Government to yield to those rights and with good will submit to the inevitable and accept the motion in the spirit in which it is made. If co-operation is offered on the one side co-operation can be accepted on the other. I find that there was a chorus of congratulations to the Honourable Member in charge. I have not the privilege of an acquaintance with Sir Charles Innes, nor have I had the doubtful privilege of having been in the Assembly during the last two Sessions.

Mr. M. Rethnaswamy (Nominated: Indian Christians): You have the privilege now.

Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar: I will only add that before he goes he can put the coping stone upon the convention Resolution by recommending to Government to accept this motion.

Mr. H. G. Cocke (Bombay: European): Sir, I do not know whether the Honourable gentleman who has just sat down intended to make a serious speech or a humorous speech, but he has certainly failed to carry very much conviction to this House,—(Some Honourable Members: "Question?") judging by the manner in which it was received. The Honourable Member seeks to reduce the Demand for the Railway Board by the whole of the amount except Rs. 100. But his chief aim appears to be to substitute his friends on the Railway Board for the present incumbents. Does he suggest that they will be prepared to work for Rs. 100? (An Honourable Member: "Certainly.") If he wishes the Railway Board abolished I did not hear him suggest any alternative. He merely suggested that those carrying out the work to-day are not suitable and therefore I suggest that the amount by which he seeks to reduce this Demand is rather absurd. There is another aspect of this question which was just touched upon by my Honourable and gallant friend, Colonel Crawford, earlier in the morning. If a cut of this large amount is put down and debated seriously we gain nothing by it whether it is passed or whether it is thrown out. We are deprived of the right of really offering useful criticisms of the Railway Board by discussing short motions in connection with points arising. Therefore it seems to me that Honourable

[Mr. H. G. Cocke.]

Members on the other side should endeavour not to move these large cuts if they really wish that the budget work of this House should be seriously considered.

The Honourable Member said that Indians were available, that there were Indians who could fill posts with considerable utility to the country, and he also said, "we are as fit as you." The whole point is that the railway management in this country wants the best men obtainable. We know that we have recently lost two men of considerable ability. It is not easy to replace those men even by Europeans or Americans or by anybody else. Honourable Members may remember that some years ago the Great Eastern Railway took over as their managing director, an American. Considerable opposition was raised at the time to that, but I believe the appointment was amply justified. In the Railway Finance Committee the other day in connection with Sir Robert McLean's departure, I put the question to the Financial Commissioner whether it would have been possible, had we desired to do it, to bring in an American, or a Frenchman, or an European of any sort, on a salary of Rs. 10,000 a month if we thought it a commercial proposition to do so. And I was told that it could not be possible under our present rules and that the maximum pay that we could pay to anybody, however efficient, was Rs. 3,500 plus an allowance of another Rs. 1,000. That point was taken up by a Bombay paper in a leading article which I was reading last night and it is stated there as the conviction of the writer that this sort of thing must cease if the Indian Railways are to get the best men. Of course, if you do not want the best men and if you consider that the Railways could be run by appointing men with a few years' experience, then, I am sorry for the future of the Indian Railways, because I am perfectly satisfied myself that it is a job for the specialist, for the expert, and the number of men who are fitted to step into the shoes of people who are leaving after a very considerable number of years' experience in this country is, I say, very limited indeed.

The Honourable Member also stated that a more frequent reference should be made to this House in connection with railway matters. He appeared to desire that this House should become a sort of a Board of Directors. I think nothing more terrible could happen than that this House should be constantly consulted in connection with the administration of Railways. Annually there is ample opportunity, provided large cuts are not put down to prevent criticisms as in this case, but annually, apart from that, there is ample scope and time for criticism of railway matters. The suggestion that this House should go into committee throughout the year to avoid strikes is one which, I am afraid, would have a very serious effect. It is one of the evils of State management that strikes and labour matters are open to discussion in an Assembly of this sort. Whatever Honourable Members may say who are interested in labour, there is no question whatever that it is not the right way to deal with labour matters or strikes, by debate in this Assembly.

Maulvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Before recording my vote against the motion proposed by my Honourable friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, I owe it to myself to make my position clear as to why I am going to adopt this attitude. Sir, I

quite agree with the Honourable the Mover of the motion that our grievance against the Railway Board in not appointing at least one Indian on that body and their attitude in not making appreciable progress in the way of Indianisation are certainly quite valid and genuine and this attitude of the Railway Board calls for a strong protest and censure on the part of this House. Sir, I am quite prepared to record my vote in favour of motions of this character when they will be discussed in the House but I do not find myself in a position to vote for a motion which amounts to a refusal of Grants and which encourages or invites the Governor General in Council to use his power of certification. I consider it detrimental in the best interests of the country to encourage the Governor General in Council to use the special and emergency powers which are vested in him by the Government of India Act. I do not see what real good motions like this can do to the country. These motions have now become something like annual fixtures, something like the flower show or the horse show at Delhi. Really we must go on protesting and we must try to protect our interests or we must go on ventilating our grievances year after year, month after month and day by day. But, Sir, the methods of ventilating our grievances and making our demands must be more reasonable and more dignified than the way which this motion proposes. With these remarks I oppose the motion.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I rise at an early stage of the debate more for the purpose of disillusioning my friend Mr. Cocke and others who perhaps share the same opinion with him. He was not sure whether the motion was moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar seriously or in a light-hearted way. Now, Sir, if the meaning and purport of a motion is to be judged by the language which is employed, if it is to be judged by the manner in which it is urged, then I say there could be no reasonable doubt in the mind of any one who is inclined to take a serious view of the subject about the sincerity and seriousness of the speaker. Apart from that, the subjects which he has touched upon are subjects which as my friend the Honourable Mr. Cocke will come to know by and by are by no means a bouquet of flowers for the Railway Board. They will very soon feel rather scared by them. (*An Honourable Member*: "They don't.") Well, let me examine how far they are impenetrable to good feelings. At any rate the House will feel it and that is all I care for. The Honourable Mr. Cocke said "What is the use of talking of Indian members. We want the best men." I suppose by that we are to take it that the persons whom we have got now are the best possible men that you could get. And, Sir, what is the surest test of it? To see what they have done. Have they done anything which entitles them even to the compliment of being average business men who know anything about their business? I shall in a moment satisfy the House. I may be unable to satisfy the Benches opposite, but I am perfectly certain that I shall satisfy the greater part of this House and specially this side of the House that the one thing in which the Railway Board have distinguished themselves is utter incompetence and gross negligence and I propose to establish that. I will only take one point in the railway administration or maladministration as it should be properly called. Yesterday we were engaged in the general discussion of the Railway Budget. In the course of that many sins of omission and commission on the part of the Railway Board were brought

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

to the notice of the House. To-day in the course of this debate and the debate on the various Demands, I am sure further sins of omission and commission will be brought out, but the one which has only been noticed in passing by the Honourable Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, namely, that relating to the surplus of wagons now on hand, beats all others. What are the facts? I see my Honourable friend Sir Clement Hindley smiling at that remark. Well, Sir, before I demonstrate the inefficiency of the Railway Board, let me dispose of a few preliminary things that have been said. Let me dispose of my friend Maulvi Muhammad Yakub whom I may forget in the heat of the argument later on. He has given an early indication of the inclination of his own mind to the House. He says "I am going to vote against this motion and I do not want to keep it a secret from the House why I am going to do so." He agrees in the complaints, in the existence of grievances, but he adopts what, no doubt according to him, is the more statesmanlike course of not objecting to the whole Grant but of concentrating attention upon the grievances on a minor Grant. He says "If you go on like this, it becomes an annual fixture like the flower show". But may I ask, if we go on year after year making small cuts, half a dozen cuts or two dozen cuts, bringing out grievance by grievance and deducting Rs. 100, what would that be? Would it not be as annual a show as this is? If we lend ourselves to such childish display, that would be a Punch and Judy show and nothing else. Now, the serious argument—and it is a wonder to me that Honourable Members can seriously entertain such ideas—the very serious argument which was very much applauded on that side of the House was, what is the use of inviting certification by His Excellency the Governor General? You know that if you cut the whole of this Demand it is bound to be certified. Well, what of that? Are we to regulate our reason, are we to regulate our argument, are we to regulate our action in this House as representatives of the people by what His Excellency the Governor General might be pleased to do or not to do? Are we not here seriously to put forward the grievances of those whom we represent irrespective of what my friend Colonel Crawford or anybody else might think or might do?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I agree with you.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: If my friend's argument is pursued to its logical conclusion what will be the result? The Government may come year after year with the most grotesque demands and my friends will say, "Oh, don't cut them down, otherwise they will be certified by His Excellency". And therefore, the fear of certification must keep you back from speaking out your mind. Sir, I do not subscribe to that doctrine. I am rather for speaking out boldly and openly and I say here that the Railway Board is not entitled to a farthing of this Demand. (Applause.) Then there was another remark made by my friend the Honourable Mr. Cocke. He said, "Why has he retained the hundred rupees? Does the Honourable Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar expect Indian members of the Board to serve on a hundred rupees?" No, Sir. I do not know which to admire most, the inability of my friend the Honourable Mr. Cocke to understand whether my friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar was serious or not, or his great penetration of judgment and his great understanding of the rules under which cuts are made. He is under the impression that we who ask for the omission of a Demand—because it is tantamount to the omission of the Demand—

must be prepared to find four or five members of the Railway Board to serve the country for nothing. That would be the logical end of the argument. Nothing of the kind. What we say is this, that the present Railway Board and the present railway administration is so unsatisfactory that the only way to censure it properly is to cut down the whole of the allowance under that head, because that is the most effective way, the most clear way in which we can signify our disapproval and our dissatisfaction.

Now with these few remarks upon the things that were said quite apart from the main point, I come to the one point upon which I beg to call the attention of this House. It was touched upon by my friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, but of course he had to deal with a large number of points and I think it is necessary for me to supplement his remarks upon that particular point because the House will not be able exactly to comprehend the enormity of the offence—I call it offence advisedly—of the Railway Board in the matter of wagons. Sir, until yesterday it was an admitted fact that there were 80,000 surplus wagons for which there was no use.

Mr. H. G. Cocke: No immediate use.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: That is an improvement by the Honourable Mr. Cocke. What was said was that there was no use for them during the monsoon months, which have gone now and there is no question of immediate use in that. What was said yesterday was that for years—that fact is admitted—it had been felt that there was a surplus, and in order to make that point clear I shall refer to the answer given by the Honourable Mr. Parsons to the question put by Mr. Kelkar on the 31st of January. The question was:

“Will the Government be pleased to explain how they came to have a surplus of 30,000 wagons as mentioned by Sir Clement Hindley in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Agriculture?”

The answer of the Honourable Mr. Parsons was:

“The information given by Sir Clement Hindley to the Royal Commission in October, 1926,”

—In October 1926, I stress that—

. . . “was that there was no foundation for a complaint of shortage of wagons inasmuch as owing to improved methods of working there had been something like 30,000 wagons more than the number required for working the traffic for the previous three months.”

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The monsoon season.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I am coming to that. The genius of Sir Charles Innes has discovered that the three months previous to October are the monsoon months:

“The number of course fluctuates from day to day, and it was not suggested that there will always be this number of wagons in excess of daily requirements. Apart from a falling off in traffic, the surplus is due to improvements made in the working of railways and also to additional facilities provided during the past few years.”

The past few years! Then he gives us the main factors which have contributed to the surplus. Now this answer was given long after the monsoon

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

had come and gone. We do not find in that list of factors given here that the monsoon also had some part to play in the matter of this surplus. But of course, as I have said, that discovery was made only yesterday because the three months previous to October, 1926, were, as we all know, monsoon months.

Now, Sir, what was the modification given yesterday? What was the alteration in the answer? It was said that that was due to the monsoon, and that now all but about 5,000 wagons are in use. Now, Sir, that I take at the very lowest as an admission that in this busy season there are 5,000 wagons standing idle in the yards, and therefore that at the very least there is a surplus of 5,000 wagons. Now leaving aside everything else I ask the House to consider what this surplus means. That surplus means this, and if you understand what the cost of these 5,000 wagons is. In answer to a question put by Mr. Kelkar on the same day it was stated that the cost was Rs. 5,170 per wagon. Now, taking it roughly at Rs. 5,000 per wagon the surplus of 5,000 wagons means two and a half crores of rupees sunk and gone to the bad. (*Several Honourable Members*: "No, no.") I do not understand. If my arithmetic is all right, I am all right. I say, Sir, that two and a half crores have been thrown away. I mean 5,000 wagons—Rs. 2½ crores—2½ crores of rupees which they could have done without spending; at the very least I can put it at that. There were some observations made yesterday on this side of the House as to the lowest wages that were allowed to Indian workmen, and my friend, the Honourable Mr. Prakasam, took some pains to compare those wages with those prevailing in other countries. The answer which my Honourable friend, Sir Charles Innes, gave was—"I invite Mr. T. Prakasam to go with me to his own lands and to show me if there is anybody who gets more wages than that." Now I say, if you can afford to throw away 2½ crores of rupees on something which you do not want now, on something which you may or may not want in future, can you not spend a crore or at least a few lakhs on raising the wages, the starvation wages, of these poor men? (Hear, hear.) But I do not admit that it has been proved that there are only 5,000 wagons standing idle. It may be that they are moving about: we have no data to judge what service is being taken from these wagons, whether they are necessary or not. We know as a fact that in October, 1926, it was stated that something like 30,000 wagons were standing idle. After October the point was noted, the fact was made public, and since then it is the easiest thing in the world to set them rolling about in several directions, in many directions. What data have we to say that a proper use is being made of these wagons? (Hear, hear.) They may simply be shifting from one station to another. It is not, Sir, that I am suggesting this as a thing which does not occur to the Railway Board: things like that have occurred to the Railway Board, as was pointed out yesterday, by my Honourable friend in regard to the stores. There was a reduction of stores. They were moving from one place to another and they were thus reduced. It may be said that we are over-suspicious; but when we are treated in the manner in which we have been treated, what can we do, when we are able to lay our hands upon a particular thing? Here on your own confession you are having 30,000 wagons standing idle! Why did you spend that 15 crores of rupees if they were not wanted? The last answer to that was—the monsoon. Well, Sir, the monsoon is a thing which comes every year and goes away every year; but let us see what were the causes which were attributed for

this surplusage by Mr. Parsons. I will not read the whole of it, but I will give you the catchwords:

- (1) Reduction in the time occupied in repairing wagons.
- (2) Strengthening of tracks and bridges.
- (3) Improved marshalling yards.
- (4) Reduction of train mileage.
- (5) Extension of the use of telephone train control.
- (6) Increased speed of trains owing to the extended use of vacuum brakes.
- (7) Gradual elimination of low capacity wagons.
- (8) System of pooling collieries.

Now, Sir, let us closely examine this situation. These are the very improvements which along with the purchase of wagons formed the subject of the Rs. 150 crore programme. Any business man knowing his business who was engaged simultaneously upon all these enterprises should have worked out what the progress on one line would lead to in another, or whether these eight things that have been going hand in hand ever since the year 1919 or 1920, all these things would have arrived at the development at which they are now alleged to have arrived, namely, to the extent that they reduce the number of wagons required. All these things have been going hand in hand, side by side, and it takes the Railway Board, this efficient body of men, this very practical body of men, to discover that all of a sudden they find 30,000 wagons on hand. What was this due to? Oh, it must be due to the monsoon! I say, Sir, that it is a most hopeless incompetence which is involved and implied in practical men, business men, doing special classes of business, not being able to foresee what the result of the development in one class of business would be upon the other class as the years go by. Then, again, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that from the year 1919 or 1920 to the 30th September, 1926, no less than 61,976 wagons were purchased, and out of these I understand that not more than 6,000 were purchased in India, all the rest coming from England, so that we have nearly 6,000 wagons purchased in India and about 55,000 wagons purchased in England, and we find in October, 1926, that the number of surplus wagons is 30,000. Now in June, 1926, four months before October, what do we find? We find the Railway Board taking sanction from the Standing Finance Committee for Railways for the purchase of 5,515 additional wagons (Laughter), which shows that the Railway Board was in blissful ignorance as to what was happening, as to the causes which were contributing to lesser and lesser purchases of wagons.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons (Financial Commissioner, Railways): When I placed that particular issue before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, I explained very carefully to them that we were at the time engaged in examining what our wagon requirements would be; that in any case we would not require more than that number of wagons; and that quite possibly we should not be spending all the money. As I had no suitable opportunity of meeting them again and putting the matter before them, I could not explain to them that the actual money for general service wagons which they then allowed would not be spent.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: My point is that up till June, 1926, the Railway Board was in blissful ignorance of the true state of things. Then in 1926 they were only just enquiring as to how things stood and if they came to know later on that they did not want any wagons they would not spend the money. That was very gracious indeed. But is it the way in which the Railway Board is expected to do its business? Are they just simply after years of purchasing from outside, not even in India, to say "Let us now see how matters stand. It may be we are purchasing more wagons than are necessary." That was in June. Four months later they find as a result of enquiries that they have as a matter of fact 30,000 wagons on hand. I do not say that the money has been spent. But what I charge the Railway Board with is extreme negligence and thorough incompetence. No body of people who know their business and who go about it in a business way could possibly have been in ignorance of the fact that in June when they were asking for sanction for 5,000 more wagons there was really a surfeit of wagons. Of course my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes said that it was impossible to do constructive work without committing *bona fide* mistakes. Now, I have had a good deal to do with that expression "*bona fide*".

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I did not say "*bona fide*".

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I was giving more credit to my friend than he deserved. Now, let us take it that the mistakes were not *bona fide* mistakes. Not being *bona fide* mistakes, they are less defensible. And I ask, what does it show? It again shows their incompetence. Either they were *bona fide* mistakes or mistakes which a man who knows nothing about his work will commit. Now, Sir, this is not the only aspect. There is yet another aspect. That aspect is taking 15 crores of rupees out of the pockets of the tax-payer to invest them in wagons which were not required, and by the exercise of ordinary diligence, ordinary business prudence, the Railway Board ought to have discovered it was unnecessary to lock up the money in these 30,000 or more wagons.

There is yet another aspect of the question, and that relates to the wagon industry of India. Now, Sir, it is a very painful story. The history of this begins with the communiqué of 1918. I will not weary the House by reading long extracts, but I will only read just a few sentences. The Government communiqué, dated the 1st March, 1918, states:

"The Government of India have recently had under consideration methods of making India more independent of outside sources in the supply of railway materials. One case in particular which they have recently examined in consultation with the Indian Engineering Association and Railway Administration is the construction of wagons in India; and, as the result of enquiries they have made, they are now able to announce that they will guarantee to purchase in India 2,500 broad gauge and 500 metre or narrow gauge wagons annually for ten years."

That was the solemn and definite guarantee given on the 1st of March, 1918.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Cancelled in 1924.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I shall come to that. Now, let us just see. My friend can calculate how many months before October will be the monsoon. I can also make a little calculation. My little calculation is that on the 1st of March, 1918, the War was still going on. The Armistice came only in November, 1918; and of course we know all the promises that were made to this country in war time. What happened to these promises after that? And the explanation why that guarantee was cancelled in 1924

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: When we passed the Steel Bill.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I am coming to that too. That was the guarantee, and then what was said was:

"The aggregate requirements of Indian railways will certainly be more than 3,000 wagons a year; and once the Indian production of wagons is established on a satisfactory basis, there is every reason to hope that an increasing proportion of orders will be placed in India."

That was in 1918. Then we come to 1921; and in 1921 there was another communiqué which said:

"In pursuance of their expressed policy of making India as far as possible independent of outside sources in the supply of materials, the Government of India have had under consideration the question of the construction of Locomotive Engines in India, and they are now in a position to give a general undertaking that tenders will be invited annually in India for all the railway locomotives and locomotive boilers required by Government during the 12 years commencing with 1923."

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: That was after the War. 1921 was not war time.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Because in those days I referred my Honourable friend to the chapter on locomotives in the First Report of the Tariff Board. There they have shown that English manufacturers could not manufacture at a price at which they could be manufactured here and in fact they were driven to the expedient of selling below cost price.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muham-
madan): Unemployment in England had not then commenced.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Then came the Report of the Railway Industries Committee. That was in 1922-23. And what they said was this:

"It will now be clear why our Chairman decided that we must await the Fiscal Commission's report before submitting our own report. For we see no escape from the conclusion that the industries which we are now discussing, if they are to be developed—or rather kept alive—in India, must temporarily get some form of protection or assistance from Government. . . . We do not think that any useful purpose would be served by our going on to examine the further question whether special measures should be taken to develop these industries, as, for instance, by guaranteeing them orders at a price at which they can work, even though that price may exceed the price admissible under Rule 10 of the Stores Rules. . . . The only recommendation, therefore, which we can make is that if a Tariff Board is constituted. . . ."

it should consider these questions. Then the Tariff Board was constituted and this is what they said. This was of course in 1924:

"It is essential that the Indian manufacturer should have some assurance of continuity of orders, and as his capacity for carrying out work will increase as time goes on, that the numbers ordered in India should gradually rise."

Later on they say:

"The Indian production this year (1925-26) will be far higher than it has ever been in the past, and this is the direct result of the payment of bounties on wagons.

The administration of the bounty scheme has brought about a rapid expansion of the industry, and if there is an abrupt reversion to a more limited scale of protection, part of the money already spent will have been spent in vain. If as a result of the enforcement of the limit of Rs. 7 lakhs a year, two of the wagon building firms are squeezed out and receive no orders, the bounties already paid to them will have done nothing to promote the development of the wagon building industry."

That is one aspect. What about the huge capital expended in the construction of the work?

"It would be very regrettable", they proceed, "we think, if the rapid expansion of the industry during the last twelve months were followed by a period of decline, and for this reason we have recommended that the allotments for expenditure on wagon bounties in 1926-27 and 1927-28 should be Rs. 18 lakhs in each year."

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

Now what do we find? We find that the bounties recommended by the Tariff Board are 18 lakhs of rupees a year, and yet there are no orders. What are the bounties to be given for? There are no wagons required, no orders are being given, and therefore there are no bounties to be had. And what is to happen to those to whom hopes were held out? What is to become of those firms? Thousands of skilled labourers are being turned out into the streets. All the capital employed goes to the wall, and why? Because the Railway Board committed a mistake in ordering more wagons than was necessary (*An Honourable Member*: "And that from England") and that from England.

Then I have the high testimony of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, as to the manner in which the thing worked here. He says:

"The whole question of the wagon industry will be examined *de novo* this year, and will be brought up again before the House at this time next year."

That was on the 17th February, 1926, and now we are in the expected time. He also says:

"I think we can claim that as far as we have gone, the policy has been very successful. It is a fact that in the last two or three years these wagon firms have been able to increase their output in a very remarkable way."

And what is the reward they get? They are killed and liquidation is confronting them.

Now, Sir, after all this painful story, see how the subject is treated by my Honourable friend, Sir Clement Hindley, in his speech on the Railway Budget. What does he say? He says:

"The Railway Board perhaps cannot altogether escape criticism in that up to a comparatively recent period this new development was not expected to materialise so rapidly."

—they are going on year after year and yet it was not expected to materialise so rapidly—

"and that we were even a year ago contemplating some necessity for addition and renewals of wagon stock. The reason was, however, that our new reliable statistics, which help us to watch matters of this kind"—

—before that they were groping in the dark—

"had only been established in 1924"—

—even after they were established it took two years or more to be useful to the members of the Railway Board—

"and there was insufficient accurate evidence on which to form conclusions. The fact, however, has now got to be faced that we shall not have to purchase any new general service broad gauge wagons either as additions or renewals for next year and most probably for the year after as well and perhaps for some years thereafter. With all due sympathy"

—now come the crocodile tears, if I may say so, sympathy for the manufacturers but accompanied with feelings of exaltation for the result—this is a very remarkable sentence and I beg the House to weigh it properly—

"with all due sympathy for the people who have been expecting orders to build wagons"—

—merely expecting orders as a matter of grace—

"we should be rightly charged with hypocrisy if we did not regard this great saving of public money with considerable satisfaction."

Satisfaction indeed! Satisfaction at what? Satisfaction at squandering away 15 crores of rupees of the tax-payers! Satisfaction at killing home industries at the expense of patronising British industries! Satisfaction at turning out more than 5,000 skilled labourers into the streets, because no other fate awaits them after this allegation that for some years hereafter we shall not require any more wagons. At the conclusion also my friend, Sir Clement Hindley, says:

“ At this stage ”

—he was recounting the achievements of the Railway Board for the year—

“ perhaps I need only mention the facts that we have definitely overcome wagon shortage ”—

—and how? By overstocking India with unnecessary wagons to the number of thirty thousand. That is the satisfaction. Now, Sir, I hope my Honourable friend, Mr. Cocke, will now realise what really able and competent men can do!

I do not think I will be true to myself if I do not on the floor of this House mention the fact that it is the common belief that all this policy was neither a mistake, *bona fide* or otherwise, but it was, as I hinted some time ago, due to the exigencies of what happened after the War. There was the War of 1918. Then it is commonly believed that despatches were received from England in this country calling upon the Government of India to assist home industries in the best possible manner by obtaining as many orders as possible for these and other things. If that is so

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: May I contradict that statement at once, Sir?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I am glad that my friend contradicts it.

Mr. T. O. Goswami: That is only a formal denial. There are statements actually made in Parliament which tend to prove it.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: But if the belief is wrong I say it is wholly excusable and pardonable, if it is not actually true.

Now, Sir, this is the story of the wagons. But is this all? As I have said, many other points have been discussed in this House, and many more will be discussed. On the top of the wagon story comes the Raven Committee's revelations. There again my friend, Sir Charles Innes, took credit for his bravery and frankness and courage. He invited the Raven Committee to go into these matters and the report of that Committee is in the hands of everyone. I do admire that courage, but I would admire my friend, Sir Charles Innes' courage more if he would devise means to compensate India for the loss that it has sustained by these wagons.

Now all these things are going on and what are our Railway lords doing? Going about in special trains. It so happened when I was going from pillar to post and travelling by all sort of conveyances, bullock carts included, I arrived one afternoon at Khandwar station, there being a breakdown of my motor car. And what did I find? A special train glittering in white and gold. I thought it was the Viceroy, but I knew that His Excellency the Viceroy was not travelling at the time. I looked from my waiting room and was told it was the Railway Board Special. Then I peeped out and what did I see? I saw all the railway officials drawn up on the platform, even the dhoti-clad babu having

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

provided himself with a pair of trousers for the occasion, and they were all there as a guard of honour for the Members of the Railway Board. They came, they saw, they conquered, and after ten minutes when I peeped out again, I saw the train had gone. That was the luxurious way in which they were travelling, and this is the account they give of what they have been doing, after the high salaries they draw and the luxuries which they enjoy. I need not repeat the few things that have been laid before the House. I say this question of wagons alone is sufficient to condemn any Railway Board. Of course there are other things which I have no doubt other Members will develop. I have taken a good long time and I do not wish to keep the House for any length of time more. There is for instance the coal scandal connected with the name of Mr. Church the engineer. Then there is the North Western Railway underframes scandal, rejected after being made.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: What is the scandal?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Underframes made by a Calcutta firm.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: An Indian firm.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Yes, made by an Indian firm on a wrong specification evolved by the consulting engineers of the Railway Board, and when this consignment is delivered, they find it has to be rejected, involving the loss of several lakhs of rupees. It is an Indian firm who did it, but the Indian firm only conformed to the specifications of the Board's engineers. What happened was that these frames, when they were delivered, were found to be wholly unsuitable and had to be rejected.

Mr. E. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Because they were not British steel frames!

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Then there is the question of an Indian member of the Railway Board, as my friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar pointed out. It is not one member, but we must have a majority of Indian members. (Swarajist Applause.) In that matter two definite promises have been broken. I call them definite promises and I can assure my friends on the opposite side that this side of the House will never be satisfied unless, not only one, but more than one member of the Railway Board are Indians, taken from among people who enjoy the confidence of the people, and not merely from a restricted field of selection on the pretence of having special knowledge. I quite agree with my friend that no special knowledge is necessary, no technical knowledge is necessary to be a member of the Railway Board. It is a regular business. I say that the high officials of the Finance Department, who know their business, would any day do it better than the present members of the Railway Board. Indeed it is a question of laying down policies, which after all is the business of the top of the administration. The top of the administration is not required to know how to mark a sledge hammer or what to do with an engine. I do not know whether I am safe in saying that perhaps Sir Clement Hindley does not know how to drive an engine—oh! he does. No technical knowledge is necessary; what is necessary is a business head, the ability to foresee things, to foresee the legitimate consequences of business enterprises and to fit one department of business into another so that they may collaborate and work together and not independently and be a burden to the tax-payer. That is what is wanted and for that any man who knows his business, who

carries his head on his shoulders and has had a training in various departments of the Government and knows how they work, will be enough. Your Finance Department, I am glad to say, to-day is an example of efficiency to other departments working under the Government of India and there are any number of people who would be available if you simply go and select your men from a wider field. However it is not for me to say where the man should come from and who he should be, nor who he should not be. What I say, is, it is a mere pretence to say men are not available. Now, Sir, I do not wish to go on any longer. What I will say is that the story that I have given, the facts that I have placed before the House, only show one thing, and that is that utter incompetency, gross negligence and utter disregard of the tax-payer are written large on the administration of the Railway Board. Sir, there is something rotten in the State of Denmark, and I submit that the Railway Board must be submitted to a very searching inquiry in all their departments, and I have not the least doubt that, if that is done, revelations not less startling than the Raven Committee revelations will be revealed.

Sir Clement Hindley: Sir, I rise to expose further instances of my incompetence in managing the railways from the Railway Board. It has been usual during the last two or three years to bring this motion forward in the House, and it has been my happy lot to sit and listen to these storms of abuse and to be defended by the Honourable Member in charge of Railways. I have not as a rule intervened at this stage in the budget discussion. I think, however, that it is only fair to the Members of this House that I should at once explain what I think about the Honourable Pandit's mare's nest of the 30,000 wagons. Sir, if the Honourable Pandit has based the whole of his case against the Railway Board on the particular instance of these 30,000 wagons, then he has a very hollow case indeed and I for one am perfectly willing, and I am sure my colleagues of the Railway Board will be with me, in having the whole of the story of the 30,000 wagons blazoned round the world and put in every railway technical magazine and placed before the railway managers of the world for their judgment. I know they are not sitting in judgment here, but I am prepared to have the details of that incident placed before the most competent railway managers all over the world, and I feel perfectly confident that we of the Railway Board will receive nothing but commendation. (Laughter.) I am glad a little laughter opposite has brought the matter perhaps to a little lighter aspect. So far as I am concerned, I want to give, from the railway manager's point of view, a short history of this particular mare's nest. When I came to the Railway Board, Honourable Members will perhaps remember that the Railway Department of the Government of India was suffering under the castigation of the Acworth Committee's Report. Now extracts from that report have been read and read again in this Assembly. And the particular work which I understood I was to do when I was placed in this position of Chief Commissioner for Railways, was to remedy the defects of railway administration which the Acworth Committee had brought to notice. One of the most important criticisms which they brought against the railway administrations, which was based on evidence which they had collected all over India, was the insufficiency of wagons for handling goods. It is not a very long time ago, in 1921 when the Report was published, and screams of rage went up all over India when this evidence was collected showing that goods were not able to move because there

1 P.M.

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

was shortage of wagons. Instances were given. I gave an instance myself as Agent of the East Indian Railway where a whole crop, a very valuable oilseed crop in North Bihar had been unable to secure its market because the railways were unable to handle it. That is a recorded fact and I do not wish to enlarge upon it now but it meant a loss to the country and it meant a loss to the cultivator. The Acworth Committee's Report is full of instances of that kind where they proved that the railways were incapable of carrying the traffic that was offered. Public bodies continued to press upon Government this cry of shortage of wagons. Everywhere people found they were unable to move their goods in time. We had the cries of the coal trade, the wheat trade and others; and it was perfectly clear that there was a very good basis for this general complaint. Well, as I have said, I understood that one of my first duties in taking over charge of the Railway Board was to remedy this, amongst other things. Now one of the reasons for that shortage of wagons had been apparent to many of us in the railways for some years. The reason was, or rather the real facts were that wagons were not available at the loading places. In many cases wagons could not be got to the consigning points in time to take the traffic and they could not be got away in good time to the consigning points. The reason for that, as I say, was fairly well known to many of us on the railways. If any Honourable Member likes to find that old document in the Library, the Acworth Committee's Report, he will find the evidence which I myself gave as Agent of the East Indian Railway. I may be perhaps now writing an indictment of a former management. I could not quite understand from the Honourable Pandit whether he was making an indictment against the Railway Department of the Government of India for many years past, or whether his attack was particularly directed at me, but I concluded from most of his remarks that his attack was directed at me and my administration. When I was Agent of the East Indian Railway I brought to the notice of the Acworth Committee certain instances where insufficient funds had been allotted to the railway for improving the capacity of the line by doubling, by improving marshalling yards, by strengthening bridges, in order that we might be able to move our wagons more rapidly about and therefore solve the traffic problem. As Honourable Members are perfectly well aware, up to the year 1921 funds were not available for this purpose and the work was not done. Now, when I came to the Railway Board, I had to take rather a broader view of the matter than I did perhaps as Agent of the East Indian Railway; but I found that exactly the same conditions obtained over the whole of the country. On nearly every railway there had been limitation of the funds available for improving the capacity of the line and it took some time to ascertain what improvements were necessary, what money was necessary and how it could best be spent. It is impossible for one to come to an office like this and by a stroke of the pen to say *this shall be done and that shall be done to-morrow*. It is bound to take some time. Now I and my colleagues anticipated that when we had carried out some of the more important improvements on our programme we should be able to make better use of our wagons. We undoubtedly had that object in view when we recommended and got authority for expenditure on improvements. But I have, in my budget speech, and elsewhere, frankly admitted that none of us expected the results of those improvements to materialise as rapidly as they did. It is, I quite admit, an extremely difficult matter for laymen to understand, and it is very difficult for

technical people like myself perhaps to put the matter in clear language. I would like to give just a few instances in expansion of Mr. Parsons' answer the other day, a few reasons which have helped, which have conduced to the freer movement of wagons and therefore made more wagons available at the consignment points. First of all, we have a gradual improvement in the number of wagons under repair at any one time. Now in those years when I first came to the Railway Board there were very large arrears of maintenance and repairs. That also the Acworth Committee reported on. To overcome those arrears required a careful examination of the position and a certain amount of reorganisation of our methods. We did gradually overcome those arrears but it was very difficult to see at what period we should have recovered from the effects of the War. Actually the improvement in overcoming arrears of repairs and certain other improvements which we mention elsewhere in regard to our workshops have effected a very considerable reduction in the number of wagons under repair at any one time. Now if this is put into figures what does it actually mean? On one railway, for instance, there were as many as 8 per cent. of the wagons under repair in the workshops at one time. Now Honourable Members opposite are not, I submit, Sir, in a position to say whether that is a large figure or a small figure. No Honourable Member opposite, unless he has an intimate knowledge of railway work in this country or elsewhere, can say whether 8 per cent. is a large or a small figure of your total stock to be under repair in your workshops at any one time and it was only by improving our methods in the workshops—an improvement which is gradually going on now and which must take some time—that we found it possible to have a fewer number of wagons in the workshops at any one time. We have in certain workshops reduced that number, by increasing our speed of repairs, to about $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. It does not follow that that is possible everywhere, nor does it follow that it can be maintained at that figure, but that is the figure to which we can aim, and that means an addition to our effective wagon stock of something like 6 per cent. We have been accused of scandalous waste of money in the past, presumably because of the fact that we had that 6, 7 or 8 per cent. of wagons under repairs at one time—that is what my Honourable friend means by his indictment. We have been accused of scandalous waste of money in having that number of wagons under repairs in the workshops at any one time.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Not at all. That is not my case.

Sir Clement Hindley: If I may be allowed to continue, the Honourable Pandit will see that that is part of his case as I understand it. Because it is by reducing that number that we have what he is pleased to call a surplus of wagons.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Not what I am pleased to call, but what you are pleased to call.

Sir Clement Hindley: Very well, what I am pleased to call a surplus of wagons. Is it seriously contended that I when I came to the Railway Board in 1922 should have said, "From to-morrow the wagons will only take a week in the shop instead of six weeks?" Is that the argument? Where did that method come from—the method that we are now applying in the workshops to our repairs? It came as a result of the strenuous

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

efforts that were made during the War to produce materials in large quantities on the Continent and in America. It was a new discovery just as the aeroplanes are a new discovery, just as the motor cars are a new discovery. I see a smile on the Honourable Pandit's face. But it is the fact that aeroplanes are a comparatively recent discovery and this business of mass production in workshops is also a very recent discovery. We may be blamed for not discovering it before just as you would probably blame the airmen for not having discovered aeroplanes before. Now, Sir, let me proceed. This is one of the causes why we are now able to meet the demands of traffic and are not in the old position of having to refuse wagons for traffic. We have by that and other means which I shall relate presently arrived at a position where we can meet the demands of traffic, whereas five years ago we were unable to meet the demands of traffic with the wagons that we had. It is not true to say that we have done that by buying more wagons. Unfortunately I have not got the figures here to show how many wagons have been bought in the last five years, but it is not anything like what the Honourable Pandit has said. The wagons that have been purchased in India during the last five years, and that is a point to which I shall refer again, have been based to a large extent on the capacity of the Indian manufacturing firms. We have not purchased 30,000 wagons in the last five years and we have not thrown away Rs. 15 crores of public money.

Now, I wish just to mention one or two other matters bearing on this particular question, that is to say, the reasons why we are now in a position to have wagons ready for moving traffic whereas five years ago we were not in a position to meet the demands of the public traffic. For instance, the strengthening of bridges and the strengthening of tracks—I must apologise to the House if they think that I am giving them a technical lecture, a matter which I was accused of last year. But it is important. I have been accused of gross extravagance and gross incompetence and I claim it is within my right to make my position clear in this matter. (Laughter from the Congress Party Benches.) This is not a light matter with me and my professional reputation has been impugned and it is open to me as a Member of this House to explain it.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will have the fullest protection from the Chair.

Sir Clement Hindley: Another matter which has conduced to our having wagons available for traffic is that we have been going through a long programme of strengthening of bridges and tracks in order to carry heavier locomotives than we had done before. Those heavier locomotives can carry heavier and higher capacity wagons and they can travel at higher speeds. This is also a very important factor in making more wagons available. On one section alone which I may mention, we have been able to improve our bridges—I suppose I would be accused there of a dereliction of duty, in not having improved those bridges on the day I took over charge. We have increased the load on our trains from 1,100 tons to 1,450 tons. That is a very great facility in meeting traffic demands and means that we have more wagons available than we require.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Yet you order more wagons. (Laughter from the Congress Party Benches.)

Sir Clement Hindley: If you like I will go on. I do not think the House is listening to these technical points and I do not wish to weary it

An Honourable Member: There is nothing very technical in it.

Sir Clement Hindley: There are other causes. We have, for instance, gradually adopted vacuum brakes on goods trains. I do not think—I am not certain—that there is any other country in the world that has adopted the use of vacuum brakes throughout on its goods trains, and this, up to date has effected an increase in the speed of goods trains by at least 10 per cent. and we expect to get a very much larger increase. I cannot go into the technical reasons in full, but I wish to say that the vacuum brake does enable an increase of speed to be made on goods trains. We have also adopted over all the main lines a system of telephone train control which enables us to get our trains through with fewer delays. As wagons have been ordered during the last 10, 15 or 20 years, they have been ordered to a higher capacity than the older wagons and that has resulted in a larger carrying capacity of our wagons as a whole.

Then we come to the particular point about these 30,000 wagons which seems to have obsessed the Honourable Pandit. I have given in as brief a form as possible the technical reasons why we have arrived at the present position and why the former criticisms which used to come from this House about shortage of wagons do not now come up. It is considered to be an extraordinary fact apparently by Members opposite that we should have available 30,000 wagons more than we require on any particular day for loading. Have Honourable Members opposite studied the matter? Do they know enough about railway economics to say that this is unnecessary? (*An Honourable Member:* "Do without it.") In those years about which the Acworth Committee have written there was a shortage of wagons every day, we had a minus quantity of wagons and people were crying for wagons. Now when we are loading something like 12,000 to 15,000 wagons a day we have at the present moment I think something like 5,000 or 6,000 wagons over and above what we require for loading. That is to say, to-day when I am loading all over the country 15,000 wagons I have 5,000 or 6,000 wagons available against to-morrow's demand. Those 15,000 wagons I have got to load to-morrow, and where are they coming from? They are coming in all over the country unloaded here, there and elsewhere and brought in. Supposing they do not all arrive in time, how am I going to meet the demand, the insistent demand of merchants and others for loading wagons? Is it reasonable to expect that we should go on without any reserve at all? Is it reasonable that we should live from hand to mouth every day? In the coalfields alone . . . (There was talking going on in the Congress Party Benches.) If the Honourable Members opposite do not wish to listen to me . . . (Laughter).

Mr. President: The Honourable Member need take no notice of all this.

Mr. Chaman Lal: Have not the Honourable Members a right to laugh?

Mr. President: Order, order.

Sir Clement Hindley: I do not mind anybody laughing so long as I can carry on my speech. We are loading something like 4,000 to 5,000 wagons in the coalfields alone. Some of these go to Bombay, some to Calcutta and others to Cawnpore. They have got to get back over long distances; some come back with goods and others without

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

goods. When 4,000 wagons are required in the coalfields alone every day, is it unreasonable that we should have something like 5,000 or 6,000 wagons scattered all over the country ready and available in cases of emergency for loading to-morrow?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I ask the Honourable Member whether he knew that when he said there was a surplus of 30,000 wagons.

Sir Clement Hindley: I think that Honourable Members have not perhaps had an opportunity of reading my evidence before the Royal Agricultural Commission. I do not know whether it has been published yet but I can explain what it was. I will come to it a little later. When we are loading what we call our peak traffic, we have something like 5 or 6 thousand wagons spare, not spare in the sense that the Honourable Pandit means, that this might be taken away and nobody would notice their loss, not spare in the sense that we have bought them and thrown away public money, but spare in the sense that they are a reserve against what we are going to load to-morrow. In 3 months of last year when traffic was slack we had practically continuously as many as 3,000 wagons. Now, we get down to the point. You can call it a reserve if you like. What I told the Agricultural Commission was this. I had put before me by the Agricultural Commission a very serious complaint from somebody in the United Provinces on shortage of wagons. From the wording of that document, I was perfectly certain that it was a resuscitation of an old complaint dating back from some years before. I said to the Royal Commission that that complaint was out of date. It may have applied to the years 1919, 1920 or 1921 but it does not apply now and to strengthen my argument I said the figures of wagons available at the moment were 30,000 and they had been so for the last three months. And I pointed out that the complaint that they could not get wagons to load could not be justified. That was the essence of the evidence I gave before the Agricultural Commission. Now, Sir, as I have said just now, is it unreasonable for us to have a certain reserve of wagons for loading? We hear a great deal of efficiency in America. I have with me here a document issued by the Bureau of Railway Economics which gives certain figures relating to American railways. I would just like to read a short extract:

"The improvement in equipment condition, in combination with the increased capacity of the plant and a more efficient basis of operation, put the carriers in the position of having at all times during 1925 a surplus or reserve amount of equipment sufficient to guarantee that, whatever further traffic was offered, the increase could and would be handled with corresponding effectiveness. Impressive proof of this is furnished by statistical compilations of the Car Service Division, relating to number of stores locomotives and surplus freight cars in good condition throughout the year 1925. Beginning with a total of 4,849 stored locomotives on January 1st, and ending the year with 5,166, at no time during the twelve months did the railways have less than 4,208 locomotives in reserve, while from April to August the reserve ran consistently above 6,000."

These are the railways of America: the pamphlet goes on:

"Similarly, the year opened with 266,252 surplus freight cars in good physical condition and closed with 267,739. The minimum number of reserve cars reported during the year was 104,000 while the maximum was 345,000."

Now, Sir, if America with its efficient railways finds it advisable from the business point of view to have a reserve stock of these dimensions, is it extravagant, is it throwing away public money that we should have either 5,000 or 30,000 wagons in excess of our actual requirements?

Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar: Is this a reserve or a surplus?

Sir Clement Hindley: I am perfectly willing to call it either a reserve or a surplus. It is a matter of language. But actually these wagons are in reserve against the incidence of railway traffic.

(At this stage there were several attempts at interruption from Honourable Members.)

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has made it clear more than once that he is not willing to answer questions.

Sir Clement Hindley: Honourable Members will, I think, probably agree with me that in order to prevent serious complaints from the public that we do not provide wagons in sufficient numbers, it is necessary to have some reserve. Now the question at issue between myself and the Honourable Pandit is as to what the size of that reserve should be.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I do not admit that it is a reserve at all.

Sir Clement Hindley: I have just said it is a matter of language. The Honourable Pandit may not admit that it is a reserve. Anyhow I can perhaps be permitted to have my opinion that it is a reserve.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I am only referring to Mr. Parsons' statement that it is not a reserve.

Sir Clement Hindley: If it is not a reserve, I do not know what is. The Honourable Pandit does not, I think, claim to be an expert on railway management.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I am an expert, when the facts are before me.

Sir Clement Hindley: Am I to take it, Sir, that the Honourable Pandit really knows what the reserve on Indian railways ought to be?

(Several Honourable Members tried to interrupt at this stage.)

Mr. President: I would ask the Honourable Members not to interrupt the Honourable Member. He cannot go on with his speech with the fire of these interruptions. (*An Honourable Member:* "He cannot object to laughter.")

Sir Clement Hindley: I have no objection to good-tempered criticism or to laughter. I want to be allowed to pursue my line of thought. Now, Sir, the size of this reserve is the real matter at issue. Does the Honourable Pandit profess to know what the size of this reserve should be? I frankly confess—I make no bones about it—this is a matter with which we must experiment and I would rather have a slightly larger reserve than is really necessary than one which is not sufficient to meet all demands. The House can express its opinion on this when it comes to vote.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Does the Honourable Member expect me to answer his question? I do not pretend to know what the size of the reserve should be. What I rely upon is the Honourable Mr. Parsons' reply in which he does not say that it was a reserve and accounts for it in other ways.

Sir Clement Hindley: Sir, the wagons are there for anybody to see and I would claim that whatever wagons we have ordered during the last few years have not been a waste of public money. The present position is, as I have shown, that we have a reasonable reserve and I do not think that this House is in a position to challenge the opinion of its expert officers on railway management in regard to what the size of the reserve of wagons ought to be. If they wish to express their deep sense of the wrong we have done in the purchase of these wagons, of course they are entitled to give their vote in that sense, but as an expert, with a special privilege of

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

being able to speak to this Honourable House, I would say that the opinions of the Railway Board on this subject are worthy of hearing.

Now, Sir, I do not think it is necessary for me to go into the vexed question of the wagon industry. I could not help thinking, when the Honourable Pandit Motilal, having exhausted his thunderbolts and his lightnings at me and my colleagues, came down to the somewhat plaintive cry about the Indian wagon industry, what all this is about. I do not think he really thought that I had thrown away 15 crores of public money. I think he was working up to the Indian wagon industry. Now, Sir, what would he expect us to do when we found that for this year at any rate it would be waste of public money if we bought any more wagons. Does he expect me to say nothing about this and order more wagons? It would be a very easy thing to do. Nobody would have heard anything about it and I should have sat down here and nobody would think that this is the sort of yarn that the Honourable Pandit would like us to believe.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: You will not say it until there is another Agricultural Commission.

The Honourable Sir Clement Hindley: I do not know whether the Honourable Pandit wants to make a second speech now, but perhaps he may find an opportunity later. I want to know in view of this indictment whether it was my duty to buy more wagons to feed the Indian wagon-building industry, or whether it was right for us to make the matter public and say we do not now think we need to buy any more wagons? Which was the right thing for us to do? Am I to be abused, Sir, in this wholesale fashion because I have put the facts forward and because I have said that now is not the time to buy any more wagons? That seems to be an extraordinary position for a public servant to be in here. Here I say you can save yourselves the money which would otherwise go into the pockets of the Indian wagon-building industry. But I suppose, Sir, it is their privilege that public servants should be abused. But that is the position as I see it. The Honourable Pandit knows perfectly well what has happened because we have made the matter public as soon as we found that it would not be necessary to buy any more wagons this year. We put the matter frankly before the Indian wagon-building firms; we had discussions with them and we made certain offers to them, which they in one instance refused. I submit that Government have gone the whole length they could go in that respect, and it is not really for this House to abuse us because we decided not to place orders for wagons that were not required.

On the subject of the Raven Committee's Report, Sir, I could speak at some length. The principal point that has been brought up against us—and there I believe it has been recognized generally that we have made, I do not like to say honest, because I think Honourable Members opposite think that we have no honesty in us at all—but we have made a simple effort perhaps to put matters right in our workshops.

Mr. President: I do not desire to interrupt the Honourable Member but I would like to know whether he is going to be long?

The Honourable Sir Clement Hindley: No, Sir, I will sit down directly. I only want to say this, that if Honourable Members will study with any care that document, instead of only reading pages 81 and 82, which Mr. Chetty has drawn their attention to, they will see that there is rather more in it than an accusation that we have been throwing stores about the place,

writing them off and then declaring a faked surplus. And, Sir, if I may use so strong a word, I would say that it is merely childish to take one page out of a book and make an indictment upon that. There is any amount of evidence in that book to show that what has been referred to there in regard to stores is a matter of store-keeping and book-keeping, and does not connote any serious waste or loss of stores. I only want to say, Sir, that that matter of the store-keeping and book-keeping in regard to stores is being very carefully examined now by our expert accountant officers and we have hopes of putting these matters on a completely satisfactory footing. I want to answer merely the accusation of Mr. Chetty and others that there is anything in that book which says that we have wantonly thrown away or lost public stores.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I would just like to know one fact from the Honourable Member, because I may not have the opportunity again of asking him this question. Would he kindly tell the House within what period these 30,000 wagons were bought?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: And where?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I shall try to get that information by the time the House re-assembles.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-Five Minutes Past Two of the Clock.

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

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, is there any quorum in the House?

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): May I inquire why the Government Members are absent from the House?

(An Honourable Member: "We have got a quorum and we can proceed.")

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, the following message has been received from the Secretary of the Council of State:

"I am directed to inform you that the Bill further to amend the Societies Registration Act, 1860, for certain purposes, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 15th February, 1927, was passed by the Council of State at its meeting on the 22nd February, 1927, with the following amendments:

In clause 2—

(1) before the words 'In section 20' the words 'In the preamble to and' were inserted;

(2) the letter and brackets '(a)', the word 'and', and the whole of sub-clause (b) were omitted.

2. The Council of State requests the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly in the amendments."

Sir, I lay on the table the Bill as amended by the Council of State.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Expenditure from Revenue.

DEMAND NO. 1.—RAILWAY BOARD.

Mr. President: The House will now resume discussion on the motion moved by Sir Charles Innes and the amendment proposed by Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): Sir, I rise to support the amendment before the House, and I can assure the Treasury Benches that I take as serious a view of the motion before the House as they themselves take. I feel that no Legislature can pass such a serious motion of censure on a department of the Government unless they mean in every sense all that such a motion can imply. Sir, in the last two years motions of similar nature were, I understand, considered and passed by the Assemblies of those days. But this motion, Sir, at this time has a particular significance, and I think this side of the House has a special reason to press that this motion be carried. Why I say this is that I was more than surprised to hear from my Honourable friend the Commerce Member that the last two conditions of the convention resolution regarding Indianisation and stores were not a part of the convention. Technically, I may concede that the Commerce Member is correct, but I am sure that he will bear me out when I say that to all intents and purposes Sir Charles Innes promised us, the non-officials who were a party to that convention, that Government would try their level best and carry out those two conditions also, although not embodied in the first part of the convention. Sir, the three years of the convention will be over next September. Sir Charles Innes himself said the other day that he would be prepared, if the Assembly wished, to revise the convention. May I ask if Government have played their part in the convention? And when replying let him bear in mind that they have failed to carry out the virtual promise given by Sir Charles Innes that Government would at the earliest opportunity try and put an Indian on to the Railway Board. It is not, Sir, a question of one or two Indians on the Railway Board. We are longing for the day when the Railway Board will have all Indians on it (Hear, hear). Now if you do not make a beginning now, and you have not made a beginning in the last three years despite the additional part of the convention Resolution, may I ask, if it is the intention of Sir Charles Innes and the Government of India that it should take a century before the Railway Board is fully Indianised. The day is past, Sir, when we can justifiably be told that there are not Indians capable of occupying those positions. It will carry no weight on this side of the House, it will carry no weight with the country, and I think that Government simply make themselves ridiculous by advancing arguments of that nature. That is why in 1924 we felt that if Government made a beginning with one or two appointments when the first opportunity arose, the country may be satisfied. In three years' time Government have made no beginning at all. There was an encouraging sign when Sir Basil Blackett said that the scales would be definitely weighted in favour of an Indian when there was a vacancy, and, the way the vacancy of the Financial Commissioner was filled may well make any one despair. I feel, Sir, that the Government of India in the Commerce Department have themselves to thank if this side of the House

insists that a severe censure of this nature should be repeated from year to year for the reason that the Government of India in the Commerce Department have failed to carry out what was a virtual promise by the Honourable Member—and the opportunity, Sir, occurred last year and was deliberately allowed to go past us.

Sir, I would have rested content with only these observations explaining my reasons for supporting this motion, but Sir Charles Innes yesterday in the course of his reply on the general debate named the Acworth Committee on which it was my privilege and what I now regard as my proud privilege to have been associated with those three distinguished Britishers who were brought out to report on the Indian railways. I, Sir, was anxious to rise immediately to correct what I thought was a misstatement by the Honourable the Commerce Member. But lately, Sir, the Honourable Members on the Government Benches seem to have made up their minds not to give way when anybody on this side of the House wishes to correct them in a wrong and misleading statement or even to make a personal explanation. That is the reason, Sir, why I wish to ask for your indulgence for a few minutes to refer to one or two of the subjects which have been discussed this morning in the House with much heat and with considerable sighs on either side of the House. Sir Charles Innes, Sir, relied on the Report of the Acworth Committee for the purchase of wagons which are now said to be surplus wagons. May I ask the Commerce Member, Sir, to quote me any part of the Report of the Acworth Committee containing a recommendation regarding increased rolling stock being purchased? What I believe the Commerce Member has in mind is that the Acworth Committee said that enough funds were not supplied or earmarked by the Government of India to the Railways of India for the purpose of repairs and renewals to the railway plant and arrears of some. But, Sir, that did not by any means imply that the Acworth Committee said that you must buy more wagons or more locomotives or for the matter of that more of any particular plant necessary to run our railways. The Bengal Chamber, Sir, in that year 1920-21, when the Acworth Committee was sitting, actually passed a resolution and asked the Government of India to call upon—those were the words used by the Bengal Chamber—to call upon the Acworth Committee to submit an *ad interim* Report. The Acworth Committee, when that resolution was passed on to them by the Government of India in the Finance Department, pointed out that the terms of reference to them did not call upon them to look into defects in various parts of the railway administration but they were to advise about—and I now quote, Sir, from paragraph 14 of that Report:

“(A) management whether directly by the State or by Companies in England or in India,

(B) the constitution, status and functions of the Government organ of administrative control,

(C) finance and financial control,

(D) the relation between the railways and their customers,

(E) miscellaneous cognate questions.”

The Acworth Committee cannot possibly therefore be relied upon by either the Commerce Member or the Chief Commissioner for Railways for either the surplus of wagons or a surplus of anything else that may to-day be discovered by them. I feel, however, Sir, that I would very much be inclined to agree with the Commerce Member when he pleaded before the House yesterday that those who have to do constructive work cannot do it without

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

a few mistakes. I fully agree with and sympathise with that, and as a merchant I myself am wide-awake to the fact that I rarely do any sort of constructive work unless I make a few mistakes. But the question is were these particular mistakes in ordinary course of business or was there any neglect in what is now being discovered and admitted by the Railway Board as mistakes. I will here, Sir, remind my Honourable friends on the other side of another Committee to which none of the members on the other side has referred, and that, Sir, is the Inchcape Committee. The Inchcape Committee which reported in March 1923 pointed out, Sir,—and I am now referring to page 74 of their report under the head "Locomotives" this: I will only read a few lines:

"It will be observed that it is proposed in 1923-24 to replace by new engines no less than 405 locomotives in 1923-24, out of a total stock of 8,136, which is equivalent to renewing on a 20 years life basis. We regard this as excessive."

In the next paragraph again they say:

"It is clear, therefore, that there is a large surplus stock of locomotives on the North-Western Railway."

Then again under "Carriage and Wagon Stock" they say:

"The provision for the renewal of coaching stock does not call for special comment, but with regard to freight stock the expenditure on the North-Western and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways should, we think, be largely curtailed."

Under "Miscellaneous Vehicles" they say:

"We think it is evident that the proposed provision for the two railways named is excessive and should be drastically curtailed."

Further on page 69 they say:

"With regard to goods stock the maximum tonnage conveyed in any year subsequent to 1913-14 was only 8.8 per cent. in excess of the tonnage conveyed in that year, whereas the stock of wagons has increased by 21 per cent. Further, large orders have been placed for additional goods vehicles in 1922-23 and additional orders are contemplated for 1923-24 although no great increase in traffic is anticipated."

I venture to ask how many wagons and locomotives were bought after the Inchcape Committee reported? My Honourable friend from Agra, Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru, yesterday in the course of his speech pointedly asked for similar figures. I expected the Commerce Member in the course of his reply yesterday to supply my friend Mr. Kunzru with some figures. But these figures have still to come from Government. In the meantime, I have been able to look up a few figures which I would very much like the Railway Department to explain before the House votes on this motion. I have culled these figures from Railway Administration Reports of respective years. In 1923-24 the net additions to locomotives was 168. This was after what the Inchcape Committee reported. The net additions to wagons was 6,233. In 1924-25 locomotives on order were 207, locomotives placed on the line were 137, wagons on order 9,951 and wagons placed on the line were 4,835. In 1925-26 locomotives on order were 208, those placed on the line 179, wagons on order 12,246, and those placed on the line were 7,725. These are big figures after the warning of the Inchcape Committee and need the fullest explanation if the Railway Board wish to escape from the charge of deliberately overlooking the unequivocal report early in 1923.

The Chief Commissioner, Sir, asked whether what is called "excess" may not be regarded as a "reserve", and that I think was particularly in connection with the wagon question raised by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru. He asked the Honourable Pandit what was the reserve of wagons which the Indian Railways needed. Naturally the Honourable Pandit said "I am not in charge of the Railways of India and I cannot give a reply to it." The Chief Commissioner then confessed that he himself could not say what the reserve should be. May I ask him whether any of the Committees which have reported till now did say that India should have a reserve and if so what is the percentage of reserve of wagons or locomotives which any of these Committees have recommended? I am particularly fortified in making this enquiry because I know that on the Incheape Committee we had the benefit of the advice of a very leading official of one of the English Railways, Mr. J. Milne, and all the calculations embodied in the report were based on methods and on calculations which were absolutely up to date even in the West till 1923. It therefore strikes me as a little shifting of the ground for the Railway Board to say that what we ordinarily call here as surplus wagons may be regarded as a reserve of wagon capacity for the Indian Railways.

Even granting that the Railway Board are not guilty of neglect regarding the surpluses under reference, can this debate of to-day not be laid at the door of the tendency of the Railway Board not to take into their confidence the two Committees which are attached to that Department? Why was the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, Sir, not apprised of all this last year and this year? And if they were, we would like to know what that Committee said regarding the position which we are discussing so exhaustively and with so much heat in the House. I see my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta shakes his head, by which I infer that it never was brought before the Railway Finance Committee.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Not this time.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: There was no Standing Finance Committee in existence at the time I was able to put it forward.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I take it that there was a Standing Finance Committee in existence till last September. I will again give way for a reply.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: You asked a question and I am sure you will give way. There was certainly a Standing Finance Committee until the end of last Session; but negotiations with the wagon building firms were then going on and there was nothing which, without prejudicing the interests of those firms, I could have made public.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: May I inform the House that the question of rolling stock was especially excluded before the Standing Finance Committee.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: If this item was excluded from discussion by that Committee of this House which was appointed for the purpose of going into these details, it does not lie in the mouth of any officer of the Railway Department to get up and say that these are highly technical matters and cannot be understood by this House.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: The only reason why this was excluded from the present Standing Finance Committee was that the previous Standing Finance Committee had dealt with the rolling stock programme for which money was going to be asked in this Budget. That was the sole reason and there was no idea of keeping the matter away from the Standing Finance Committee.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I understand that my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta was a member of the previous Standing Finance Committee also.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I was in the walk-out at that time.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I feel, Sir, that the Railway Department had good reason to infer or to suspect that this matter would be discussed in the House and they should have taken the Standing Finance Committee for Railways into their confidence before the Railway Budget was presented to the House. If, as Mr. Parsons says, there was no time, all that can be said is that it is a peculiarly unfortunate coincidence that the Committee appointed by this House could not go into this matter and satisfy themselves that the explanation now given to the House was satisfactory.

But I saw the Honourable Sir Charles Innes speaking with great feeling yesterday, regarding certain Members on this side of the House who made obvious inferences which I suggest to Sir Charles Innes he himself would have made if he was a Member on this side of the House without the information that he possesses in virtue of his office on the other side of the House. Members who see and hear piecemeal all the things we have read of till now have, after all, some capacity to think. They put two and two together and have very frankly ventilated their views that after all may not this be the result of a scheme for providing more orders in England. I do not wish, nor, I am sure, will any Member either wish to close his mind to any further grounds that may be urged on the other side; but I do not think that it lies, Sir, either with the officers of the Railway Department or the Honourable Sir Charles Innes to say to anybody who frankly expresses his opinion on this score, basing it on the obvious inference which he is compelled to draw, that he is unjustified in making the inference. He may be proved ultimately to be rash in making such an inference, but he is *prima facie* justified in making it. Does it lie with Sir Charles Innes to take such a Member to task? On this side of the House suspicion is increasing regarding certain methods which are followed by some departments of the Government of India, which are believed to be not in the best interests of India. I submit that the other side of the House had best look into their own shortcomings in not taking Members on this side of the House into their confidence. No one on this side of the House enjoys having to run down any officer of the Government of India.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): Question.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: My friend Colonel Gidney may question it, but I am sure of it because I have been talking about this matter with Members since two days. I can assure Colonel Gidney that he is not the only man that can appreciate good work done. The whole question is, is the good work something that is tangible and that serves the interests of the tax-payer. As soon as you can afford Members on this side of the

House any proof of it there will be Members springing up from this side of the House to congratulate the Railway Board more than Colonel Gidney can do.

It is with a heavy heart, but with just conviction that I say that the Commerce Department have deserved this vote which this side of the House wish to see passed. Sir Charles Innes and his department have not carried out the modest moral undertaking which they gave to non-official Members at the time of the railway convention that the first available seat on the Railway Board will as far as possible be made available to an Indian. It may be that that was no part of the convention which Government Members accepted officially, but to all intents and purposes we were told later that every time a seat was available on the Railway Board the scales would be weighted in favour of an Indian with equal qualifications as a European. No Indian would ever be available unless this side of the House pressed the claims of Indians year in and year out, and that is what this side of the House is determined to do.

Regarding the other question of surplus stores, wagons and locomotives, I am sure that everyone here has still an open mind and would like more information put before the House in order that Sir Clement Hindley may prove that he does not deserve the strong terms which have been used this morning.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Sir, I rise at this point because I find myself in considerable difficulty. The speech of my Honourable friend, 3 P.M. Pandit Motilal Nehru, has left me in somewhat of a dilemma, because I feel that there are points upon which I would like to give my vote and yet I am asked to vote on the large issue of cutting down the whole of the supplies. The gentlemanly attributes of the Pandit are well known to the House, and he has shown that he is very much more civilised than I am, because while he proposes to knock his victim on the head with one blow, I desire to tear him to bits and to kill him by inches. In asking me and my colleagues here to vote on the question of the omission of the whole vote, I feel that we cannot go with him, but had the attention of the House been concentrated on some of the points which he raised in his speech, I feel that possibly some of us might have voted along with him.

On this question of wagon shortage I felt that the Pandit had made on my mind a very good impression, but Sir Clement Hindley's explanation satisfied me to some extent. I am however still left in a quandary. It seems to me that the Indian wagon industry has had some sort of pledge from the authorities of the Railway Board; and if not exactly a pledge, a good deal of encouragement. I presume the Railway Board gave that encouragement to the Indian wagon industry as one of the methods by which they hoped to get over the question of the shortage of wagons which was of great moment at the time. As Sir Clement Hindley has explained, the methods adopted to speed up traffic proved so successful that the question of increasing the supply of wagons is no longer necessary. I would like to know from Sir Clement Hindley exactly what the annual replacements are likely to be when he has fulfilled the whole of his programme of improving facilities for traffic and the supply which he gets from those means has been incorporated into his ordinary programme. What would then be the supply of wagons required per annum by railways, and will the Indian wagon industry then have sufficient work to do?

[Col. J. D. Crawford.]

As I have said, however, I feel that the motion before the House at the moment is one to which I cannot lend support. I believe that in putting forward a motion of this nature we are going back to yesterday and opening out once more a general discussion on the Railway Budget instead of endeavouring to concentrate the attention of the House on points of policy which we desire to criticise and on which the vote of the House would be an important factor. For that reason I myself have an amendment down for discussion later on a point of policy. On this occasion I must however vote against the motion of my friend, Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar.

Lala Lajpat Rai (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar. It was said by one Honourable Member from this side of the House that it is ridiculous for us to omit Demands like this altogether, by which we encourage the Government of India to exercise their powers of certification too often. Well, Sir, on the face of it it does look ridiculous, but what are we to do? Has the Government of India during the last three or four years shown any regard for the opinions and sentiments of the people of India with reference to the administration of the Railways or with regard to the general policy of the Government of India? If they are in the habit of continuously disregarding the wishes of this side of the House and of the general feelings of the community, what are we to do, but to record our censure of and our dissatisfaction with their policy in as strong terms as we possibly can? That, I submit, is the reason for the course we are adopting on this side of the House and I may at once say that the Railway Department of the Government of India is the one department in regard to which every Indian feels the greatest possible humiliation and suffers under the sense of the greatest possible injustice. Next to the Army it is the one department of the Government of India which has been the cause of India being bled white. We have suffered enormous losses from the railway policy of the Government of India ever since railways were first started in this country, and that chapter has not been closed even to-day. I find, Sir, that one of the most moderate politicians in this country, the Honourable Sir D. E. Wacha, some years back, even before this Reforms Act, recorded his verdict on the railway policy of the Government of India in strong language, which to the present moment remains good. I do not propose to read a long extract, but I do propose to read two brief extracts from his writings. He said:

"At the very outset we cannot help remarking that the breathless pace at which capital, like water, has been expended during the last few years, at the behest of the interested Chambers of Commerce, is not only inordinate but most improvident. The entire railway policy of the Government, specially in its financial aspect, demands the most searching investigation by an impartial tribunal of experts wholly independent of influence at Calcutta and Whitehall."

Then, Sir, he goes on further:

"The worst and most inexcusable feature of Indian railway policy is the supreme indifference and neglect of the authorities to the crying wants and wishes of the Indian public—those vast millions of the population who travel about 36 miles in a year and who now contribute the largest portion of the coaching traffic amounting to 13 crores rupees per annum. The interests of the European mercantile community are deemed of paramount importance while those of the Indian population at large have been uniformly held of secondary importance, if at all. At the beck and nod of the former, with their screaming organs of opinion behind, the Government readily spend millions like water on railways without an ultimate thought of the tax-payers and the return such capital would give. It is the greatest blot on Indian railway

administration that it ignores the interests of the permanent population and is eager to satisfy first the cry of the interested and migratory European merchant. No private railway enterprise would spend such enormous sums of money and no proprietary body, however rich and influential, would tolerate in any part of the civilised world, the loans after loans."

and so on. And he sums up in one sentence, which I submit is still the characteristic of the railway policy of the Government of India:

"It is a dismal tale, the history of Indian railway finance from first to last."

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: What is the date of that book?

Lala Lajpat Rai: Some years ago, before the Reform days, but I have read this in order to show that the railway administration of India has not improved a bit since that—since one of the greatest moderate politicians of this country (Sir D. E. Wacha), than whom no one understood the finances of this country better, and than whom there was no greater authority either on railway finances or the general finances of India, deliberately made the observations referred to by me.

Several points have been raised by Pandit Motilal Nehru in his severe indictment of the railway policy of this Government, and the indictment which he has made is well grounded on facts. I may state at once, and I weigh my words, and I say it with the greatest sense of responsibility, that the railway administration of India is not carried on in the interests of this country. Look at it from whatever point of view, look at it from the point of view of the purchase of railway stores, look at it from the point of view of the travelling public, look at it from the point of view of the employees of the railway administration, from the point of view of labour; look at it from any point of view you like, you will find that the railway administration of this country is not being carried on in the best interests of the country. Firstly, it is carried on in the interests of foreign trade; secondly, it is carried on in the interests of the European mercantile community, as was said by Sir D. E. Wacha; and thirdly, it is carried on in the interests of the European and Anglo-Indian employees of the Railway Department. We find, Sir, that Indians doing the same kind of duty, performing the same functions, having the same responsibility, are differently paid, and paid very low salaries as compared with their Anglo-Indian and European colleagues doing exactly the same kind of work. We find the Europeans and Anglo-Indians on the different railways in India obtaining greater privileges in the matter of salaries, in the matter of leave allowances and other attractions, in the matter of living and other conditions, than the Indian employees do. To the charge that was brought by my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru of incompetence, of negligence against the Railway Board I add another, that of callousness to the human needs of the labouring population which works in the railways here. I submit, Sir, I was amazed and I was very sorry to hear that a kind-hearted gentleman and an otherwise noble man should have stood up in this House yesterday to defend the policy of the Government in paying Rs. 9 and Rs. 10 a month to Indian workmen on the railways. In the 20th century to call labour a commodity to be sold and bought in the open market at the lowest prices available and to taunt the Honourable Member who was quoting figures from other countries to shew that labour was much better paid there than he paid his agricultural labourer even less, I submit is a thing than which there could be no greater proof of the inhumanity of the system that prevails in India. To justify a wage of Rs. 9 or Rs. 10 a month for a man, probably a man with a family, is,

[Lala Lajpat Rai.]

I consider, a thing which is absolutely indefensible and which would not be tolerated in any part of the world except India, where the people of the country are absolutely voiceless and helpless in the management of their affairs. Sir, my friend Mr. T. Prakasam was quoting figures from the budgets of other countries pointing out the proportion of the maximum salaries and the minimum salaries which were paid on the railways in those countries, and what was the reply from the official Benches? One Honourable Member interrupted and said that he should also quote the mileage of railways which the officials in other countries were looking after implying thereby that salaries were determined by mileages. He evidently thought we had not studied the mileages of the railways of the world. There are countries, Sir, which have a greater railway mileage than India. Mr. Prakasam was comparing the minimum and maximum salaries paid to railway officials in the other countries of the world to the corresponding figures relating to this country. But what has mileage to do with human needs? Does mileage affect human needs? Are we not bound in decency to provide a living wage for all who work on these railways. Are we to consider that because the agricultural labourers in some parts of this country get a wage of four or five annas a day which I do not admit, therefore a human Government, a civilized Government, an up-to-date Government is justified in paying Rs. 9 or Rs. 10 a month to the workmen on the railways simply because they find a great number of them can be had at these salaries and there is competition between them? That only shows the utter helplessness of the people, the economic helplessness and the misery of the people who have to accept this service even for Rs. 9 and Rs. 10 a month, on which salary they have perhaps to maintain a family of four or five. What is this but sweating and sweating of a most revolting nature? I submit that is a very serious charge. I expected my Honourable friend to say he was sorry for it, but he never said so. It may be that perhaps he cannot immediately improve their position, cannot grant a salary much higher immediately because it will involve a very large amount of money, but I expected some word of sympathy from him for these unfortunate people who have to work and live within that salary. That word of sympathy never came from the other side. It is all very well for my friends to say that we should not encourage these strikes and these labour troubles which interfere with the administration of railways, but they forget that we are human, we cannot help looking at these things from the human point of view. While we admit that the Honourable Member cannot grant an increase to Rs. 30 at once as proposed by my Honourable friend Mr. Jogiah, he should have said he would try to improve the condition of these workmen and look into their wages to some extent; but no word of sympathy came from those Benches at all. We are being rebuked from day to day for moving motions which make us look ridiculous according to them in the eyes of the public, but I submit this is a question upon which there is a clash of opinion and there is a clash of interests also. We can well understand the interests of the Honourable gentlemen on the other side. We need not question their motives. Interests are so strong in this world that they affect our judgment and our characters even without motives being consciously bad. Sir, it is not a question of motives, it is a question of interests—their interest and our interest. Their interest and the interest of the Indian public and the Indian wage-

earner clash. We are bound to voice our interest even though it may take us centuries to have our voice heard by the authorities that be. We must go on hammering from year to year until we get the power to have these grievances redressed.

Sir, the Indian Railway administration is the greatest white elephant that the Indian tax-payer has to maintain from year to year. The convention has not improved matters to any appreciable extent. It has not been a success so far. I admit that in certain respects the administration of the railways has improved. I admit that the attitude of Indian economists towards the railways, which they looked upon unfavourably, has to be changed because everyone wants to travel by railway and it is cheaper. But at the same time when we compare these railways with the railways on the Continent or with the railways in the United States or Canada, and when we compare the salaries that are enjoyed by the officials employed by the State in those railways as compared with the salaries of officials here in this country, we find what a great difference there is between the two. Sir, in India there is no proportion between the benefits conferred on the people and the comfort enjoyed by them and the salaries enjoyed by the highest railway officials. It has been insinuated that we shall have to go to the market for the most competent men because in this country there are no people who are fit to become members of the Railway Board or who can adequately perform those duties. Sir, I repudiate that insinuation with the greatest emphasis that I can command. But even if we have to go to the open market of the world for getting expert knowledge or for recruiting those people whom we want in this country, will the Government of India allow us to go into the market of the world in order to fill the posts of the Civil Services? Where then is the question of the markets of the world? There is absolutely no question of such a thing. If it is to be assumed that the British alone can administer this country in the best interests of the country, and that a certain proportion of the higher services of India must be British employed on their own terms, then there is no question of choice or market price. If the British force the services of their people on us, force us to employ them at such exorbitant prices as do not prevail anywhere else in the world—which are in fact not only 3 or 4 times but ten times as high as those given to corresponding officers in other civilised countries—I submit it is not a question of buying or selling in the market. It is a question of forcing us to accept their own price, their own valuation; and so long as we are forced to do this, we are bound to raise our voice in protest against invidious distinctions and unnatural preferments. Sir, in the matter of the recruitment to Indian services we want to occupy the same position in our country as other people do in theirs. The claim of my countrymen that at least one member of the Railway Board should be an Indian is not an exorbitant claim. Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas says—and I endorse what he says—that our aspiration is that every member of the Railway Board should be an Indian; because it is only an Indian and an Indian alone who can safeguard the interests of the Indian people, the Indian nation and the Indian wage-earner. Others cannot do that, however angelic, however saintly they may be. Their interests are different from ours; and that has been distinctly shown by the charges that have been brought by this side of the House against the railway administration, especially by my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru. It is not a question of reserves and surpluses at all. It is a question of the point of view from

[Lala Lajpat Rai.]

which you must look at the thing. The question is whether the railway policy of the Government of India shall be determined in the interests of India and Indians or in the interests of Britain and the British. If you are going to invest the taxpayer's money in such surpluses and reserves, I do not know where you might go. Surpluses can be created to any extent and paid by loans whenever the interests of British trade demand it. No case has been made out for surpluses and reserves. I listened with great respect to the speech made by the Honourable Sir Clement Hindley but I am sorry to say I was not convinced by the arguments or the facts adduced by him in his defence. The indictment made against the Railway Board from these Benches is perfectly justified. It is based on the past history of the railway administration in India, it is based on the present policy of the railway administration in India, and it is based on its future prospects also. There is no prospect of any reforms being introduced into the railway administration in India unless the Government of India makes up its mind freely to introduce the Indian element much more than it has done so far.

One word more, Sir, before I sit down. We shall not be satisfied if one Indian member, is taken on the Railway Board and taken from the service itself. It may of course be said that we are clamouring here for posts. We are not; but even if we were, what does that matter? How can people who are themselves clamouring for posts and for high salaries charge us with sordid motives? After all, we are human. We shall not be satisfied, and the Indian public will not be satisfied unless the Government employs some men from the public life of this country who are as well versed in railway affairs as members of the Railway Board. We do not want men to be promoted from the lower ranks of the service into high positions on the Railway Board because, unfortunately circumstanced as they are, they will not be in a position, by the force of habits and environments and by the force of circumstances, to look after the interests of India so well as public men who move in the public life of India will do. I do not admit that the public life of this country is so absolutely poor in talent as not to be able to furnish one or two members for the Railway Board. I admit we may have to go with caution. We have no objection to foreign experts being employed in technical departments, where they can guide us, instruct us and help us; but I do contend that in the administrative line our men can do as well as Englishmen. I do not say I myself can but there are others who can do even better. I therefore think, Sir, that this stock argument advanced from day to day, and from hour to hour that there are no Indians fit for these administrative posts, should be discontinued. People on the other side ought not to put forward this stock argument with any pride. How can they say that after 200 years of British rule in this country, the people of the country are so absolutely devoid of ability, so incapable of learning anything, so absolutely poor in talent, that they cannot supply one man to sit on the Railway Board, to look after the interests of India and to help in the management of Indian Railways. That would be a poor admission to make and it would be a grave and serious charge against British work in India. Sir, I am not one of those who believe that British rule has been an unmixed evil. It has done good as well as evil, though on the whole no foreign rule can ever do much good. But at the same time the argument advanced that we must have the best men and those best men are not available in India cannot be listened

to. It certainly does not add to the pleasantness of our relations and it does not help us in any way. They say that their motives are the best. We may not question their motives out of courtesy; but facts are facts and they speak for themselves. After all they are human beings. And where is a human being who is not swayed by self-interest and the interest of those near and dear to him? There may be exceptions to this rule, but they can only be few and far between. I voice the sentiment of the whole country, of the vast population of my countrymen, when I say that the railway administration in this country is not being carried on in the best interests of the country. Sir, this is the one department where, on platforms, in railway carriages, in offices and in many other ways, every Indian feels and feels to the core, the marrow of his bones, that he is a slave, a subject to be ill-treated, to be insulted and to be humiliated by men whose position and status in life compared to his is nothing. He has to eat humble pie at every step. Be he a Raja or a Maharaja, be he a Member of the Assembly or of the Council of State, he has to eat humble pie before every Anglo-Indian or European, however small and low-salaried he may be. It enters like steel into his very soul; and he can never forget this outstanding fact of his life. He sleeps with a sore heart, a heavy heart after having suffered that humiliation; he curses the time and the moment when he allowed himself to be subjected to foreign rule.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney and others:

I move that the question be now put.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Sir, the increasing discontent on this part of the House is not subsiding. On the contrary, it is rising and culminating to an apex from year to year in consequence of the growing inefficiency of the Railway Board. Three years ago we entered into a convention with the Honourable Member for Commerce and Industries. After prolonged negotiations a formula was reached and that is embodied in the Resolution which was unanimously passed by the last Legislative Assembly. Honourable Members on this side of the House, especially my Honourable friend, Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, regard it as a convention to which the Honourable Member for Commerce demurs. I do not regard it as a part of the convention but I regard it as a part of the compact made by the Honourable Member with this side of the House, and I ask him to say whether this was not a compact and a compromise upon which the whole of the covenant was accepted by the members of the Railway Advisory Council and thereafter by the Legislative Assembly. Viewed in that light, whether you call it a covenant or a compact, an agreement or a compromise, there remains the fact that the Government pledged themselves to carry out this part of the Resolution as much as the rest of it, and I ask the Honourable Sir Charles Innes what he has done to carry out that part of the Resolution. That is the main question. The question is not whether it is a compact or a covenant but the question is whether this part of the Resolution, which was a part of the compromise arrived at after prolonged and deliberate consultation, accepted by the Government and passed by the unanimous vote of this House, has been or has not been fulfilled by the Honourable the Commerce Member who presumably spoke on behalf of the Government and whose joint responsibility he pledged to the representatives of this House. That is the main question.

Now, Sir, I ask another question and that is that this covenant was to run for at least three years. It was passed by the Legislative Assem-

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

bly at its sitting on the 20th September 1924. In the first instance, as I have said, we were reluctant to give a longer time and three years was fixed as the period for which it should run in the first instance. Those three years will shortly expire and I wish, therefore, to ask what the Honourable Member has done to make good his pledge given to this House, which was to have been fulfilled long before the expiry of the three years? That is the question which Members on this side of the House should ask the Honourable the Commerce Member to answer and answer to the satisfaction of the representatives of the people here. We feel that there has been a breach of good faith on the part of the occupants of the Treasury Benches. We feel that when this Resolution was passed we were clearly given to understand that every part of the Resolution would be given effect to by the Government. And we now feel that, while the Government have had the plums of the bargain as it were, they have left the main portion of the Resolution, upon which we had been negotiating with the Government and without which we would not have recommended rest of the covenant, severely alone. There is, I submit, a strong feeling on the part of the Members of this side of the House. If that were all that would be enough, but there was a good deal more. The Honourable Member for Commerce knows too well the gross inefficiency of the Railway Board. Has he forgotten that scandalous contract which was given to Messrs. Spedding and Co. during the last Session of this Assembly? Has he forgotten the special Committee of the Railway Council that went into the question and condemned that contract as a contract which has cost this country lakhs of rupees? If I had time I would give you the details of that contract.

Mr. President: You have.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: And what was the result? All that we were told was that it was a serious mistake made by the Railway Board in giving a long contract to a European firm in supersession of several longstanding Indian firms of sleeper suppliers. And that contract was given to a firm of really middlemen who entered into a contract with the Government for the supply of those sleepers and who pocketed the middlemen's profit which the Railway Board knew they had no right to do. One department was selling and the other department was buying—that was the contract. "We went into the question", it was said, and "we will not do it again". My Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru has already referred to the coal contract scandal, but that is not all. We have this Raven Committee's Report and in the opening pages of that report we find writ large the strongest condemnation of the Railway Board and their management. In the very preface you will find that while in the Indian State Railways they employ a large number of men than are employed in England the payment made and the inefficiency shown by the Indian workshops are severely condemned. This report was published only last year. We were told, "we had nothing to conceal, nothing to disguise when this Committee was appointed". That may be so, but the fact remains that this report on the management of State Railway workshops is the severest condemnation of the Railway Board and an unanswerable impeachment of their inefficiency.

Then, Sir, we have the question about the railway wagons. The Honourable Sir Clement Hindley spoke with some feeling but I am afraid he spoke without conviction, because the charge against the Railway Board

is that they have themselves admitted that there is a surplus of 80,000 wagons which represents a capital expenditure of Rs. 15 crores. The Honourable Sir Clement Hindley quoted from an American publication that there were also certain reserve wagons in America. But I should have been more interested to hear from the Honourable gentleman the percentage of reserves in America and the percentage of reserves in India.

Sir Clement Hindley: May I just reply, Sir? I believe it is 25 per cent. in America and something like 4 or 5 per cent. in India.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Well, of course, that is not so simple a question as the Honourable Sir Clement Hindley thinks. You have to go into the figures, you have to see the mileage run, you have to see whether these wagons are constantly employed and the other auxiliary questions connected with it. I am asking the Honourable the Chief Commissioner for Railways to distinguish between reserves and surplus and I am sure of all persons—we laymen do not know—he as a technical man understands the difference between what is a reserve wagon and what is a surplus wagon. As I understand, surplus wagon means a wagon for which the railway have no use and which is supernumerary. Now if you have got 80,000 supernumerary wagons for which you have no use and which were lying idle three months before the time when you gave evidence before the Royal Commission, then I beg to submit that so much capital was lying idle and therefore unproductive and you have to show cause why you embarked on the purchase of such a large quantity of surplus wagons for which you had no present use. Sir, you remember that before we adjourned for luncheon we were promised information, asked for by the Honourable Mr. Jinnah, as to when, to which I added as to where, these wagons were purchased and we were promised information after luncheon. It is well nigh tea time. It is about 25 minutes to 4 and that information is not forthcoming. I venture to ask them once more to give us the information at this stage because we are suspicious that these superfluous wagons were purchased for the purpose of relieving unemployment in England. I pause for a reply. That, I submit, is a feeling which is working in the minds of some of our people. You have been buying locomotives and questions were asked last year and the year before last. When you purchased locomotives in England, it had worked out to more than 15 or 20 per cent. of the prices which were then ruling on the Continent and we asked you why you purchased these and you gave us the stock reply that these locomotives are standardised or a few words to that effect which convinced no one on this side of the House. These are the questions which are naturally agitating the minds of our people. My friends, Colonel Crawford and Mr. Cocks, while they sympathised with us on this side of the House upon the merits of our grievances, said "you can make a small cut and we shall walk into the lobby with you". Sir, when whole cuts are made they are certified. When small cuts are made, they are ignored. What are we to do? We have been making small cuts and I am not sure whether these cuts were not made in spite of the Honourable Mr. Cocks and Colonel Crawford's going over to the other side on previous occasions. We, as I have said, are in a state of utter exasperation. What are we to do? Shall we take hammers in hand and in a body go for the members of the Railway Board or adopt the only constitutional means, ineffective and inefficient though it may be, of recording our increasingly vehement protest against the inefficiency of the Railway Board? Nothing else is left to us. I therefore submit that every Member in this House

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

must unite in supporting the motion because it is a motion upon which we feel and feel strongly that we must record our united and emphatic protest.

One word more and I have done. We have been told that Indians are not employed in the higher services of the railway because we cannot get technical men, men possessed of sufficient technical knowledge. But are the ministers of transport in other countries technical men? Are they not Parliamentarians possessed of administrative capacity sufficient to lay down the policy which technical men have to carry out? Well, Sir, it has been a stock argument by the occupants of the Treasury Benches. I will give you one short example because it illustrates my point. Some five years back I asked the Honourable Member for Commerce, Sir Charles Innes, why this firm of Messrs. Thomas de la rue and Company were being paid large sums of money for making stamps in England, a great deal of which, when they came to this country, had to be destroyed because of their deterioration on account of climatic and other causes, and the Honourable Sir Charles Innes very nearly convinced me by saying that the climatic conditions of this country were against the production of stamps. Thereupon I put myself in communication with foreign countries and Ceylon and produced for his information a very large number of stamps which had been locally manufactured and told him that those stamps were made locally and were of the very finest design in point of colour and everything else. My Honourable friend was still unconvinced. Thereupon I produced a catalogue from Germany and showed him that by an automatic process stamps could be produced at a very economic cost. He was still unconvinced and thereupon, in my utter despair, I moved a cut with the result that the machinery of Government was set to work and we are now producing in this country what I think are some of the finest stamps that can be produced in Asia, and insurmountable difficulties dependent upon climate, want of technical knowledge, want of suitable atmosphere, absence of a moist climate and presence of dirt and dust in the atmosphere have all disappeared, and I think with pardonable pride the Honourable the Commerce Member congratulated himself and I congratulate him upon the fact that we are now producing in this country stamps which were for nearly 25 years a foreign monopoly.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: What was the cut you made?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: I made a cut of one rupee. But it was a very sharp cut. Now, Sir, if the Honourable Commerce Member had read the handwriting on the wall, he would have acted as promptly as he did in the matter of stamps. We have had promises not only from him but also from his colleague the Honourable the Finance Member, but these reinforced and redoubled promises have not yet been made good and we feel, therefore, that short cuts are of no avail to us and this is the only means we have of ventilating our grievances and drawing the attention of the authorities here and in England to the fact that our solemn recommendations and our repeated protests made from year to year cannot be lightly ignored. On these grounds I ask my friends on this side of the House to unite in supporting the amendment.

(Several Honourable Members moved that the question be put.)

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

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: My friend Dr. Gour can always be relied upon to help his opponents. He has just told us an extraordinarily interesting story of how by his own pertinacity and his own ingenuity he eventually drove me, a stiff-necked bureaucrat, to make stamps in India. It was my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah who extracted from him the answer that he had made a rupee cut. I ask Dr. Gour that if the Government were so responsive to a cut of one rupee, why does he now support a motion for the cutting of the whole Grant? Surely the lesson to be drawn from this extremely interesting story which Dr. Gour has told us is that the Government pay as much attention to a censure of the House, as after all a motion for reduction which is carried is a censure, whether it is a reduction of one rupee or a reduction of the whole Grant. That is the point which my friend Maulvi Muhammad Yakub and Colonel Crawford both tried to put, and I am glad that Dr. Gour has lent such strong support to the plea of these two gentlemen.

This debate has followed the usual lines. It is on this day of the year and the three successive days that I realise what an extraordinary villain I am. Everybody in the House, at any rate on that side of the House, gets up and tells me exactly how many crimes I have committed in the last year. I do not mind it myself, quite honestly, after five years, in fact I think this is my sixth, and after this sixth Railway Budget I have really got to a state where I am case-hardened. But I must confess that I do wish Honourable Members opposite would confine their abuse to me and would not go abusing my officers. As far as I can judge, there are two lines of attack which have been made upon me to-day. The first line of attack is that I have not carried out the promise made when the separation convention was passed. Dr. Gour accused me in so many words of having broken a pledge. Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas and Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar used almost the same words. Now, Sir, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas had a very great share—if I may say so I am eternally grateful to him—had a very great share in arranging that convention. We agreed in 1924, and Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas will bear me out when I say that it was part of the arrangement that we arrived at that we should exclude from the convention any reference to what I may call the Indianisation of the Railway Board. We deliberately excluded from the actual clauses of the convention the two clauses of the Resolution which referred to Indianisation. And, Sir, when that Resolution was put to the vote, I took the very greatest care to make my own position plain. I did so because I expressly wished to safeguard myself against any charges in the future of broken faith or broken pledges. There is no charge which an Englishman or a Scot resents more than that, the charge that one has broken one's word. Now, Sir, what did I say? I said:

“As regards the Railway Board we have already recruited Indians for the staff of the Railway Board, that is, for the appointment of officers attached to the Railway Board, and I hope we shall be able to continue this process.”

We have continued it and two of the most important officers in the Railway Board outside the actual Board itself are Indians now, one is Mr. Hayman and the other is Mr. Gupta.

“As each appointment becomes vacant I will undertake that the claims of Indians are considered. As regards the members of the Railway Board I cannot bind myself to dates, as it must take time before there are Indians of the requisite standing and experience for admission to the Railway Board. As I pointed out the other day, the Railway Board is a purely technical body and does not control policy.”

[Sir Charles Innes.]

Now, Sir, I think the House will agree that I did safeguard myself absolutely in that matter. I gave a promise that we would consider the claims of Indians as vacancies occurred, but I pointed out that time must elapse before Indians of the requisite experience and standing are available for appointments on the Railway Board, and I did not hold out any hope that we should be able to appoint them to the Railway Board at an early date. Pandit Motilal Nehru and Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar have both suggested that it is not absolutely necessary that the Railway Board should be a technical Board. But, Sir, I can quote against Pandit Motilal Nehru and against Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar the authority of the Acworth Committee's Report. The Acworth Committee definitely said that the Chief Commissioner of Railways must be a technical railway man; and we hold in the Government very strongly that the other members of the Railway Board, excluding the Financial Commissioner, must also be technical railway men. After all, what does the Railway Board do? It has Railway questions coming up daily; it has to examine projects for new development; it has to examine all kinds of traffic questions, all kinds of establishment questions connected with the railways; and our general policy in filling up the appointments in the Railway Board is to have a Chief Commissioner who is Chief Commissioner of Railways and is above his colleagues on the Railway Board. He is really the expert adviser of the Government of India and he must be, as the Acworth Committee said, a technical railway man. Then we have two members of the Railway Board proper, and our usual plan, though it is not always so, is to have one man a traffic expert and the other member an engineering expert. Sometimes we have had a mechanical engineer but usually it is a civil engineer.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Are there no Indian Chief Engineers on the railways?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am glad to inform the Honourable Member that the Chief Engineer on the North Western Railway appointed about a year ago is an Indian. (*An Honourable Member:* "And on the Eastern Bengal State Railway.") Not now. Then Sir, the only other officer on the Railway Board is that *rara vis*, perhaps rare even in this House, namely, the financial expert. That financial expert is appointed by the Finance Member, who consults me, but I generally leave the matter to him because I do not pretend to understand finance or financial experts. Now I should like people to think what it means when they press me to appoint Indians to the Railway Board. How are these vacancies filled up? They are the prize appointments of a very large service, the whole of the railway service, and when you have a vacancy on the Railway Board you have only a limited number of men, your senior railway officers, whose claims can be considered, as things are at present, for appointments of that kind. Now, Sir, the House continually presses me to neglect the claims of those officers and even to put in, as Lala Lajpat Rai suggested, a non-official. Pandit Motilal Nehru I think had in mind some Indian officer on the Indian railways. In either case what the House is asking me to do is to supersede or pass over men who by long years of excellent work on the Indian railways have earned their promotion; and frankly I cannot do it. I am as responsible to those men as to this House, and I should feel that I was committing a great dereliction of my duty and my responsibility if I either superseded them or passed over them in order to put in a man who would be, *ex hypothesi* as I hold, less qualified for that appointment. And

that is our difficulty. I do hope that this House does not think that I enjoy standing up here year after year opposing you upon this. It is no pleasure to me and I have done my very best to understand the point of view of my Honourable friends opposite. I can quite see and I understand it, that they feel that the Railway Board is so to speak a close corporation from which the Indian is definitely excluded. Well, Sir, I can quite realize that point of view. I do hope you will recognize my difficulties. I have always told you it is purely a question of time. I myself can never understand why it is that year after year the whole of the Railway Board Budget is thrown out for what I regard as a purely temporary circumstance. Year after year we are taking more and more and more Indians into the Indian railway services. Already they are beginning to climb to the top. As I told the House the other day, an Indian in the last year has been appointed as Chief Engineer of the North Western Railway. Another Indian has risen to the post of Divisional Superintendent on the North Western Railway. That shows what the policy is. I am quite prepared to admit that this Indianisation policy was rather belated; I am quite prepared to agree that it ought to have been taken up earlier. But still we are now coming to the point when Indians are beginning to rise to the top, and it is only a question of time before in the ordinary course Indians will be appointed to the Railway Board, not because they are Indians but because they are the best men for the appointment and because they have qualified themselves for the appointment.

Mr. B. Das: What about your successor, the Member for Railways?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member surely ought to know by this time that my successor is not appointed by me but by His Majesty the King. But, Sir, that part of my case is as familiar to you as it is to me. What I did not like about this debate was the attempts made to discredit the Railway Board; to prove that Indians are fit for appointment to the Railway Board by trying to prove that the existing members of the Railway Board are unfit for their appointments. I heard Mr. Goswami say "Hear, hear". Now, Sir, it seems to me that that is not altogether an attitude which I think Honourable Members opposite need be proud of. As I say, Indians are rising to posts of responsibility on the railways, but in order to show that they are fit for the Railway Board, it is not necessary I think to devote long and laboured speeches to prove that the existing members of the Railway Board are totally unfit for their position. Now, Sir, I believe—and I speak now with five years' experience—I say India owes a great debt of gratitude to Sir Clement Hindley (Hear, hear) and to all other members of the Railway Board. Sir Hari Singh Gour will bear me out. I remember the very first time I attempted to defend the Railway Budget in this House, I had the most terrific onslaught from Dr. Gour. In those days I was not so accustomed to Dr. Gour as I am now. I remember being very gravely embarrassed by that onslaught, not only because the onslaught was a very fierce one but because there was a great deal of force behind it, because the railways at that time were in a thoroughly bad way. Then I persuaded Lord Reading to appoint Mr. Hindley, as he then was, as Chief Commissioner in October, 1922, and the first thing we did was to associate with him Mr. Sim. Sir Clement Hindley and Mr. Sim have laboured hard together during the last four years: and what I say is this, that whatever complaints you may have against them in matters of detail, whatever complaints you may have against us on particular aspects of railway working, I am sure that

[Sir Charles Innes.]

no fair-minded man in this House will deny that the Indian Railways are ever so much more efficient than they were when Sir Clement Hindley took charge of them (Applause). Let me point out one broad fact. In the last three years we have made from the Indian Railways excluding commercial railways a net profit of 31 crores of rupees—31 crores of rupees; that is to say, we have paid all our interest charges and have earned 31 crores in addition. Two or three months ago I was reading the report of a lecture by a gentleman by name Sir Lyndon Macassey. He was discoursing upon the evils of the State management of railways, and he was enlarging on that subject and said in the course of his lecture that in every country where State management had been tried, it had ended in disastrous failure; and he went on to say that of all the countries where the railways were State-managed, there was only one as far as he knew and that I think was New South Wales where at the present time they were making a profit out of their railways. I am glad to have this opportunity of making it clear that the Indian railways, mostly State-managed, mostly managed directly by the State, have in the last three years made a profit of 31 crores of rupees. Now, Sir, I should like this House to realize, to remember, that the Indian railway system is the third biggest railway system in the world, and I think I am correct in saying that it is far and away the biggest State-managed railway system in the world; and I think it is a great tribute to Sir Clement Hindley and the Railway Board that when they have got the enormous load of responsibility that the management of this huge railway system involves, at the end of five years—Sir Clement Hindley to my great regret is about to go—he is able at any rate to show that during the course of his five years he has transformed the Indian railways from a system I may say of grave disorder to a system of great efficiency, and that he has paid regularly during the last two years our contribution; he has paid you something like, I think I am correct in saying, 22 crores of rupees, that is our gross contribution paid to general revenues; and it does seem to me rather ungrateful that the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru and other Members of this House should have devoted the whole of their many eloquent speeches in that fashion making the most violent attack upon the efficiency of these officers.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: We are no respecter of persons.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Now, Sir, let me just say a few words about this vexed wagon question. I notice that Sir Hari Singh Gour was, even at the end of Sir Clement Hindley's speech, quite incapable of understanding the position. It is a fact that in the monsoon months of last year we had what was estimated to be 30,000 wagons standing idle, but I understand that at the present time the number of such wagons is standing in the neighbourhood of 5,000 or 6,000. Sir Hari Singh Gour, Sir, deduced the fact that we were carrying a reserve of 30,000 wagons. Nothing of the sort. Surely even Sir Hari Singh Gour knows that, in the first place, our traffic varies according to the season. In the monsoon season we earn on our railways something like 150 lakhs a week. This last week we earned 226 lakhs. That is to say, this is our busy season, as shown by the fact that 226 lakhs were earned last week. In the monsoon months we earn 150 or 160 lakhs a week. Now if we have got to have a sufficient stock of wagons to carry a traffic which brings in earnings of 226 lakhs a week, surely it must be perfectly obvious even to

Dr. Gour that in the monsoon months, when our traffic drops so much, when we only earn something like 150 lakhs or 160 lakhs, surely it must be obvious that we must have a large number of wagons stabled. It does not mean that these wagons are unnecessary, because, if we had only sufficient wagons to carry our monsoon traffic, obviously we should have about one-third too few wagons for our busy season traffic. They explain one reason why you must at certain seasons of the year have a very considerable number of wagons stabled. Then again the traffic varies with the year.

An Honourable Member: They are your reserves, not surpluses?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: It also varies according to the state of the harvest. As the Acworth Committee pointed out, railway earnings vary abruptly according to the state of the harvest results and the fluctuations of trade. At the moment this is our busy season. We have 5,000 or 6,000 stabled at the moment. Next year may see a revival of trade, and we may find ourselves short of wagons. But at the moment, on looking into the matter, we think that our reserve is probably just as much as we require now and are likely to require in the next two years. All that Pandit Motilal Nehru said about 15 crores of rupees of the taxpayer's money having been wasted on these wagons, all that was totally mistaken. I said yesterday that we had got into a mess in regard to this wagon business, and I say it again, but it was not because we have got a surplus, a reserve, of wagons—I welcome that myself. The real trouble is in regard to the wagon firms. Pandit Motilal Nehru read out our communiqué of 1918; that communiqué in which we so to speak invited the wagon firms to come into existence. Then we carried on this progress by passing the Steel Bill of 1924 and granting bounties for their maintenance. Well, one of the difficulties and dangers of hot-house methods of protection and bounties is really that we may force industries rather quicker than may be wise. Last year we were able to place orders with them up to their full capacity. That one fact is just the answer to all the suggestions that have been made that in our rehabilitation programme we have had in our minds the British manufacturer and the British manufacturer only. Last year in pursuance of our policy in regard to wagons we were able to place orders with the Indian Standard Wagon Company and the Peninsular Locomotive Company to their maximum capacity. We have got the Indian Standard Wagon Company, the Peninsular Locomotive Company, Burns and Jessops. Two of them, the Indian Standard Wagon Company and the Peninsular Locomotive Company, are entirely dependent on railway orders; the other two have wagon shops in addition to a general engineering shop. The result of our bounty system was that we created in this country wagon firms capable of turning out between 4,000 and 5,000 wagons a year. We never guaranteed that we would place orders for more than 3,000 wagons a year. Still we arrived at that position. By our methods we created in this country a wagon industry capable of making all these wagons. Then, last year, it was only in May, June and July that the whole matter was gone into and the whole matter was examined and our wagon programme was co-ordinated with all the work that has been done in rehabilitation. Efforts were made in the first place to forecast the curve of our traffic and the curve of our wagon uses and we came to the conclusion—and I say it was an embarrassing conclusion for me—we arrived at the conclusion that at present we were not justified in either this or the next year in placing any more orders with these firms. As Sir Clement Hindley said, the easiest

[Sir Charles Innes.]

thing for us to do would have been to order the minimum number of wagons we required under the communiqué of 1918, and said nothing more about it. But we decided not to do that. The first thing we did was we had all the representatives of the wagon firms up in Simla. We placed the whole facts before them and we asked them, "Have you any suggestions to make?" They went away and we discussed it. Eventually we discussed it with them and we made them two offers. I am perfectly frank with the House, because Pandit Motilal Nehru has made a full point of this wagon position and I want to be perfectly frank. We discussed this matter with the firms and eventually put the whole case before them in a memorandum. One of the offers was:

"They (the Government) will call as soon as possible for tenders in India only for such miscellaneous wagons of different gauges and different types as they will require in 1927-28. The exact number of the wagons will depend upon the conversations now going on with the Company Railways, but it is hoped that the number will reach between 1,700 and 1,800."

We then offered:

"The Government will also call, as soon possible, for tenders in India only for such underframes as they will require in 1927-28. Here again the exact number will depend upon the conversations now proceeding with the Companies, but it is hoped that the number will be in the neighbourhood of 600."

Never before have we placed orders for anything like that number of underframes in India. We undertook to:

"instruct the State-worked Railways to place orders in India for such spare parts as they require and as they cannot conveniently make in their own workshops"

and finally we undertook to:

"instruct the State-worked Railways to call for tenders in India only for shedding, roof trusses and bridge spans up to 80 feet span."

That is what we promised to do for the year 1927-28 and we told them that we would consider the matter again next year. And we said that if they were not prepared to accept the offer, the only suggestion we could make was that we should offer to buy out the two firms, the two firms which were entirely dependent on the railway orders, the Indian Standard Wagon Company and the Peninsular Locomotive Company. Why did we make that offer? We did not want to enlarge our responsibilities in that way. But this is the answer I want to make to Pandit Motilal Nehru. One thing we did keep, and kept in the forefront of our minds throughout all these negotiations, was that it was absolutely essential that if possible we should keep the wagon industry alive in India and we thought the best way we could do it if these firms wanted not to continue was to make the wagons ourselves in our own shops. There was no thought to place orders in Great Britain. The only orders that were placed—I think I am correct in saying it—in the last two or three years in Great Britain were for special types.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Is it not true that the type of wagons, the orders for which were guaranteed was very different from what the offer now is for and that the plant necessary to manufacture and produce the parts and the other things which were mentioned will be different to what has been employed in the type wagons?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member has caught me on a technical point. I understand it is a fact that the orders we offered to place in India this year are for miscellaneous wagons of different gauges and types and these different gauges and different types do require different jigs, they do not require different machines, but they do require certain re-adjustment of machines. That was the offer we made to the firms. The real trouble in this matter is that you cannot have two firms like this making one type of article dependent solely on the Indian railways. That is the whole difficulty of the situation. Can we guarantee always to place orders with these two particular firms? They make nothing else. That is one of the dangers of the situation. You cannot have wagon building firms whose capacity is in excess of your ordinary requirements. They may be underquoted and it may be that in a particular year that because they can make nothing but wagons they are left without work. But, at any rate, I have said enough to show that we do recognise that we have put these wagon firms in a difficulty and that we have done our very best to be fair to the firms and that we have throughout taken the firms into our confidence. Now, I hope I have disposed of the case built by Pandit Motilal Nehru. In so far as he has told us that we have locked up 15 crores in buying surplus wagons, I think that Sir Clement Hindley and I have shown that there is nothing in the Pandit's case. As regards the effect of this matter upon Indian wagon making firms, I claim to have assured the House that we have done our best to treat the firms with consideration, we have taken them most fully into our confidence and that we have done our best to help them to tide over a very difficult period. I do not think, Sir, that I need say anything more. I resent very much on behalf of the officers who have served you very faithfully and very well on the Railway Board all these wild charges that have been made against them, and I do suggest that it is wrong of this House in order to prove that Indians are fit for service in the Railway Board to try to prove that officers who have rendered I think signal services to India are incompetent and inefficient. I hope, Sir, that I have said enough to show that this House ought to be grateful to these officers rather than attack them in this way. I see that the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru laughs. Sir, I myself am inclined to believe that the sin against the Holy Ghost is the sin of ingratitude. We, Englishmen, have served in this country for 150 years. There is hardly a stone in this land which is not stained with the blood of an Englishman. There is hardly one of us who has not buried in this country, it may be, a wife, it may be a sister, it may be a child. We have done our very best for this country and, Sir, in order to serve your political ends, is it right that you should render us not gratitude but merely abuse such has been showered to-day on the members of the Railway Board? Sir, I oppose the motion.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,43,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1928, in respect of the 'Railway Board'."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the Demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 9,42,900."

The question I have to put is that that amendment be made.

The Assembly divided :

AYES—59.

Abdul Latif Saheb Firookhi, Mr.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswami.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sesha.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
Chaman Lall, Mr.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Chunder, Mr. Nirmal Chunder.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Dutta, Mr. Srish Chandra.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Ismail Khan, Mr.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
Jayakar, Mr. M. B.
Jogiah, Mr. Varahagiri Venkata.
Kartar Singh, Sardar.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Khin Maung, U.
Kidwai, Mr. Rafi Ahmad.
Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. Dharendra
Kanta.
Lajpat Rai, Lala.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayyid.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
Prakasam, Mr. T.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Rananjaya Singh, Kumar.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Muhammad.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar.
Tok Kyi, U.
Yusuf Imam, Mr.

NOES—52.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Akram Hussain Bahadur, Prince
A. M. M.
Allison, Mr. F. W.
Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr.
Ashrafuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur
Nawabzada Sayid.
Ayyangar, Mr. V. K. A. Aravamudha.
Ayyangar, Rao Bahadur Narasimha.
Gopalaswami.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
Coatman, Mr. J.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.
Donovan, Mr. J. T.
Dunnett, Mr. J. M.
E'jaz Rasul Khan, Raja Muhammad.
Gavin-Jones, Mr. T.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J.
Graham, Mr. L.
Greenfield, Mr. H. C.
Haigh, Mr. P. B.
Hayman, Mr. A. M.
Hezlett, Mr. J.
Hindley, Sir Clement.
Howell, Mr. E. B.

Hyder, Dr. L. K.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
Kabul Singh Bahadur, Risaldar-Major
and Honorary Captain.
Keane, Mr. M.
Lamb, Mr. W. S.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Macphail, The Rev. Dr. E. M.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
Nath.
Mohammad Ismail Khan, Haji
Chaudhury.
Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
Alexander.
Nasir-ud-din Ahmad, Khan Bahadur.
Natieq, Maulvi A. H.
Paddison, Sir George.
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Roy, Mr. K. C.
Ruthnaswamy, Mr. M.
Bassoon, Sir Victor.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Willson, Sir Walter.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the
24th February, 1927.