

26th 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 No. 181X/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	1191-93
The Railway Budget—	
List of Demands—	
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 West- ern 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 Mainte- nance 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>	
Low Salaries of Postal Clerks, Peons and Subordinate Services and inadequate Pensions of Subordinate Retired Officers	2054-2101
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	2109-00

Monday, 14th March, 1927—

Questions and Answers	2161-85 ¹
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—	
Desirability of increasing the consumption of Salt in India and of making India self-supporting in the matter of Salt	2186-2202
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—	
Report of the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces Committee: University Training Corps	2202-40
General Policy and Expenditure	2203-14
	2214-40

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 26th February, 1927.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

NUMBER OF INDIANS IN THE TRAFFIC OR THE LOCOMOTIVE SERVICE DRAWING MORE THAN Rs. 1,000.

612. ***Mr. T. C. Goswami**: Will Government be pleased to state how many Indians there are in the traffic or in the locomotive service getting more than Rs. 1,000?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to question No. 421 asked by Diwan Chaman Lall on the 15th February 1927.

SALE OF REVERSE COUNCIL BILLS.

613. ***Sir Hari Singh Gour**: (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the statement in the *Commerce* newspaper of Calcutta, to the effect that the Government has resorted to the policy of restarting the sale of Reverse Council Bills?

(b) Did Sir Malcolm Hailey assure the House as it is stated in the journal last mentioned that the sale of Reverse Council Bills will never be made without the consent of the Assembly?

(c) What is the amount of the sales and the amount drawn from the Gold Exchange Reserve to meet the difference?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to make a full statement of its policy regarding the sale of Reverse Council Bills?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to question No. 154 by Kumar Ganganand Sinha on the 31st January.

EXPENDITURE ON THE ROYAL AIR FORCE IN INDIA.

614. ***Sir Hari Singh Gour**: (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a reply by Earl Winterton to a question put by Mr. Kelly in the House of Commons in November last, to the effect that the Royal Air Forces in India were units of the Imperial Forces and not part of the Indian Army and that they did not comprise any enlisted Indian personnel?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state what is the actual cost of the Royal Air Forces in India and whether it is met out of the revenues of this country?

(c) If the answer to the last question be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state whether it is not a fact that the Government of India have assured this House more than once that the Army in India is maintained solely for the defence of India and that it is no part of the Imperial forces or equipped for that purpose? Is it still the position of the Government of India or has it been abandoned? If so, since when and why?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) Government have seen the reply.

(b) The cost is just over a crore and three-quarters a year. It is met from the revenues of India.

(c) The Honourable Member appears to be referring to answers given by Mr. Burdon in this House on the 5th February 1924, and the 27th January and 16th February, 1926. In the course of those answers it was stated that the Army in India is not maintained for Imperial purposes; that the Government of India hold the army maintained in India to be maintained entirely for the purposes of India; and that when portions of the forces maintained in India are lent to His Majesty's Government and used for purposes outside India, the cost is borne by the British tax-payer. This is still the position of the Government of India, who see no inconsistency and very little connection between the statements I have quoted and the reply given by Lord Winterton. The Honourable Member may perhaps be confusing Imperial Forces with Imperial purposes, and the Army in India with the Indian Army.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Will the Honourable Member be able to enlighten the House as to the distinction between Imperial forces and the forces maintained for Imperial purposes?

Mr. G. M. Young: Imperial forces are forces raised in the United Kingdom. Forces maintained for Imperial purposes are forces maintained for purposes other than the defence of India.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: May I beg to inquire whether the policy of the Government of India is that the Army in India is kept for purposes extraneous to the defence of India?

Mr. G. M. Young: I have already replied to that question.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Is the Honourable Member aware that a series of Resolutions moved when the Honourable Member's predecessor, Sir Godfrey Fell, was the Army Secretary and unanimously carried by the House decided that the Army in India should be primarily and solely maintained for internal defence and warding off external aggressions?

Mr. G. M. Young: If the Honourable Member is referring to the Resolution of the 28th March, 1921, I am afraid he is not quoting it correctly.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Will the Honourable Member enlighten the House as to how far the Royal Air Force in India maintained for Imperial purposes is consistent with the policy set out in the Resolution unanimously accepted by the House?

Mr. G. M. Young: The Royal Air Force in India is not maintained for Imperial purposes. It is maintained for the defence of India.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Is the Honourable Member aware that it was stated in the Committee which was formed for the purpose of finding out what were the military requirements of the country that so far as the Army in India and the Air Force as it then stood was concerned it was

all that was held necessary for the purpose of maintaining the defences of India?

Mr. G. M. Young: I think that question is sufficiently long for me to ask the Honourable Member to put it down on paper.

PUBLICATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SKEEN COMMITTEE.

615. ***Sir Hari Singh Gour:** Will the Government be pleased to state when the Report of the Skeen Committee is likely to be ready for publication? Do Government propose to publish it simultaneously both in England and in India? If so, when?

Mr. G. M. Young: I refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave on the 31st January, in answer to starred questions Nos. 61 and 149, I am afraid that I have nothing to add to that answer as yet.

MAXIMUM INCOME-TAX AND SUPER-TAX LEVIED IN INDIA AND ENGLAND.

616. ***Sir Hari Singh Gour:** Will the Government be pleased to state the maximum income-tax and super-tax leviable in this country and in England and what percentage does it represent to the gross income of the payee in each case and to what extent has the incidence varied in the two countries since 1918?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blakett: A statement containing the information asked for is laid on the table.

The maximum rates of Indian income-tax since 1918 have been as follows :

1918-1919 to 1920-21	12 pies in the rupee.
1921-22	16 " " "
Since 1922-23	18 " " "

The British income-tax rates for the same period are :

1918-19 to 1921-22	6 shillings in the £.
1922-23	5 " "
1923-24 and 1924-25	4s. 6d. "
1925-26 and 1926-27	4 shillings in the £.

2. The super-tax in India is now levied on a scale of graduated rates except in the case of companies which are charged at a flat rate of one anna per rupee. Prior to 1920), however, the tax on all assesseees including companies was levied at graduated rates, and in the case of a company, firm or Hindu undivided family, was charged only on its undistributed income or profits.

The rates since 1918 have been as follows :

1918-1919 and 1919-20 :

In respect of the first $\frac{1}{4}$ lakh	Nil
Next $\frac{1}{4}$ lakh	1 anna in the rupee.
" $\frac{1}{4}$ lakh	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ annas " "
" $\frac{1}{4}$ lakh	2 " in the rupee.
" $\frac{1}{4}$ lakh	2 $\frac{1}{2}$ " " "
Over 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs	3 " " "

	1920-21.	1921-22.	Since 1922-23.
(1) In respect of the first lakh of rupees of taxable income—			
(a) in the case of a Hindu undivided family—			
(i) in respect of the first 75,000 rupees.	<i>Nil</i>	<i>Nil</i>	<i>Nil</i>
(ii) in respect of next 25,000 rupees.	1 anna in the rupee.	1 anna in the rupee.	1 anna in the rupee.
(b) in the case of an individual and an unregistered firm—			
(i) in respect of the first 50,000 rupees.	<i>Nil</i>	<i>Nil</i>	<i>Nil</i>
(ii) in respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	1 anna in the rupee.	1 anna in the rupee.	1 anna in the rupee.
(2) In respect of the first 50,000 rupees of income over 1 lakh.	1½	1½	1½
(3) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	2	2	2
(4) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	2½	2½	2½
(5) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	3	3	3
(6) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	...	3½	3½
(7) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	Remainder at the rate of 3 annas in the rupee.	4	4
(8) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	...	Remainder at the rate of 4 annas in the rupee.	4½
(9) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	5
(10) In respect of the next 50,000 rupees.	5½
Remainder In the case of every Company	1 anna in the rupee.	1 anna in the rupee.	6 1 anna in the rupee.

The British super-tax rates for the same period are :

	1918 and 1919. Per £ of income.	1920 to 1924. Per £ of income.	1925 to 1926. Per £ of income.
	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>	<i>s. d.</i>
First £ 2,000	<i>Nil</i>	<i>Nil</i>	<i>Nil</i>
Next 500	1 0	1 6	0 9
" 500	1 6	2 0	1 0
" 1,000	2 0	2 8	1 6
" 1,000	2 6	3 0	2 3
" 1,000	3 0	3 6	3 0
" 1,000	3 6	4 0	3 6
" 1,000	3 6	4 6	3 6
" 1,000	4 0	5 0	4 0
" 1,000	4 0	5 0	4 0
" 5,000	4 6	5 0	4 6
" 5,000	4 6	5 0	5 0
" 10,000	4 6	5 0	5 6
Remainder	4 6	6 0	6 0

The percentage of the tax to the gross income is given below. In the case of super-tax, the percentages vary with reference to the income. Three examples have been worked out.

Indian Income-Tax.

Year.	Maximum rate of income-tax per rupee.	Percentage to gross income.
1918-19 to 1920-21	12 pies.	6.25
1921-22	16 "	8.33
Since 1922-23	18 "	9.37

British Income-Tax.

Year.	Per £ of income.	Percentage to gross income.
1918-19 to 1921-22	6 shillings	30.00
1922-23	5 "	25.00
1923-24 and 1924-25	4s. 6d.	22.50
1925-26 and 1926-27	4 shillings	20.00

N.B.—The above figures do not take into account the allowances and abatements given in the United Kingdom on account of dependents, earned income, etc.

Indian Super-Tax.

Percentages to gross income.

Year.	Companies.			Individuals and unregistered firms.			Hindu Undivided Family.		
	Rs. 1 lakh.	Rs. 6 lakhs.	Rs. 10 lakhs.	Rs. 1 lakh.	Rs. 6 lakhs.	Rs. 10 lakhs.	Rs. 1 lakh.	Rs. 6 lakhs.	Rs. 10 lakhs.
1918-19 and 1919-20	3.12	14.58	16.25	3.12	14.58	16.25	3.12	14.58	16.25
1920-21	3.12	5.73	5.93	3.12	14.58	16.25	1.56	14.32	16.09
1921-22	3.12	5.73	5.93	3.12	17.45	20.47	1.56	17.18	20.81
Since 1922-23	8.12	5.73	5.93	3.12	20.05	27.03	1.56	19.79	26.87

British Super-Tax.

Percentages to gross income.

Year.	£7,000	£40,000	£70,000
1918-19 and 1919-20	8.75	19.84	20.98
1920-21 to 1924-25	10.54	23.65	26.37
1925-26 and 1926-27	7.95	23.14	26.08

ENVELOPES FOR USE OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

617. ***Sir Hari Singh Gour:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state why the envelopes for use of Members in the writing room are printed over with "On His Majesty's Service" with the matter "Member, Legislative Assembly" printed at a corner?

(b) What is the additional cost for printing this matter?

(c) And why is it considered necessary when Members enjoy no privilege of franking their letters or use service stamps?

(d) Do Government propose to discontinue this?

Mr. L. Graham: (a) and (c). The printing of the words "On His Majesty's Service" on the envelopes placed in the Members' writing room is due to an error the origin of which I have not been able to trace. The object of printing the words "Member, Legislative Assembly" on the envelopes is to discourage the use of these envelopes by persons who are not Members of the Legislative Assembly.

(b) I am informed that the cost of printing this matter depends on the number of envelopes struck off at any one time and that the cost, if 1,000 are printed at one time, is one anna for every fifty envelopes.

(d) The envelopes inscribed "On His Majesty's Service" have been withdrawn from the Members' writing room. For the reasons stated above, it is proposed to retain the words "Member, Legislative Assembly".

Sir Hari Singh Gour: May I inquire whether it is not the practice in the House of Commons for members using official stationery in the writing room, that there is no such thing as "Member of the House of Commons" inscribed on envelopes and all that the envelopes and letter heads contain is an embossed crest of the House of Commons?

Mr. L. Graham: May I suggest, Sir, that this question about note paper in the House of Commons does not pertain to my department at all?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: May I beg to inquire whether the embossed stamp on the envelopes and the note-paper containing the words "Legislative Assembly" is not sufficient to distinguish the letters and envelopes used by Members from those used by outside people?

Mr. L. Graham: The embossed inscription "Legislative Assembly" is on the back of the envelope.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: May I ask my Honourable friend Sir Hari Singh Gour what objection he has to the retention of the words " Member, Legislative Assembly " ?

Sir Hari Singh Gour: Saving the cost of printing, Sir.

INFERIOR QUALITY OF STATIONERY SUPPLIED TO MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

618. ***Sir Hari Singh Gour:** (a) Are Government aware that the stationery supplied to Members in the writing room is much inferior to that supplied to the Members of the first Assembly?

(b) If the change be made to effect economy, has it been extended to the other Departments of Government?

(c) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the economy so effected?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) The stationery now supplied to Members is not so good as that supplied to Members of the first Assembly.

(b) Yes.

(c) An endeavour is being made to collect the information and if it is readily available it will be sent to the Honourable Member. I may add for his information that the paper now supplied is of indigenous manufacture and is quite as serviceable as the more expensive imported paper which it has replaced.

Mr. E. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Has the superiority of the stationery supplied to the Members of the first Assembly anything to do with the fact that the members of the Swaraj Party came into the second Assembly?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: I have no information on that point.

ANNUAL INCREMENTS OF MEN IN THE SECOND DIVISION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT.

619. ***Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy:** 1. Is it a fact that the ordinary maximum pay of Rs. 300 fixed for the second division men of the Government of India Secretariat has been made attainable by them in 25 years by an annual increment of Rs. 8?

2. Is it a fact that the ordinary maximum pay of Rs. 500 fixed for the first division staff of the Government of India Secretariat has been made attainable in 20 years by an annual increment of Rs. 15?

3. Is it a fact that the ordinary maximum pay fixed for the dufftries and record sorters in the Government of India Secretariat has been made attainable in 20 years?

4. Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for treating the second division men worse than the record sorters and dufftries not to speak of the first division men, in the matter of attainment of their maximum in 20 years?

5. Are Government aware that there is strong discontent amongst the men concerned for being treated worse than the dufftries and record sorters?

6. Is it a fact that the men concerned petitioned to the Government of India for the redress of their grievances?

7. Is it a fact that their prayer was rejected though backed by the Imperial Secretariat Association?

8. Do Government propose to reconsider their case favourably and to sanction an increment of Rs. 10 a year and to make the maximum of Rs. 300 attainable in 20 years? If not, will they please state the reasons?

9. Are Government aware that there is a strong feeling amongst the public that owing to the absence of Anglo-Indians in the second division the case of the second division men consisting solely of Indians is not being favourably considered?

10. Do Government propose to allay the present discontent by granting their prayer?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: (1), (2) and (3). Yes.

(4) The fact that the maximum pay fixed for the second division is not, as in the case of daftaris and record keepers, attainable in 20 years does not in the opinion of Government constitute a hardship.

(5) and (6). Government have received representations on the subject.

(7), (8) and (10). Representations received from the Imperial Secretariat Association in 1923 and 1925 were rejected. A further representation has since been received and is under consideration.

(9). No. The facts are not as stated by the Honourable Member.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Regarding the answer to (9), will the Government be pleased to lay on the table of the House a complete list of the establishment for the second division to enable us to verify whether there are any Anglo-Indians in it?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: I did not say that there was no Anglo-Indian. If the Honourable Member will put down his question, I will consider whether we can give him a statement.

SCALES OF PAY OF THE MINISTERIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT AND ATTACHED OFFICES.

620. ***Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy:** What are the scales of pay for the ministerial establishment of the Government of India Secretariat and of its attached offices?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: A statement showing the scales of pay of the ministerial establishment of the Government of India Secretariat and of its attached offices is being forwarded to the Honourable Member.

RECOGNITION OF THE IMPERIAL RECORD DEPARTMENT AS AN ATTACHED OFFICE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

621. ***Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy:** Was the Imperial Record Department ever recognised as one of the attached offices of the Government of India. If so, when?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: There is no rigid definition of "attached" and "subordinate" offices. In recent years subordinate offices moving with the Government of India are generally treated as "attached" offices. The Record Office does not so move.

TRANSFER OF THE IMPERIAL RECORD DEPARTMENT FROM CALCUTTA TO NEW DELHI.

622. ***Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy:** (a) What portion of the Imperial Record Department has been removed to New Delhi? When will the entire building for the Imperial Record Department in New Delhi be ready for occupation and when do Government propose to transfer the whole of the Imperial Record Department from Calcutta to New Delhi?

(b) Do Government propose to revise the scales of pay of this office on its transfer to New Delhi?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: (a) The records from 1899 onwards have been removed to New Delhi. The record office building is for all practical purposes ready for occupation. A programme for the removal of the whole of the Crown records has been prepared and funds are being provided in the Budget of 1927-28 to carry out the programme.

(b) Revision of the scales of pay is not contemplated at present.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: With reference to the answer to question 622(a) I beg to inquire where these records are deposited in New Delhi?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: They will be deposited in the new record office building.

REVISION OF THE PAY OF THE SECOND DIVISION MEN IN THE IMPERIAL RECORD DEPARTMENT.

623. ***Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy:** Is it a fact that the existing annual increment of the lower division clerks of the Imperial Record Department is Rs. 3 only? Are Government aware that this rate of annual increment is hitting hard the men of the second division on their transfer from Calcutta to Delhi? If so, do Government propose to revise their scale of pay so as to bring it on the same level with the scale of pay of the other attached offices? If so, when? If not, will they be pleased to state the reason?

Mr. J. W. Bhore: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative and to the second part in the negative. The clerical staff transferred has been given an immediate increase of pay ranging from Rs. 20 to Rs. 40 besides other material concessions.

PAY AND PROSPECTS OF THE CLERKS IN THE IMPERIAL RECORD DEPARTMENT.

624. ***Mr. Bhabendra Chandra Roy:** (a) Is there any difference in the academic qualifications fixed for the recruitment of the clerks in the Imperial Record Department and the Government of India Secretariat?

(b) Is it a fact that the duties of the Secretariat record clerks are more or less of a routine nature? Is it a fact that they draw better pay and have better prospects than the clerks in the Imperial Record Department, and if so, why?

Mr. J. W. Shore: (a) Recruitment to the Government of India Secretariat is made by competitive tests held by the Public Services Commission (formerly the Staff Selection Board) while the men employed in the Imperial Record Department have not been required to undergo that test.

(b) The actual work of supplying records on requisition is done in the Secretariat by daftaris or sorters on much smaller pay than that given to clerks. The work of the men employed on recording proceedings in the Secretariat is not treated as routine and their pay is higher than that of the clerks in the Imperial Record Department both for this reason and also in view of the expensiveness of Simla where they are required to work for a considerable portion of the year.

TRANSFER OF THE OFFICE OF THE SENIOR GOVERNMENT INSPECTOR OF RAILWAYS FROM MADRAS TO OOTACAMUND.

625. ***Mr. T. Prakasam:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article headed "Transfer of the office of the Senior Government Inspector of Railways from Madras to Ootacamund" at page 185 of the Indian Railway Magazine?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what reasons necessitated the removal and whether the Local Government was consulted in the matter and what its opinion was?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) Yes.

(b) The Local Government was consulted and agreed that the headquarters of the Senior Government Inspector should be at Ootacamund. The Senior Government Inspector spends so much time on tour in the cold weather that it was considered desirable that his office should be in one place all the year round instead of being transferred up and down with the Madras Government.

Mr. T. Prakasam: May I ask, Sir, is it not the duty of this Inspector to look to the convenience of the traffic and also to attend to the complaints of the merchants who have to send their goods by train, and whether it will be convenient for this Inspector to attend to his duties from the top of the Ootacamund Hills?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I think, Sir, the Honourable Member is labouring under a misapprehension as to the nature of this officer's duties.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I know, Sir, whether this officer is going to draw hill allowance for staying there?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Will the Honourable Member put down the question? I do not know.

Mr. T. Prakasam: May I know what the duties of this particular officer are?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member will find that information on record if he will read up the budget debates for the last three years.

Mr. T. Prakasam: Would it be very difficult to state exactly what the duties are just now?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am afraid, Sir, it would be beyond the limits of an answer to a question if I embarked on that task.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PURCHASE OF SLEEPERS FOR THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY.

113. **Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) The number of sleepers purchased for the South Indian Railway during the past three years?
- (b) The number of sleepers bought by the Company during the three years from Canada and Australia?
- (c) The number of sleepers for which tenders were accepted from Malabar for the above?
- (d) The prices at which the tenders for local supply and supply from Canada and Australia were accepted?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Information is only available for the year 1926-27. It shows that in this year orders were placed for 4,07,400 broad and metre gauge sleepers, 2,52,500 of which were obtained from America and Australia, and the balance from Malabar. All the broad gauge sleepers were obtained from Malabar at prices varying from Rs. 8-12-0 to Rs. 8-14-0 per sleeper. Metre gauge sleepers were obtained from Malabar at rates varying from Rs. 3-10-0 to Rs. 4-0-0 per sleeper, from America at Rs. 3-7-9 per sleeper, and from Australia at £8/17/6 per ton of 50 cubic feet c.i.f. Madras.

PURCHASE AT CHEAPER RATES IN MALABAR OF TIMBER OF THE QUALITY SUPPLIED BY CANADA AND AUSTRALIA.

114. **Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether foreign timber is soft and has to be creosoted to serve the purpose of sleepers?
- (b) Whether the timber of the quality supplied by Canada and Australia can be got cheaper in Malabar than in Canada and Australia?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) Some foreign timbers are hard; others are soft. Some foreign timbers have to be treated with preservatives for use as sleepers; others do not have to be so treated.

(b) Timber of the quality supplied by Canada and Australia is not, as far as Government is aware, grown in Malabar.

RESULTS OF THE FAILURE OF THE SOUTH INDIAN RAILWAY TO PLACE ORDERS FOR SLEEPERS IN MALABAR.

115. **Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim:** Has the attention of Government been drawn to the fact that failure on the part of the South Indian Railway Company to place its order for sleepers in Malabar has resulted in considerable unemployment to a large class of the population whose main occupation is timber-cutting and that the timber trade has also immensely suffered?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Government have received no representations of any kind to this effect.

RECOGNITION BY THE DIFFERENT RAILWAYS OF RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSOCIATIONS.

116. **Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether it is a fact that there are in existence "Railway Passengers Associations" throughout the country?
- (b) Whether such Associations are recognised by the different railways?
- (c) Whether these Associations are consulted on matters of importance to the railway passengers?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) Government are aware that certain Passenger Associations exist.

(b) Yes.

(c) Any representations made by these Associations receive due consideration by Railways, but the consultative Committees for Railways are the Local Advisory Committees.

FARES CHARGED PER MILE FOR DIFFERENT CLASSES ON DIFFERENT RAILWAYS.

117. **Khan Bahadur Haji Abdullah Haji Kasim:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House a statement of fares charged per mile for different classes on different railways?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given in this Assembly on the 3rd instant to question No. 94 asked by Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar and to the published Time Tables and Coaching Guides of Railways.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddimal (Leader of the House): Sir, with your permission I desire to make a statement as to the probable course of Government business next week.

Honourable Members are aware that the presentation of the second portion of the Budget will take place at 5 P.M. on Monday, the 28th February, and thereafter a motion will be made for leave to introduce the Finance Bill.

It is understood, though I have not been approached in the matter directly, that there is no general desire on the part of Members of this House to raise a debate on any motion in connection with the settlement effected with the Government of the Union of South Africa. That being so, the time offered for this discussion was on Tuesday the 1st March, and in place of that discussion the adjourned discussion on the motion for a Supplementary Grant in respect of Civil Aviation will be resumed; and thereafter the next business to be taken will be the business remaining over from Monday the 21st, that is to say, motions will be made to take into consideration and if those motions are accepted by the House, to pass the Madras Salt (Amendment) Bill, the Provident Funds (Amendment) Bill and the Bill further to amend the Presidency towns and Provincial

Insolvency Acts. Thereafter the adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nathi Mitra for the appointment of a panel from which the Standing Committee to advise the Industries and Labour Department is to be selected will be resumed. Wednesday the 2nd March is a gazetted holiday. Thursday and Friday, the 3rd and 4th March, have been allotted for general discussion on the second portion of the Budget. The House will not sit on Saturday, the 5th March.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): I beg to inquire with reference to the statement of business which the Honourable the Home Member has announced whether it is the intention of the Government to allot a day for the transaction of non-official business, especially a large number of Bills which are outstanding, and also the adjourned debate on the Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: Not next week, Sir, I will consider the matter and make a statement next week.

Mr. Varahagiri Venkata Jogiah: Sir, I beg to put the following short notice question to the Honourable Member for Commerce.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I have received no notice of any short notice question.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member may have given notice of a short notice question, but has he been informed that the question has been put down for to-day?

Mr. Varahagiri Venkata Jogiah: I gave it at half past nine.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is in a hurry. No orders have yet been passed on his notice, which must in due course go to the President and then to the Department. He must therefore wait.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—contd.

SECOND STAGE—contd.

Expenditure from Revenue—contd.

DEMAND No. 3—AUDIT.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,70,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1928, in respect of 'Audit'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 4—WORKING EXPENSES: ADMINISTRATION.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,30,00,000 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 'Working Expenses: Administration'."

Mr. G. S. Ranga Iyer (Bohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir, I have got certain motions under the head "Audit" and I thought I could have moved them.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is too late. I take it that the Honourable Members Mr. Sesha Ayyangar and Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar do not wish to move their motions.

Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar (Madura and Ramnad cum Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I do not propose to move the motion standing in my name; if permitted, I shall speak on the comprehensive motion of Mr. Prakasam.

Mr. President: Mr. Prakasam.

Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar (Madura and Ramnad cum Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by 2 crores of rupees."

This Demand is for Rs. 12,30,00,000 and it comprises several items shown under this head. The first is Agency; starting with the salary of the Agents, it deals with all those officers who come under that establishment. We have been supplied, Sir, with 14 pink books in which the details are given with regard to the 14 different Agencies. The Agent's salary is shown there, that of the Assistant Agent, of the Deputy Agent if any, of the Chief Engineer and his assistants, the Chief Auditor and his assistants—all these are shown in each one of these pink books. My first submission to this House is that the expenditure has been steadily growing for a very long time. In 1881 the proportion was 49.37 per cent. Nine years later in 1890 it was 49.87 per cent. Fifteen years later, that is in 1905, it was 46 to 48 per cent. Now, Sir, in 1925-26 we had 65.66 per cent., in 1926-27, 66.76 per cent., and in 1927-28, 65.59 per cent. That is, out of every one hundred rupees of the gross income, over Rs. 65 is wanted for the working expenses. I shall point out to the Honourable Members just now what enormous extravagance there has been under this head when compared to Japan. The other day when I was addressing Honourable Members here, there was a question put to me whether I could give the mileage in Japan. Before I give you those figures of Japan I would like to submit to you the amounts of salaries shown in these 14 pink books of the different railways in our country under this first item of Agency in this Demand. The Assam-Bengal Railway is shown in the books and the maximum and minimum monthly salary of each officer is given. I have converted it into yearly: the total minimum shown for the Assam-Bengal Railway is Rs. 2,55,600 and the maximum under this head of Agency is Rs. 4,09,800. The distance of this Assam-Bengal Railway is 1,049 miles. The difference between the maximum and the minimum is Rs. 1,54,200. Then with regard to the Bengal and North-Western Railway, the distance is 2,083 miles. The minimum yearly salaries come to Rs. 2 lakhs. The maximum is Rs. 3,74,400. The difference between the two is Rs. 1,24,400. On the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, the distance is 3,000 miles. The minimum is Rs. 5,83,500. (*Mr. K. Ahmed:* "Company-managed"). Yes. The maximum is Rs. 11,23,800. The difference is Rs. 5,38,800.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): May I ask the Honourable Member with regard to the figures read out by him as minimum and

maximum salaries whether we are to understand them as indicating the start and the limit to be reached according to time-scale increment?

Mr. President (to Mr. T. Prakasam): The Honourable Member should resume his seat if he wants to give way.

Mr. T. Prakasam: I did not quite understand the question of my Honourable friend.

Mr. M. S. Aney: With regard to the figures shown as maximum and minimum, may we understand what the Honourable Member means by them?

Mr. T. Prakasam: I will now take the Great Indian Peninsula Railway pink book, page 8 to explain this. We see in column No. 5 that the minimum salary shown of Agents is Rs. 3,500. The maximum also is Rs. 3,500. Coming to the next item, the minimum is Rs. 1,750 and the maximum is Rs. 2,150. The starting pay is the minimum and the highest he could reach is the maximum. These are the two maximum and minimum figures that I am now placing before Honourable Members. Then with regard to the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, 3,041 miles is the distance. Rs. 5,05,800 is the minimum. The maximum is Rs. 8,19,800. The difference is Rs. 3,40,000. Similarly, we have got other railways, but I would in this connection give the figures with regard to the Rohilkund and Kumaon Railway. There, the distance is only 571 miles. Of this the State Railway is 312 miles, whereas the length of the Company-managed portion is 259 miles. The annual minimum pay is Rs. 64,200 as is shown in column 4. The maximum is Rs. 1,84,600. If you please take page 7 of the Rohilkund and Kumaon Railway, you will see that this is a very small distance of 571 miles, belonging to a Company, of which the State railway line is only 312 miles. The Agent's salary is not shown in this. What is shown against his name is only Rs. 250 for his fixed allowance. I do not know exactly what salary is paid by the Company to this Agent now. So far as the Deputy Agent is concerned, his salary is shown here as Rs. 1,600. For a distance of 571 miles,—the whole line,—of which the Government line is only 312 miles, there is also a Deputy Agent on Rs. 1,600, who is paid out of our funds. If you look into the minimum salary, Sir, on this line you will find, the Auditor of Accounts, Assistant Auditor, Chief Engineer, Resident Engineer, all getting below Rs. 1,000 and some below Rs. 500, the total monthly amount coming to only Rs. 5,350. That is the minimum. The maximum comes to Rs. 15,400. This is because it is a private Company not guaranteed, and that accounts for smallness of expenditure on the part of the Company. If these State and guaranteed Railways had been put under the management of Indians and if for the high officers, Indians had been appointed—Indians who would be anxious to serve their country for a smaller pay—it would have been very much cheaper. I have read these figures to you with a view to show that it cannot be pleaded by the Government that it has been very essential to start with the maximum pay shown in these columns. They start with a minimum salary and they go up to the maximum and I have given you both the figures and I have shown you the difference between the starting salary and the maximum salary in the last column which I have just now given to you. My submission to you all is

Mr. President: Order, order. I must insist that the Honourable Member should address the Chair.

Mr. T. Prakasam: I am very sorry, Sir, and I beg your pardon. My submission to you, Sir, is this, that if the offices of these Agents and all other officers had been in the hands of Indians—Indians who would have qualified themselves by this time if only opportunities had been given to them—there would have been no necessity, to be incurring this expenditure year after year. It is not a matter, Sir, of one year or two years or ten years or twenty years even; it is a matter of 50 years, 60 years and even more than that, that this extravagance has been going on at this rate. This expenditure could have been avoided if only the Government had really been anxious to look after the interests of the people of this country as "trustees." They have not done it. Commenting on the Raven Committee's Report there was an article in the *Modern Review* written by one who had served in the Railway Department for nearly 50 years and one who could speak with authority. These are the words written by Pandit Chandrika Prasad in the *Modern Review* in 1926:

"With the cheaper rates of Indian labour the cost of Indian Railways ought to be very much lower, but the reverse is the case. In making a similar comparison in 1870, the late Sir J. Danvers wrote 'One of the chief expenses connected with the working of the Railways in India is the high cost of European Agents. This cost still persists and no improvement can be expected so long as the higher posts of railway officials are not held by Indians.'"

In 1870, Sir J. Danvers wrote this, that one of the chief expenses connected with the working of the Railways was the high cost of European Agents. That was in 1870 and now it is 1927. 57 years have passed. For 57 years this British Government have been telling us and also the outside world that they have been training us. If 57 years have not been sufficient, I would like to ask this Government, Sir, whether even 500 years would be sufficient to take us a step forward. How are things going on in Japan, a country that is governed by its own Government. I have taken the figures for 1918. The mileage in Japan was 5,931 miles; the total passengers that travelled in the year was 245 millions as against a total number of only 599 millions of passengers in India with a distance of 38,579 miles. The salary of the Chief Commissioner in Japan corresponding to our Chief Commissioner here who draws a salary of Rs. 6,000 a month, is only Rs. 1,020 a month. The number of passengers that are taken in trains are 159 persons; for a single carriage in a train only 12 persons. The average number of trains per day per mile is 16.1. You can measure the distance, Sir, now. If 16 trains are running over a distance of 5,931 miles or any good portion of it, what the length of the rails would be you can imagine. My friend Mr. Ruthnaswamy was telling us that the Railways are welcome here and they have been the cause of the political advance. Whether they have been the cause of political advance or not, all that I can tell the Government is that these Railways are meant for the comfort and convenience, if any, of only the higher class passengers and not of third class passengers who contribute the bulk of the money. Third class passengers, who pay the bulk of the money for this Government and for the comfort and convenience of all other persons, travel in trains like cattle and sheep with no convenience or comfort. In Japan the number of passengers for a train is only 159, because they have increased the number of trains running. I have given, Sir, when I was referring to these 14 pink books and the railway lines that are referred to in those books, the distances also, the distances under the control and management of each Agent, the minimum salary being Rs. 2,500 per month for the Agent alone. Put it any way

you like, compare it any way you like; it is not a case in which the Government could say, Japan is a small country where only 5,900 miles of railway are controlled, whereas in India over 38,000 miles are controlled. I have given for that reason the fourteen different Agents, each of whom draw Rs. 2,500 as against Rs. 1,020, the salary of the Chief Commissioner in Japan. If this Government had cared in the least to look to the prosperity of the country, they could have minimised the cost by more than half under this head alone. Can it be said that in this country men could not have been trained as in Japan? There the best of the men came forward to serve their country and to do the work for Rs. 1,020 a month. Are there no people in this land who have been and are willing and anxious to get trained under you, and would undertake the duties? What is the salary which the members of the Servants of India Society have been getting in India? Does it mean to say that the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri joined that service for the pittance that was given to him? To kill patriotism and to say that you are the only superior people in this world, that you must come over here and control these lines for ever and that we must occupy only subordinate positions—that is not right.

I go to another item to show the nature of the extravagance in the Railway administration—"Staff for heavy repairs". Here even according to the findings of the Raven Committee there is extravagance admittedly in workshops, both in regard to locomotives and wagons and carriages. They compared the figures of India with the figures of the United Kingdom. In the preface of the Raven Committee's Report, in the very first lines, they have stated:

"The most striking feature of the shops, in comparison with those in England, is their size and the strength of labour they employ, in proportion to the volume of work turned out. I was not altogether prepared for the marked difference that is shown between the English and Indian workshops. I have attempted to bring this out in the following table where I have shown the number. It will be seen that the number of men employed in the size of workshops in India is very much in excess of that in England."

For every single man that is employed in England, here in the loco. workshops, according to the findings of the Raven Committee, 3.80 men are employed. Again for every single man employed in England in the wagon and carriage workshops, 6.90 men are employed in India. These figures are given in Table 19, page 34 of the Raven Committee Report.

Under the same Demand you will find charges of Government Supervision. The cost is shown here as Rs. 12,33,000. What is the supervision? The supervision has resulted, according to the findings of the Raven Committee, in wastage and leakage. Wastage and leakage. Leakage one could understand with reference to a boat that is sailing. Leakage of iron, steel and all these things, that could not be ordinarily carried away by porters or coolies. Leakage includes thefts, misappropriations, and dishonest removals, not by coolies but by people of higher grades who must have been in charge. What is the leakage and wastage referred to in the Raven Committee's Report. The leakage and wastage have been described in the mildest possible terms. The Raven Committee after having gone into the whole thing gave their report in this manner. They actually found in the yards materials worth lakhs of rupees lying there without being in their proper places, without being shown in the accounts. What is it that the Raven Committee should have done in the matter? They should have given an exhaustive report, given

[Mr. T. Prakasam,]

the names of the persons responsible for it. In one paragraph you will find in the Raven Committee's Report that the entries that were made were fictitious and artificial. If artificial entries were made, if entries which ought not to have been made were made, if articles which ought to have been entered in one place had not been entered, what is the nature of the enquiry that has been made and the report that has been given to the public? The last two or three paragraphs which alone you should not look into we have been told. We have not looked into those pages only, we have tried to examine the tables, the schedule, to scan every sentence and find out what has been said and done by this Committee. Mr. Chandrika Prasad himself wrote in the *Modern Review* that representations had been made to this Committee and the Railway Board to extend the scope of the enquiry. They declined to do so, and now they have given a report in which they have said that there were leakages and wastage. It is not merely throwing away things with a view to show that the balances were all right. Leakages mean and include every dishonest thing that was done with regard to the articles. I have, during this long period of my life, heard so many complaints with regard to the manner in which things were removed from the workshops. For my part I never knew that what I heard would be confirmed by the Report of this Raven Committee. Ordinary people cannot understand such things unless they seek as have been written in this report the help of experts. Now, Sir, I would submit how things could be stolen from the shops in this manner. Some of the cases which I had heard about, are as follows. An article required by a Loco. Superintendent or by his foreman will be made and supplied in the workshop, under the head of "work-order." Its cost might be Rs. 500 in the workshop, but the bill may be made for a nominal sum of Rs. 2 and the balance of Rs. 488 will be shown under another head of work-order for "engine repairs." "Engine repairs" is an item under which any amount could be swallowed by the engine, just as it consumes water. If an article is made to order, "work order" it is called, and the account is called "ledger account" and if a bill is issued for only two rupees, and the article is worth £500, the balance is generally shown under "engine repairs." That is the leakage referred to in the Raven Committee's Report. I will read an extract from page 82 of their Report :

"In some cases these materials have been received on capital account, 'charged off' to the work for which they have been received long before the commencement of any building or erecting operations and kept lying about the shops without any apparent check whatever. We are told that this is a recent practice adopted in order to bring about the reduction of Stores balances, we have already made mention of. It is obviously ineffectual to resort to such practice, where the resulting reduction in stores balances is merely artificial and fictitious and we recommend that it be made a strict rule that no stores should be issued to workshops unless actually required for immediate use. . . . We noticed in Jamalpur and Lillooah that large stocks of materials within the workshops worth several lakhs of rupees and under the charge of the Chief Mechanical Engineers. Though under the Mechanical Department, the cost of these stores is shown in accounts as part of stores suspension (capital); and in order to do this, the accounts are maintained as they would be if the stores were held by the Controller of Stores and not by the Chief Mechanical Engineer."

What does that come to? With all these things that have come to their notice the Committee could have dealt more exhaustively and overhauled the whole thing and published the whole thing with a view to see that in future at least there should be no such frauds committed. How

many lakhs of rupees have gone out of these departments for this 'Government supervision'

Mr. President: I have been closely following the speech of the Honourable Member and he will pardon me if I point out to him that the stage for the general criticism of the Railway administration is past. He must now direct his speech to justify his proposed cut of two crores of rupees in the "Working Expenses: Administration."

Mr. T. Prakasam: Yes, Sir, if I have not been keeping that in view in submitting these things, I should have failed in my duty. However, I take note of your observation and I shall try to limit the argument as far as possible. What I have been submitting all this time is not with a view to discuss any general policy, but with a view to give arguments under each head to which I was referring. However I bow to your ruling. "Government supervision" and the charges claimed under that head I was submitting to the Honourable Members of this House cannot be justified at all. For supervision many officers have been paid on an extravagant scale and they do not deserve the salaries which have been paid and which are shown in these books, and they should be reduced. Now, Sir, with regard to this Demand No. 4 I have submitted that there must be a reduction by two crores of rupees, and before I sit down I may submit to the Honourable Members in this House that when there is so much extravagance at the top, and that has not been reduced, the argument that has been hurled at us by the Honourable the Commerce Member more than once in this House justifying a pay of Rs. 9 to the labourer who does all this work is a thing which I have not been able to understand. This money that has been paid in superabundance to those who have not been doing their duties, to those who have been negligent, could have been well paid to these poor men. In his closing speech, to which I had no opportunity of replying, the Honourable Member asked if we did not know that in the Madras Presidency a Brahmin landlord pays only Rs. 5.

Mr. President: I cannot understand how it is relevant on this motion.

Mr. T. Prakasam: It is relevant in this way, if you will permit me to say. In regard to this cut of two crores of rupees which I am submitting through you to this House, I am submitting that this reduction is essential for payment to the people to whom it has been denied. If I am controlled by the Evidence Act, it is a different matter; but I am sure you will not apply that to me or anybody here. This had been said on motions to which it had no relevancy at all.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member propose to question the rulings of the Chair?

Mr. T. Prakasam: No, Sir, I would submit that the expenditure at the top should be curtailed. With these words, I commend my
12 Noon. motion to the House.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir I have consented not to move the cut which I have tabled in order to expedite the business and I have therefore refunded 30 lakhs to my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. Before proceeding let me assure my Honourable friends on the Government Benches that whatever I say I mean and whatever remarks I offer here are meant in all seriousness. Sir Clement Hindley yesterday said with reference to my remarks that I was not serious and when I told him I was

[Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar.]

quite as serious as he was he suggested I was not a public citizen. Sir, I was born on the floor of this country. I have been brought up on the lap of mother India for nearly half a century.

Mr. President: All this has nothing to do with the motion the Honourable Member is speaking on.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: I protest against being called a citizen of the air in my own country. I now proceed to the point for which I say that these 2 crores of rupees must be reduced. This can be done in two ways. One is Indianisation of services and the other is standardisation. Sir, so far as this Indianisation is concerned when my Honourable friend Pandit Nilakantha Das said what Indianisation really meant that motion was simply laughed out. Sir, I must say that Indianisation of services is in the best interests of economy of expenditure in this country,—not to speak of the political point of view. It would reduce considerably the expenditure if all the services were manned by Indians. Sir, we are pursuing in the matter of these services a reverse process to the process that is followed in the matter of our trade relations with England, where the raw products of this country are exported and return in the shape of manufactured products. So far as intellect is concerned, the raw intellects of England are imported into this country and they go back as manufactured experts.

Mr. President: Order, order. I am very sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member but he must remember that this cut has been proposed in this year's Budget. Is it the case of the Honourable Member that employees of the railway who are not Indians should be turned out during this year and that they should be replaced by Indians?

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: Yes, Sir; that is precisely my case; and if it is to be justified on the score that there has been an accumulation of appointments in this Department and it will take a number of years before they are turned out, on the very first day I said in the course of the general discussion on the Budget that this Assembly would be prepared to vote 5 crores at a time in order to send them back with stipends and continue our reduced expenditure from next year onwards. Sir, we put it under general expenditure. If Indians are employed I will further say that Indians should not claim as large salaries as European officers are claiming nowadays. That was the second point of my Honourable friend Pandit Nilakantha Das the other day. Very often my friends on this side have said that there is a racial distinction being observed by Indians not being paid the same salaries as Europeans. I was not in agreement with them in those views. I think the Indians must set an example and when they take a post they must accept a reduced salary. That would make a stronger case for us to drive out those gentlemen altogether. The other day my revered professor Dr. Macphail among all the various and vagarious statements that he made—and I am sorry as a student to have to draw a sword against my old professor—laid emphasis on one good principle, the principle of market value. I ask him to stick up for that principle and give me the figures of the market value of all those Honourable Members on the Government Benches. If from the Indian market, without giving preference to British standard steel over there, we are asked to select the best men for filling all those places in the Railway Department as well as in other Departments, we are prepared to

Mr. President: Order, order. I would be failing in my duty if I were not to point out to the Honourable Member that he ought to make a distinction between the general discussion on the Railway Budget and the particular cut which we are now discussing. It is not right that the discussion on a particular cut should be turned into a general discussion of policy. If the Honourable Member is supporting the cut of 2 crores proposed by Mr. Prakasam, he must come to particulars and not go on generalising.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: That is exactly what I have been doing, Sir.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not confining himself to the amendment.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: At any rate, so far as my reference is concerned, Sir, I only suggest that if all these Agents, Deputy Agents, Engineers, Chief Mechanical Engineers and others are replaced by Indian Agents, Indian Deputy Agents, Indian Directors and Engineers, half the cost

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will bear in mind that the Chair regards these general statements as hardly relevant to the particular question before the House.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: So far as the exact circumstances are concerned taken as they are and taking it as an unavoidable evil that these officers must continue I proceed still to state that the expenditure can be cut down by 2 crores and even more than 2 crores; but at any rate I can find the 2 crores. That leads me on to the question of standardisation of expenditure. That, Sir, must be held to be relevant. When I raised this question of standardisation of expenditure the Honourable Sir Charles Innes pleaded *res judicata*. He pleaded that Mr. Rama Aiyangar had raised the same question and Mr. Sim had decided it; and that the matter has once for all been settled. He spoke as though I claim under Mr. Rama Aiyangar and Mr. Parsons claims under Mr. Sim. I repudiate this plea. I think an attempt must still be made to standardise expenditure if there is to be reduced cost in administration. I stick to my view that the expenditure on administration must bear a certain proportion to the gross earnings of the company. Can any commercial man ever tell us that the expenditure on the administration of a firm can go to any length irrespective of the gross earnings of that firm? Sir, whenever questions are taken up with reference to the ratio of the working expenses to gross earnings, the figures are always based on the principle of standardisation. I take, Sir, three companies as an example because I know full well that even if I go to the figures of all the companies in it will be absolutely no matter of consequence so long as the sword of certification is hanging over our roof here. I only take as an example 3 companies—the Eastern Bengal Railway, the South Indian Railway, the Burma Railways. These are railways which have nearly the same amount of route mileage; and I find, Sir, under the head 'Administration' what a disparity there is between the cost of one administration and the cost of another administration. I ask the Honourable Members on the other side to do away with that disparity. If that can be controlled, if that can be brought under one common level of expenditure—not exactly the same arithmetically, but roughly at least the same—then we can save certainly this Rs. 230 lakhs. Sir, under 'Agency' the South Indian Railway spends Rs. 246,000, the Burma Railways spend

[Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar.]

Rs. 240,000, whereas the Eastern Bengal Railway spends Rs. 935,000; under 'Audit' the South Indian Railway spends Rs. 509,000, the Burma Railways Rs. 425,000 whereas the Eastern Bengal Railway spends Rs. 940,000. Under 'Stores' the South Indian Railway spends Rs. 300,000, the Burma Railways Rs. 170,000 and the Eastern Bengal Railway Rs. 564,000. Under 'Engineering', the figures are Rs. 12,20,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 11,10,000 for the Burma Railways, and Rs. 13,90,000 for the Eastern Bengal Railway. Under 'Loco. Department', the figures are Rs. 715,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 681,000 for Burma Railways, and Rs. 866,000 for the Eastern Bengal Railway. Under 'Carriage and Wagon Department', the figures are Rs. 242,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 274,000 for the Burma Railways, and Rs. 474,000 for the Eastern Bengal Railway. Under 'Traffic' it is Rs. 580,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 650,000 for the Burma Railways and Rs. 11,70,000 for the Eastern Bengal Railway. Under 'Medical' it is Rs. 197,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 280,000 for the Burma Railways and Rs. 350,000 for the Eastern Bengal Railway—and I have never yet heard that the Eastern Bengal Railway service men are subject to greater ailments than people on the South Indian Railway or the Burma Railways. Under 'Telegraph' the figures are Rs. 297,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 328,000 for the Burma Railways, and Rs. 270,000 for the Eastern Bengal Railway. Under 'other expenses'—that is, expenses not included in all the details that I have given above and for which extra provision is made—the figures are Rs. 514,000 for the South Indian Railway, Rs. 548,000 for the Burma Railways, whereas it amounts to Rs. 15,70,000 in the Eastern Bengal Railway. I want to inquire, Sir, is there any justification for this disparity and difference? If you will take the route mileage for these three railways, you will see they are about the same—1,876 miles South Indian Railway, 1,987 miles Burma Railways, and only 1,919 miles on the Eastern Bengal Railway or less than the Burma Railways. Now, if there is such a close resemblance or similarity in the route mileage and if there is such a vast and extravagant disparity in the expenditure, is it not a case for serious attention being paid by those who are in authority, to whom is entrusted the management and custody of this public money, to see that the expenditure is adjusted according to the same standard scale? There must be some standard scale fixed; and it is only according to that that they must proceed. The Inchcape Committee proceeded under certain ratios and they have been working out certain ratios of working expenditure the gross earnings. Were they wrong? Is Lord Inchcape out of date? Is he a man of ancient days? Is that report still enforced in this Government by these finance officers? Have they still got that report in their library or have they put it into some old Curiosity Shop? Sir, I ask whether there is any justification for any extravagance of this kind, whatever may be the variations or points of difference between the various companies in the matter of the country that they serve, whether on one railway there are more jungles and forests than on another? The simple reason is that certain accumulations of officers have been made in some companies; they could not dispense with them and they continue; and when they go another somehow creeps easily in and therefore it is that they are unable to control this expenditure. If on the other hand, a strong hand is placed over them—and once more I say this—if the Audit Department turns its attention to the difference of expenditure and this difference of ratios and checks the

extravagant expenditure, then and then alone the finances of this country will be safe. Otherwise, Sir, the tax-payer's money will be wasted in every direction.

Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar: Sir, I shall try to explain to the House as to why it is that this figure of Rs. 2 crores has been put down in this motion. It is nearly 16 to 17 per cent. of the Demand under this head which is Rs. 12,30,00,000. Now, the reason for putting this figure is this: the Honourable Mr. Prakasam wants to cut down the working expenses by 16 per cent. of the existing figures. This Rs. 12 crores is a portion of the Rs. 65,22,00,000 asked for as the total working expenses for the coming year (1927-28) out of the total gross earnings of Rs. 100 crores and odd budgeted for the year. If about 20 per cent. of that is cut down, it reduces itself to a figure which would work out at 50 per cent. of the gross expenses. Strictly speaking, it will work out at 2 crores and 60 lakhs. Anyway, that is the reason why this figure of Rs. 2 crores has been put down in this motion. The reason, I would submit, for the consideration of the House for acceding to this motion is this: As I submitted, about three days back, on the general discussion of the Railway Budget, it has been more or less a convention established under long usage, that the working expenses of the Indian railway administration have always been taken to range from 44 to 50 per cent. of the gross earnings; and we have got quite recently also an instance like that—I refer the Honourable Members of this House to page 21 of the Explanatory Memorandum—paragraph 2 (ii) in connection with the Dhone-Kurnool Extension. There is mentioned an agreement entered into between the Government of India and H. E. H. the Nizam's Government for the working of a section of that branch line and they have put down the working expenses at 50 per cent. of the gross earnings. Now, Sir, that is a recent contract entered into between the Government of India and the Nizam's Government; and if that is so, the simple ground upon which the whole thing ought to rest is this; why should not the expenses of the railway administration, in regard to further extensions and in regard to the working expenses of the coming year also, be reduced to this 50 per cent.? The Government of India themselves have entered into a contract to prescribe their working expenses in connection with this railway as 50 per cent.; and we are simply asking the Government and the Railway administration to extend and adopt that principle to their own working expenses for the coming year 1927-28. I would further add that, in Japan, the ratio which the working expenses bears to the gross earnings is 46 per cent., as I am told; and Japan is a country in Asia which is more civilised and more modern in her equipments; and I cannot see any particular reason why our Indian Railway administration should have a bigger ratio of working expenses than what obtains in Japan and what obtains in their own contracts with their branch railway companies. One other reason, I would submit, why this cut should be made is this: the other day, my friend, the Honourable Mr. Prakasam, drew the attention of this House to certain figures regarding the maximum and the minimum salaries which obtain in other countries where State Railways exist. I would submit to the House that in all countries on the Continent of Europe or Asia, where there are State Railways, the maximum salaries paid are much lower than in India. I have got the figures here in the currencies of the respective countries and their equivalents in rupees. In Norway the House will find that the maximum salary is Rs. 16,665 per annum; in Sweden it is Rs. 8,750; in Denmark it is Rs. 16,000;

[Mr. M. S. Sesha Ayyangar.]

in France it is Rs. 30,000, in Belgium it is Rs. 17,500 and in Japan it is Rs. 12,240; whereas in India it is Rs. 72,000. So that in India it works out at nearly six times that obtaining in Japan and nearly two and a half times that obtaining in France. I submit, Sir, that this is really extravagant expenditure. All this can be cut down only if that healthy salutary rule of 50 per cent. ratio of working expenses is adhered to.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): Sir, in rising to take part in this discussion, I do not do so to support the motion before the House. Possibly I might have supported it if it had been a smaller cut.

My one reason for joining in this discussion is to elicit certain information in connection with railway medical administration from the Honourable the Railway Member if he will be good enough to supply it, and so my remarks will be confined entirely to the medical administration of railways in India. I have carefully gone through the various pink books that have been supplied to us, and I find that it has certainly supported the opinions expressed on the other side of the House so far as the different scales of salaries given to various Railway Agents. I refer to medical officers and it will be interesting to know that State Railways are more liberal in their Chief Medical Officers' salaries than are Company-managed Railways. There is one railway of which no mention is made about its medical administration—the North Western Railway. I should like to know what its medical administration costs this country. In this connection I hope the Government will not delay any longer in publishing Colonel Needham's Report on his enquiry into the Railway Medical Services. Now, let me take two of the largest Railways, the East Indian Railway and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. You will find that in both the Chief Medical Officer starts on an initial salary of Rs. 2,250 and his maximum is Rs. 2,500. If you compare this salary with that paid to Chief Medical Officers on other Railways, Company and State-managed, you will find that it is in some cases more than double. There is moreover not one Company-managed Railway that gives such liberal salaries to its District Medical Officers as do the State-managed Railways. It will be interesting to know why this disparity exists, because there is only one market for recruiting medical men in England, indeed all Railways recruit most of their medical men from England, I really cannot understand why there should be such a great disparity in the salaries paid to the Chief Medical Officers of the different Railways in India. In this I do not include the smaller Railways. It seems rather strange for a medical man, as I am, to stand up in this House and speak as it were against the interests of his colleagues, but, Sir, I am not doing it in that spirit; I am doing it for the good of India and for a standardization of wages. Let us take the I. M. S. It does not give different salaries to its medical officers in different Presidencies in India. The Surgeons General of Bombay, Madras and Bengal receive the same scales of pay. There might be some excuse for the disparity in the salaries of various Railway Agents, but this cannot be used in regard to medical officers whose salaries should be standardised at least in all State Railways. The Company Railways are of course at liberty to appoint their own officers and fix their own scales of pay. I think, Sir, it would be better if we standardised the salaries of medical officers on the different Indian Railways, and I make

this suggestion for the consideration of the Honourable Member in charge. I refuse to accept that India cannot supply all the medical officers needed for the different railways, and whatever may be said about the other departments of the Railways, where skilled technical experience is a *sine qua non*, this argument cannot apply to the medical department, because we who are born in this country and are of this country—and I claim to be a statutory native of India—have supplied I. M. S. Inspectors General and Surgeons General in various parts of the country, and if we can supply men fit to hold such highly responsible posts, I am quite sure we are quite able to supply all the District Medical and Chief Medical Officers for every Railway in India. I understand that Government are recruiting a larger number of Indians as medical men for the Railways, and I am thankful for this; I am also grateful to the Government for recruiting a number of Anglo-Indians. But how do the salaries of medical officers recruited in India compare with the wages given to men recruited from England? The difference is very large, and it should not be so. For instance, take the salary of a young medical officer recruited in England for the East Indian or the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and compare it with that given to a medical officer recruited in this country. It would not be comparable. I remember last year the Railway Board advertised for two medical officers for State Railways, the salary offered was about Rs. 400 or Rs. 450. For these two appointments I believe there were nearly 500 applicants, many of them possessed much higher medical qualifications than those possessed by the average railway medical officer imported from England; and to think the salary offered was only Rs. 400 or Rs. 450. Sir, this disparity in pay is not right. It may be asked why do I make this statement. I make it because I consider that, so far as the Medical Department of the Railways is concerned—and I talk as a medical man myself—India can supply most of her own railway medical needs—I will not say all—and this inability is not the fault of the Indian colleges and universities; it is because these colleges and universities have not been properly constituted and organised. There is not one Indian trained in any of the Indian Medical Colleges or Universities occupying the position of Chief Medical Officer on a single Indian Railway, State or Company. It is also interesting to note that every Indian and Anglo-Indian railway medical officer is holding a very unimportant appointment indeed; the plums of the appointments are certainly not given to them, but are all held by European imported medical men. There is a case, Sir, that happened quite lately. The case of a European District Medical Officer in one of our State Railways who, though he was not found fit to be its Chief Medical Officer, was transferred as Chief Medical Officer to another State Railway. . . .

Mr. President: Order, order. I do not exactly understand what the Honourable Member is aiming at. Is he supporting the cut of 2 crores or opposing it? I have already pointed out that we have come to particulars from generalisation, and it is not right for Honourable Members to utilise this occasion for the purpose of a general discussion of policy.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I bow to your ruling, Sir, but I had no idea that I was generalising when I protested against this disparity in salaries and this excessive importation of Europeans into the Railway Medical Services and urged the more liberal engagement of Indians of all classes including Anglo-Indians.

Mr. President: Is the Honourable Member speaking in connection with the cut of 2 crores?

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Yes.

Mr. President: Is the Honourable Member supporting or opposing it?

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I am not supporting it; I am opposing it.

Mr. President: It appears to the Chair that the Honourable Member is referring to the policy underlying the appointment of certain medical officers in the Railways. This is not the occasion for asking questions to the Honourable the Commerce Member and eliciting information on matters of policy in regard to particular appointments.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I bow to your ruling, Sir. If you rule me out of order, I have nothing further to say, except to state that I will not support this motion on the ground of its extravagance; but had it been a smaller cut, I should certainly have gone into the lobby and supported it.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhamadan Rural): Sir, I had put down a motion under this Demand to draw attention particularly to the unsatisfactory character of the South Indian Railway administration, and with due deference to your ruling, Sir, I take strong exception to the policy of the South Indian Railway Company in multiplying higher appointments and in starving the lower services. The present position of the South Indian Railway administration is that they are embarking upon huge capital expenditure; some time ago it was found by the Public Accounts Committee as well as by the Auditor that there was negligence in the management of stores on the South Indian Railway; yet they are also piling up their higher establishment like anything. In particular, Sir, I want to point out that they have provided this year for the appointment of two Deputy Agents. That Railway has got on without two Deputy Agents till now . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is attempting to speak on the merits of his own motion which is lower down in the list—can he really justify a cut of 2 crores by proving a case for a cut of Rs. 2 lakhs?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Yes, Sir, my arguments will justify that cut.

Mr. T. C. Goswami (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Is it not permissible to an Honourable Member to make out a case for remaining neutral?

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I am only trying to gather up the various small sums which make up the 2 crores, in particular I want to make out . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member's motion for a cut of 2 lakhs must stand on its own merits. He will have his opportunity later to justify it. This big cut of Rs. 2 crores should not be mixed with smaller-cuts for which motions have been put down.

Mr. E. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. Would it not facilitate the discussion in this House if Honourable Members who have put down a smaller cut than 2 crores under this particular head were given an opportunity at this stage to express their opinion on the point?

Mr. President: They can only speak on the question raised by that particular cut. The question is whether a 2 crores' cut should be made in this particular Demand or not. The Honourable Member is perfectly entitled to speak on the merits of that particular cut, but he cannot take up his own motion for a smaller cut and raise a debate on it.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I again submit, Sir, that the cut which Mr. Prakasam has put down for Rs. 2 crores includes retrenchments of the character which I am now pressing on the House, namely, that these appointments of Deputy Agents, in particular on the South Indian Railway, ought not to be made and that a retrenchment ought to be effected.

Mr. President: I am afraid I cannot allow the Honourable Member to do so on this motion. He will have his opportunity when he moves his motion.

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

Mr. H. G. Cocks (Bombay: European): Sir, the particular point we are discussing, I take it, is the question of standardisation of expenses over different railway systems and the Honourable Member on the back bench said that he looked into the figures of three lines, the Eastern Bengal, the Burma and the South Indian, and ascertained that the working expenses of the Eastern Bengal were very high in comparison to the other two. I find on looking up the European staff on these three lines that the number is greater in the case of Burma and the South Indian than in the case of the Eastern Bengal. On the Eastern Bengal the number of European Gazetted officers employed was 82 on the 1st April, 1926, and on the Burma Railways 95 and on the South Indian Railway 106. It would therefore appear that the Eastern Bengal Railway is running economically so far as European staff is concerned.

Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya (Madras: Indian Commerce): On a point of order, Sir. Is the Honourable Member speaking on the cut of 2 crores?

Mr. President: I am allowing the Honourable Member to proceed with a view to find out whether he is really in order.

Mr. H. G. Cocks: I was talking directly on the question of standardisation of railway expenses which has been raised and I was seeking to point out that of the three railways which have been taken as examples, on the particular subject of European employees, the Eastern Bengal Railway had fewer Europeans than the other two lines and therefore it would appear that that was not the reason why the working expenses of that Railway were high as compared with the other two systems.

(Several Honourable Members then 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: I have listened to this debate with the greatest attention and I must confess that I have not yet been able to discover the case which I am asked to meet. I understood that my Honourable friend Mr. Prakasam's case was that had we Indianised 50 years ago or 70 years ago, as the case may be, we should have reduced our expenditure upon administration and salaries. Because we did not

[Sir Charles Innes.]

do that he now proposes that in this one year we should cut down our expenditure by no less a sum than Rs. 2 crores. I could have understood the Honourable Member if he had proposed a token cut in order to mark his displeasure or this House's displeasure at the failure of the Railway Board in past years to go in very vigorously for a policy of Indianisation. But I put it to the House that it is not consonant with reason that the Honourable Member should ask the House to make a cut of Rs. 2 crores in order to induce us to go in further for Indianisation. The Honourable Member knows, or at any rate he ought to know, that we are now Indianising much faster than it has ever been done before and that we recruit men on precisely the same scales of pay whether they come from England or from India excepting this one point of difference. There is a basic pay and an overseas allowance. People recruited in India get the basic pay whereas people recruited in England get the basic pay plus the overseas allowance and if you club together the overseas allowances granted to all officers in the administrative part of the Indian Railways that sum would not come to anything like 2 crores. Therefore the point the Honourable Member tried to make was entirely off the mark.

The only other matter to which I need refer is that of Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar, who, I regret to see, is not in his place. Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar suggested that by standardisation we should reduce the expenditure on the Indian Railways. He deliberately made the statement that our expenditure on administration should bear a definite proportion to our gross receipts. Well, Sir, if the Honourable Member had studied the Acworth Committee's Report and the debates in this House during the past few years he would have arrived at the very obvious fact that our gross receipts vary enormously from one year to another in accordance with fluctuations of trade and the state of the harvest. Does the Honourable Member seriously suggest that when, as in this year, we have to reduce by 4½ crores our estimate of gross receipts, we should make a proportionate cut in our standing charges in administration? I think I have only to put the point to the House for them to realise that there can be no justification whatsoever for what the Honourable Member said.

Then, Sir, he repeated the old suggestion that we should try to standardise expenditure on different railways regardless of the character of the country through which these railways pass. Now, Sir, that very suggestion was made on the floor of this House by Mr. Rama Aiyangar two years ago. We had a debate about it. Mr. Sim dealt with it on the floor of this House, but as some Honourable Members were not satisfied, I made an offer. I made an offer that Mr. Rama Aiyangar's suggestions should be examined by the Financial Commissioner for Railways in a memorandum and that that memorandum should be put before the Railway Standing Finance Committee. That promise was faithfully carried out and the Standing Finance Committee intimated that they did not wish to pursue the matter further. I must say it has been rather a disappointment to me that Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar should again trot out this ancient fallacy. I do not think I need say anything more. I am quite certain that the House will not accept the motion for this cut.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 2,00,00,000."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—29.

Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswami.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sesha.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Chunder, Mr. Nirmal Chunder.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Dutta, Mr. Srish Chandra.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
Jogiah, Mr. Varahagiri Venkata.
Khin Maung, U.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. Dharendra Kanta.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Prakasam, Mr. T.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Sinha, Mr. Siddheswar.
Tok Kyi, U.

NOES—53.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
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.
Bhuto, Mr. W. W. Illahibakhsh.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
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.
Ghulam Kadir Khan Dakhan, Mr. W. M. P.
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.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
Jowahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar.
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.
Paddison, Sir George.
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Roy, Mr. K. C.
Sassoon, Sir Victor.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.
Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Willson, Sir Walter.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was negatived.

Appointment of Deputy Agents on the South Indian Railway.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 2,00,000"

in order to provide for retrenchment on the South Indian Railway. I notice in the Budget that they have made provision for the appointment

[Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar.]

of two Deputy Agents which is wholly unnecessary. While they have been going on adding to the number of higher appointments they have been starving the lower men on minimum wages of Rs. 20 and what not. The South Indian Railway is one of the unsatisfactory lines managed by companies which are owned by the State and I submit that the Government have not exercised their proper powers of control either under the general powers of administration or under the contract in dealing with the vagaries of the South Indian Railway. I submit that that Railway has not been Indianising properly. It has put Indians on the lowest minimum starvation wages of Rs. 20-8-0 a month, *i.e.*, for an educated man who starts subordinate service and if an Indian is recruited to the officer's grade he is paid the princely salary of Rs. 60 a month; he is then called an apprentice, and then when he is confirmed—he is confirmed on a very lower scale of salary, whereas a man who is recruited in England starts on Rs. 450 a month. I say it is a most outrageous scheme of recruitment and in that way the expenses of the entire management are being put up on a very extravagant scale while the lower grade men are being starved. The management is inefficient and I therefore think that the working of the South Indian Railway Administration deserves to be immediately looked into. I also submit that there is a great deal of nepotism in that Railway and I want Government to look into this also. Government have had recently occasion to express the strongest disapproval of their methods in regard to the management of timber stores. Under these circumstances I submit that the South Indian Railway should be asked to practise retrenchment in the higher grades and grant decent scales of living wages in respect of their lower subordinates, and to see that no patronage is exhibited in making appointments and that the gross irregularities of account and audit if not more are not repeated as they have been in the past.

Mr. A. M. Hayman (Railway Board: Nominated Official): Sir, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar has dealt with the matter very briefly. I will give him a brief reply. I will take up first the statement that he made that some discrimination was being shown to Indian officers appointed in a sort of probationary capacity on the South Indian Railway and that they are being paid Rs. 60 a month. The facts are that these are students who are being helped by a stipend to enable them to obtain the degree of A. M. I. C. E. (India), and if these students

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: May I interrupt

Mr. A. M. Hayman: No, sit down, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar, please.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not entitled to say "Sit down" to any other Member.

Mr. A. M. Hayman: I beg your pardon, Sir. I apologise to my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar. It was entirely due to our friendly relations that I spoke to him in that vein.

These students, if they are qualified and obtain appointments in the officers grade, will commence on the proper pay which is given to every officer who is appointed to such grade. Now, Sir, I take up the real point on which the Honourable Member has brought this motion. He says, Sir, that he objects to the two appointments of Deputy Agents on the South Indian Railway. I wish to point out to him first that provision

for new appointments in a budget is not necessarily an authorisation that the expenditure shall be incurred by a subordinate authority. The proposals of the South Indian Railway for these two extra appointments are under consideration at the present moment by the Railway Board. I may also say that the Railway Board are inclined to view with favour the addition of one appointment because of the very large programme of new construction and rehabilitation works that are going on on the South Indian Railway. My Honourable friend comes from Madras and I am sure he is very pleased with all that is being done on the South Indian Railway to extend the railway system there. Well, Sir, if you want to control the expenditure that is being incurred on a large scale on new construction and on new works you must have adequate supervision. You cannot do without it, Sir, and the Railway Board, as I say, view with favour the addition of one temporary officer of the rank of Deputy Agent to help the Agent to control this huge expenditure. The Railway Board, Sir, have not made up their mind about the other appointment, but Sir, what I wish to say is this, when the Railway Board have made up their mind as to what they are going to do in this matter, they will place before the Standing Finance Committee for Railways their proposals if they decide to create these appointments. No additional expenditure will be incurred in connection with these appointments until that memorandum has been placed before the Standing Finance Committee and considered by them. Now, Sir, in view of this explanation I would ask my Honourable friend to withdraw his motion.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 2,00,000.”

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Varahagiri Venkata Jogiah (Ganjam *cum* Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I do not move this amendment* as the point I wished to raise has been dealt with already.

Administration of the Stores Department, North Western Railway.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: The motion standing against my name is for a reduction of one lakh in regard to the Stores Department of the North Western Railway. In this connection I would draw the attention of the House to a series of questions that were asked on the 30th August 1926 by my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy. These questions related to certain contracts that were placed by the North Western Railway with a contractor named Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons of Lahore. I know neither the contractors, nor the Controller of Stores of the North Western Railway—I have never seen them nor met them in my life. So I do not know what are the usual procedure and contract terms demanded by the North Western Railway from its contractors. I am unfortunately more familiar with the unusual methods of the Controller of Stores. In reply to these questions the Honourable Member in charge of this department replied that the lowest suitable tender was accepted and there was nothing unusual in the procedure detailed in the questions asked. Now, Sir, if the Member in charge of this department thought there was nothing unusual in this procedure I desire to know why did the

*“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration,’ be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000.”

[Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney.]

Honourable Member take further action in this matter and did the action he took result in a further inquiry being made and which in turn led to the exposure of certain irregularities on the part of the Controller of Stores and if so what further action has he taken in this matter. I am given to understand that the Railway Board took some action in this matter notwithstanding the reply given by the Honourable Member. I speak subject to correction, but, I believe that a letter was written by the Railway Board to the Agent, North Western Railway, on the 8th October, 1926, calling his serious attention to financial losses due to the gross irregularities amounting, I understand, to a very serious offence on the part of the Controller of Stores in his relation with Messrs. Diwan Chand and Sons' tenders. Now, Sir, I want to know what further action the Railway Board proposes to take in the matter against this firm of contractors whose names had been previously removed from the East Indian Railway.

Sir Clement Hindley (Chief Commissioner for Railways): May I ask the Honourable Member a question? Would he kindly explain what cases he is referring to? I am afraid I did not catch the reference.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: I am referring to questions Nos. 107 to 112 asked by Mr. Neogy on the 30th August last year regarding certain contracts for castor oil, lubricating oil and cotton waste supplied by Diwan Chand and Sons to the North Western Railway. To continue, Sir, I believe—I speak subject to correction—that the Railway Board did take action in this matter. Sir, we have heard such a lot in this House about Railway scandals. We have heard about the East Indian Railway cotton waste scandal and I have not forgotten the admonition the Honourable Member tried to give me for my reference to it and my defence of Mr. D'Cruz. I wish to call this also a scandal, for in view of the questions asked and the replies given by the Honourable Member as also the actual facts of the case, I think this House is entitled to ask him what further action he proposes taking, in addition to the action I believe he has already taken—I refer to his letter of the 8th October, 1926. I ask this for two reasons. Firstly in the interests of proper administration, and secondly to oppose and if necessary to expose what, as far as I can see, seem to be different kinds of treatment and punishments inflicted on officials and subordinates for almost similar offences. I would not even suggest that this is the intention of the Honourable Member for I do believe, in fact I am sure, that when he answered Mr. Neogy's questions he was not accurately, properly or fully informed of the facts. But I do consider that such cases should be severely dealt with, and I hope the Honourable Member will be kind enough, when he replies to this, to let this House know what action he has taken or what further action he proposes to take, and secondly, if my information is correct, whether in his opinion it is right that contractors of this type should be allowed to exploit the railways. Sir, I move my motion.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, the Honourable Member has taken me entirely by surprise because he gave no notice of the particular contract he had in mind, and however efficient we may be in the Railway Board we do not carry in our minds the details of every contract entered into by every particular railway for oil. But I understand he is referring to a certain contract for castor oil entered into by the North Western Railway with a firm called Diwan Chand and Sons. I think I am correct in saying that in the first instance tenders were called for for this castor oil,

and on an examination of the tenders an order was placed with Diwan Chand and Sons. Later on in the year when the Railway wanted further supplies, instead of calling for fresh tenders they placed a further order with the same firm. That was the burden of the complaint and I think I am correct in saying that that is quite a usual procedure. I do not know what letter the Honourable Member refers to. I can only say that in view of what he has said I will look into the matter again, but I am afraid I cannot say more.

Mr. President: The question is :

“ That the Demand under the head ‘ Working Expenses : Administration ’ be reduced by Rs. 1,00,000.”

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: Sir, in view of the promise given by the Honourable Member, I ask your permission to withdraw this motion.

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

Arrangements for the Hardwar-Kumbh Mela.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru (Agra Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I move :

“ That the Demand under the head ‘ Working Expenses : Administration,’ be reduced by Rs. 1,000.”

In view of the large amount of business that the House has still to go through I shall be as brief as possible. I will not deal generally with pilgrim traffic, which is a special branch of third class traffic. The grievances of third class passengers have frequently been placed before this House. But I wish to ask on this occasion what arrangements Government are making in connection with the Hardwar-Kumbh Mela to be held in April next. I have no inconsiderable experience of these melas myself, and although I can say that during the last 12 years an appreciable improvement has taken place in the manner of handling third class traffic,

there is still great room for improvement. In a debate that took place last year, it appeared from what fell from the Honourable Member for Commerce that he was under the impression that wagons were not being used now to convey third class passengers. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar contested that statement. I am free to admit that the use of wagons has become much more infrequent than it used to be in the past but they are still used. However, I would like to know whether any instructions have been issued to the railway authorities not to employ wagons for the conveyance of third class passengers. If they have been, I have nothing more to say on this point. But if they have not I would like to say that this is a matter that requires the particular consideration of Government, and that, where third class passengers are conveyed in wagons, it is only fair that they should not be charged the full third class fare. (*Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:* “ No, they should not be conveyed in wagons at all.”) I am certainly on principle against these passengers being conveyed in wagons, but where wagons are used, it is only fair that they should be charged less fare than they would be if they were conveyed in ordinary carriages. (*Mr. N. M. Joshi:* “ Half rates.”)

My special suggestion in this connection is that on the occasion of the Hardwar-Kumbh Mela, the Government should ask the Railway authorities to appoint a superior officer specially to look after the third class passengers. The pilgrims, who flock to Hardwar, will remain in the

[Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru.]

station yard for about a week—at any rate my experience of the twelve-yearly and six-yearly *Kumbhs* of 1915 and 1921 is that the passengers had to remain in the open for days and days in the station yard. I know it was not possible to convey all passengers in the course of 24 hours. But since these passengers remain on railway premises for a number of days, it is only right that there ought to be a special officer charged with the responsibility of looking after them. It is not enough that you should have subordinate railway officials or Sub-Inspectors of Police to see that they are not maltreated, for it is not infrequently that complaints have to be made against these very officers who are supposed to protect third class passengers, and I hope that this suggestion will be given effect to. I am sure that if the superior officers of the railways look upon the handling of third class traffic as a matter not less in importance than any of the other questions dealt with by the railway authorities, the point of view of the subordinate officers will change, thus adding greatly to the convenience of the large number of passengers who flock to the sacred places of pilgrimage periodically.

Before I sit down I should like to say a word also about overcrowding. During the last twelve years while I have seen appreciable improvements carried out in every direction, I am sorry to say that my own experience does not enable me to say that there has been any improvement in regard to overcrowding. The Honourable the Commerce Member does not accept the accuracy of that statement. May I assure him in view, if I may say so, of the special experience that I have of mela traffic in the United Provinces that I cannot honestly say that there has been any appreciable improvement in this direction? There is still a great deal of overcrowding.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: At melas?

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: At melas. Of course I am speaking of melas. I have discussed this matter often with railway officers and asked them why it is not possible that coaching stock at least on various lines under the control of Government should be pooled on these occasions. At one time, that was before the East Indian Railway had come under Government management, the reply given to me by an officer of the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway was that it would be a very expensive business to take over the stock of a Company-managed Railway.

Sir Clement Hindley: Why?

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: That was the only argument that he used. To me that particular argument does not appeal very much. If you are earning a great deal through third class passenger traffic you ought not to make it a point to see in connection with pilgrim traffic that you carry every passenger at a profit. Even if you have to incur a small loss on special occasions, it is worth while undergoing it in view of the general importance of third class traffic and the large income that third class passengers contribute to the revenue of the railways. I do not know whether any action has been taken in this direction in the past or whether any action of a similar nature is contemplated in connection with the Kumbh Mela to be held at Hardwar, but I would earnestly press this matter on the attention of Government, particularly as the East Indian Railway and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway both are now being managed by Government.

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy (Bengal Mahajan Sabha: Indian Commerce): Sir, I am glad that my friend Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru has invited attention to the question of Pilgrim traffic. I believe I shall be failing in my duty if I did not give expression to my feelings regarding the inconveniences and privations of lower class passengers and the pilgrims. There is no doubt whatsoever that the question of providing better amenities for lower class passengers—and surely the pilgrims come under this category—is a matter of paramount importance. These lower class passengers have been suffering in silence, because they are uncomplaining and poor; they are voiceless. In this connection I think I ought to invite the attention of the House to the report which was submitted by the Sanitary Commissioner to the Government of India in respect of the Pilgrims Committee. The Sanitary Commissioner to the Government of India, on the 27th of September, 1916, submitted the following report:

“The Government of India can hardly be aware of the amount of ill-feeling and ill-will towards themselves which these two conditions, namely, (1) overcrowding of ordinary trains and pilgrim specials, and (2) the use of goods wagons, engender.”

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: What is the date of the report?

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy: 1916, 27th September. Sir, as a matter of fact I do not really understand why wagons should at all be used for carrying these pilgrims, these third class passengers. In 1920 when I appeared before the Acworth Committee I observed as follows:

“I regret to observe that at present the Railway Board have failed to satisfy the requirements of the public and to inspire public confidence, and I am personally inclined to press for its discontinuance. The manner in which the Indian travelling public, including the womanhood of the country, are packed almost like cattle in ordinary trains, not to speak of pilgrim specials, consisting most often of goods wagons and trucks, is sufficient to warrant the belief that the Railway Board have signally failed to justify their existence.”

Further, you will be pleased to find that no less a person than the President of the Railway Board made this observation: “that there are strong reasons for believing that third class passengers like wagons for travelling”. An astounding revelation! Wagons for travelling! That was an observation which was made by no less a person than the President of the Railway Board. This was in 1919 or 1920, and I want to invite the attention

Sir Clement Hindley: Can I ask what President of the Railway Board that was?

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy: I have not got all the materials before me. I referred to that in the memorandum which I submitted before the Acworth Committee. I shall be able to furnish you with the information later on.

Sir Clement Hindley: All I wanted to make clear was that it was not I who made those remarks.

Mr. K. O. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Does the Honourable Member describe himself as President of the Railway Board or as Chief Commissioner?

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy: I would not mention his name. It was in 1918, 1919 or 1920. I think I will not be justified in mentioning his name. That is the position. Should this treatment of third class

[Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy.]

passengers and pilgrims be tolerated? Treatment such as this—I will not mince matters when I say that it is exasperating, to say the least of it.

My Honourable friend has referred to the festival of the Kumbha Mela which will come off in March or April. It is said that the pilgrims, the lower class passengers, like wagons better than anything else. Just fancy in the killing heat of March or April these pilgrims would prefer and like these wagons. I hope the day will come when the Members of the Railway Board will try and make an experiment and find out whether they would prefer and like wagons better than their saloons. I sincerely hope that they will make arrangements for carrying third class passengers not in these wagons and trucks but in proper and better third class compartments. I am glad that in the Railway Budget provision has been made for water supply and for better class of accommodation for lower class passengers, but at the same time I feel bound to draw attention to the fact that out of 219·58 lakhs, the magnificent sum of 2·76 lakhs only have been provided for latrine and sanitary arrangements for these lower class passengers. Is this sufficient? I do not think it is and I do hope that the whole of this amount will be properly applied. I have one further suggestion to make, that, for the convenience of lower class passengers, and pilgrims in particular, who will have to travel in March and April, I think the time has come when arrangements should be made for providing third class compartments with fans.

Sir Walter Willson (Associated Chambers of Commerce: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I just wish to make a very few observations in support of my Honourable friend Pandit Kunzru's speech. I view, Sir, with the greatest regret the overcrowding of railway carriages for the third class passenger. Shipping companies are not allowed to carry in excess of their numbers, and I fail to see why railways should be such constant and serious offenders. I accept at once the difference between a long sea voyage and a short railway journey, but the point I wish particularly to urge upon the Railway Board and upon the House is this, that third class fares are now so reduced that the last reductions have failed to produce that increase of traffic which was hoped for, and I would like to see the policy of the Government and of this House directed more towards the amelioration and improvement of the conditions of travelling of the third class passenger than to some further infinitesimal reduction in the rates of fares. I am extremely anxious to see the higher standard of living which we are all supposed to aim at for our fellow-men also aimed at for our fellow travellers. I remember very well the remarks made by our old friend, Colonel Stanyon, who said how happy the faces were in an overcrowded *tikka gari* and in an overcrowded train. That may be true, but it is not leading to a higher standard of life, and whilst I accept the inevitable that there must be overcrowding in the case of pilgrims when there is a rush, still, if the railways are compelled to put men into truck wagons, I do think they should get some advantage in the fares.

Sir Clement Hindley: Sir, I am very much obliged to Mr. Kunzru for bringing this matter up and for the manner in which he has done so. It is a pleasure to me, Sir, to be able to answer a speech like that of Mr. Kunzru because it comes from one who has a certain amount of authority in that he has himself experienced and seen a great deal of this pilgrim traffic. Before remarking on the special arrangements which we are making in regard to the Kumbh Mela, I wish to make a few general

remarks about this very difficult subject of pilgrim traffic. We and all our officers regret the overcrowding at these pilgrimage times, but those Honourable Members who have been through these melas will, I am perfectly certain, understand the difficulties we always have in controlling the crowds of people who come to them. You may say that difficulties are only made to be got over. Well we accept that and we do our best to get over them, but they are very serious difficulties. I was recently in Eastern Bengal in the neighbourhood of a place called Bogra and I was there when a very large local mela was taking place. I give this as a small instance of these difficulties. The best estimates that could be made, after consulting the local authorities, of the number of pilgrims who would come to the fair was about 20,000. The place of pilgrimage was some distance from the line and was fairly equidistant from three or four stations, the line there being curved. During the days when I was there some 80,000 pilgrims had to be dealt with as against the 20,000 estimated by all the local authorities and the local people themselves who could be consulted. Now, I submit, that it is a very great practical difficulty, when you have made your arrangements for 20,000 passengers, with some allowance for excess, to find yourself confronted with 80,000. The difficulty is this. They come for two or three days beforehand but they all want to go away as soon as the particular occasion is over and they want to go away together. The difficulty is enhanced when many of them go to two or three other stations on the line by walking a few miles across country where they think they may get a train. In this case there was extraordinary difficulty in getting away the very large crowds that had assembled at the smaller stations near by. When I passed through one station there was a crowd of something like two or three thousand people at a very small place. They were very orderly people and they were very happy and they were all at that time sitting down all over the platform, all over the railway line, and all over the goods sheds. There was a small force of police and a few railway officials, and I just thought to myself "Now what is going to happen when the next train gets in", because when the train had just come in they all crowded up and got in in large numbers. When the next train came along I do not know what happened but I was told there were seven more special trains expected that night. It is obvious when a train gets to the first station where crowds are assembled it gets full up and I do not know what the people do at the next station or two or how they eventually get away. Now I am merely giving an illustration. I think everybody knows the difficulties; but we do take special measures to avoid the carriage of pilgrims in goods wagons. One of the officers came to me that evening when it was dark and getting very late and these people were all there faced with the possibility of remaining where they were all night because you cannot rush seven trains through at once; you must allow a certain interval to elapse between one train and another. If the number of passengers has greatly exceeded your anticipations and the passenger stock that you have arranged for is found insufficient how are you going to get them away? I said the only thing to do was to bring along a few goods wagons. I was told that they brought up some later which carried the rest of the people away. They went away quite joyful because they did not want to wait till the morning for another train. It is only on occasions like this that passengers now are occasionally carried in goods wagons.

The Honourable Member from Bengal quoted from the Report of the Pilgrim Commission of 1916. Well, Sir, I have only to remark that that

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

was in 1916 and this is 1927 and most Members of this House, I think, know that we have progressed a great deal in the direction of avoiding the use of goods wagons. We have had an unsolicited testimonial from one of our old opponents on the floor of this House who retracted a great deal of what he said about the Bengal and North-Western Railway in the past.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhammadan): I never retracted anything.

Sir Clement Hindley: I do not suppose he ever will, but I understood him to say that from his observation on a recent occasion, a mela or something of the kind, the Bengal and North-Western Railway have improved in this respect.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Yes, I said so.

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: The Bengal and North-Western Railway is bad enough even now.

Sir Clement Hindley: Well, Sir, the Bengal and North-Western Railway has to meet special difficulties in that it has so far had only enough stock to meet the normal passenger traffic. I just want to mention that point, which is, I do think, not quite understood. If we are going to carry a very large excess of passengers suddenly at one period, it means one of two things: we have either to keep in reserve a large amount of coaching stock which is not going to pay, or we have to run the risk of being short. Now, on the Bengal and North-Western Railway we recognised two years ago they had not sufficient passenger stock to meet the requirements of pilgrim traffic; but they have improved their arrangements and we are pressing on them the necessity for making further arrangements for rolling-stock

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy: The arrangements in the Bengal Nagpur Railway are also very bad on the occasion of the Car festival at Juggernath.

Sir Clement Hindley: The House will recognise that I really cannot go into the case of all the railways now; I am dealing with the matter generally at the moment

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: You have dealt with the worst railway.

Sir Clement Hindley: I may say that in Northern India, on the State Railways, the North-Western Railway, the East Indian Railway, and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, we have been endeavouring during this last year to effect some kind of pooling of the rolling-stock which is specially set aside for pilgrim traffic. We took up the question last year and we have gone to some extent in that direction. We have ascertained what excess stock would be normally required for the melas which usually occur and we are seeing whether we can have a pool of extra coaching stock which can be moved from one railway to another as required. I would like to say there is no difficulty on broad gauge railways for arranging, as between these railways, for the loan of coaching stock and no undue charges

I may just very briefly say what we are doing for the Kumbh Mela which we understand this year is to be one of exceptional importance. The House knows, of course, that these large melas occur at Hardwar

every twelve years, and this is to be an exceptionally large one. The matter has been very carefully studied and has been under examination by the East Indian Railway and the adjacent Railways for some months past. No time has been lost in making advance arrangements for meeting this exceptional rush of passengers. Meetings have been held between the transportation officers of the North-Western Railway and the East Indian Railway and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway to consider how they can best make the necessary stock available. We have here to depend very largely on the estimate of local authorities and the people themselves; we expect to have something like one million passengers to deal with in excess of the ordinary passenger traffic. To work the time tables which can be to some extent laid down in advance for moving this vast number of people—I would just like to compare it with the moving of an army on one of the war fronts—moving a million people in the course of a few days is a very large problem indeed. To meet that, the railways estimate that they require fifty additional rakes of passenger coaches in order to run backwards and forwards and carry these people back to the places where they came from, on a very carefully worked out time table. These fifty rakes, we hope, to some extent—to a large extent—may be found by taking away passenger stock from the other railways—the three State railways or any other railway that can spare it. We are making very careful calculations with regard to that, and I hope it may be possible to work the arrangements without having to resort to goods vehicles. But if passengers are waiting and have to be got away, I think we must reserve the possibility of having to use goods wagons. That is the way I am putting it to the East Indian Railway at present. We strongly discountenance it if it can possibly be avoided; but if it does come at a time when the choice is between leaving the passengers there and keeping them waiting for perhaps some considerable time and moving them away to their homes, it is easy to see which course is the better one; but we shall make strenuous endeavours to avoid the use of goods wagons on this occasion.

There is one other point, Sir. Mr. Kunzru suggested that we should appoint a special officer to look after the passengers who remain at the station. The arrangements locally at Hardwar are very much in the hands of the Local Government, but there is definite consultation and co-ordination of our arrangements with the Local Government, and I understand that they are drafting in a very large number of special medical officers and medical assistants and various other officers into the surrounding area in order to watch over these passengers

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Is the Honourable Member speaking of the Local Government or of the Railways?

Sir Clement Hindley: I am trying to explain that our officers are in close consultation with those of the Local Government, because sanitation and care of these pilgrims outside the railway station are the affair of the Local Government, and we are subordinating our working and our care of the passengers and our arrangements there to the plans of the Local Government. At the station itself and in regard to the passenger traffic generally, I am informed that six special experienced railway officers have already been appointed to be present for the Kumbha Mela itself on the East Indian Railway, and I think that should meet the point raised by Mr. Kunzru. They will be definitely charged with looking after the passengers.

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

I would like to make one slight remark about something which Mr. Kunzru said. He drew rather an unfortunate distinction between the action of the railway subordinates and the railway officers, and I do rather resent that on behalf of the railway subordinates, because I do think that in a case like this, where the subordinates are working with their officers and all in the interests of the passengers, it is a little unfair to draw that distinction. I think perhaps Colonel Gidney will support me in this. Railway officers and railway subordinates always work together, and I do think it is unfair to suggest anything of that kind. They are a body of men all working together as a team, and they are working at a time like this in the interests of the passengers to give them every convenience and to treat them properly. I am saying this in defence of all railway servants who have to deal with the travelling public. I hope, Sir, after the explanation I have given of the arrangements we are making for the Kumbha Mela, a matter which I understand was specially the subject of the Honourable Member's amendment, he will see his way to withdraw it.

Mr. M. Rathnaswamy (Nominated: Indian Christians): May I ask, Sir, whether Sir Clement Hindley will consider the question of not charging people who are conveyed in wagons third class fares?

Sir Clement Hindley: I am sorry, Sir, I omitted this point. It is of course quite impossible to do anything of that kind, because passengers buy their tickets in advance and wait for accommodation in the trains. They may or may not get accommodation in the regular passenger trains, and if some passengers are unfortunate enough not to be able to get accommodation in the passenger coaches, it will be impossible to issue special tickets later on if we have to convey them in goods wagons.

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy: Sir, this question is covered by motion No. 65 which stands in the name of my Honourable friend Mr. Joshi. . . .

Mr. President: What is the point of order that the Honourable Member is raising?

Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan Roy: I refer to the question put by my friend.

Mr. President: The Chair will see to it.

Mr. President (to Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru): Does the Honourable Member wish to withdraw his motion?

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: Yes, Sir, I ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion in view of the reply given by Sir Clement Hindley.

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

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty-five Minutes to Three of the Clock.

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

Mr. President: The next amendment* stands in the name of Mr. Joshi. The subject-matter of that amendment has already been discussed more than once in this Session.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): Indianisation of the superior service, Sir.

Mr. President: The general question of Indianisation of service has been discussed.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I thought, Sir, that I could have raised a debate on this motion that the superior service has not been sufficiently Indianised.

Reduction of Third Class Fares.

(Mr. President then called on Mr. M. K. Acharya to move his amendment† No. 37.)

Mr. M. K. Acharya (South Arcot cum Chingleput: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I do not propose to make any very long speech. I suppose the amendment refers to the reduction of third class fares.

Mr. President: There is no question of supposing. The amendment actually refers to that subject.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: Thank you, Sir. I am aware that already something has been done during the last few months to reduce the third class fares. I am particularly acquainted with the South Indian and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways in my own province, and I am sorry to note that the reductions which they have made are not as large and adequate as might have been expected in view of the very large profits which these two railways make. I am not of course advancing the argument that third class fares should be reduced beyond all proportion to what may be considered reasonable demands on the revenue of each railway. From the statement which was furnished to this House in reply to a question put by Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar on the 3rd February, we find that while on the East Indian Railway the reduction has been very considerable and the third class fares have come down to 2½ pies and 2 pies, on the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway they are 3½ pies, and 3 pies, and on the South Indian Railway 3½ pies, 3½ pies, 3½ pies, 3 pies and so on for varying distances. Sir, the South Indian Railway runs across a land which is not particularly or exceptionally bad and there is no reason why the South Indian and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways should not also reduce their fares considerably. One other point that I want to raise is this, that there is consideration only with regard to long distance passengers. Most of these reductions apply to people who travel beyond 300 miles. I wish to submit to you, Sir, that the third class passengers who travel beyond 300 miles are a very small percentage of the total number of passengers. If you are really to give them amenities it must be irrespective of the distance that is being travelled by these third class passengers—whether the distance is 50 or above 50 or above 300 miles. I therefore submit that it would be very

*That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 1,000 (Indianisation of superior staff.)

†That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 100. (Non-reduction or inadequate reduction of third class fares on several Railways.)

[Mr. M. K. Acharya.]

much more reasonable that all third class passengers should have the benefit of the larger earnings which have accumulated to the railways during the past few years and that all third class passengers irrespective of the distance they travel should be charged smaller rates. In particular I want to point out that the reductions on the first and second class are comparatively on a much more liberal scale. As I said, I do not want to make a very long speech; the discrepancy is so obvious, and I would press upon the attention of the House the very great desirability of making further uniform reductions in the fares for third class passengers. I hope that in view of the very large millions of people that are really concerned in this matter—and I have the honour to represent only the bulk of the middle class people—this motion will receive the very sympathetic consideration, at least on this side of the House, that it deserves.

***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt** (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): I propose to press—and I find that Mr. Acharya has already taken up the subject—that the Demand under the head "Working Expenses: Administration" be reduced by Rs. 101

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is entitled to speak on Mr. Acharya's motion. He cannot move his own amendment.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: I support the motion moved by Mr. Acharya and have only a very few words to say in respect of it.

In pre-war times the rate of third class fares was such that it went to increase the traffic, but since 1918 there have been increases. In 1918 there was an increase and again there was another in 1920. But for 36 years the railway fare that was charged for third class passengers had been uniform and that used to pay the railways and I do not see any reason why the fare should not be reduced to the pre-war level. It has been said that the third class passenger fare has been reduced to a large extent. But it has been reduced only in the case of passengers travelling long distances, that is, more than 300 miles. I beg to state that third class passengers do not travel long distances and the average distance travelled by them is about 60 miles. That being so, it does not really benefit the large bulk of the third class passengers. I should like to quote one passage from Lord Mayo's utterances so long ago as 1868 in support of my proposition.

Mr. President: When?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: As long ago as 1868, when the railways were just being introduced into this country, that is, 60 years ago. He said:

"It is to the third class passengers that we must look to make our railways paying and it is not by raising fares but by cheapening the cost of carriage and locomotion . . . that we must hope to develop the enormous revenue that we are now only touching from this source and the tendency of the railway management in this direction should be checked on every possible occasion."

I beg to say that when the railway fares were increased there might have been justification, but all those causes do not exist now and we may very well bring down the rates to the pre-war level. As regards the sufferings of the third class passengers and other things I do not wish to trouble this House by narrating them because they have already been dealt with, as also the sufferings of pilgrims. I beg to submit that this is a subject which has often been discussed in this House and it is now high time that the railway authorities reduced the third class fares further.

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I also rise to support this motion. In 1924, when the Honourable the Commerce Member made his speech he stated that when we separated the railway finances from the general finances we would get better service at reduced cost and also that through our reserve funds we would get a reduction of fares and the general benefit of commercial management. I want to ask him whether the third class passengers are getting any benefit which he had promised in the year 1924. Sir, the separation of the finances have taken place. The Railway Board cannot now complain that it has not got any reserve fund. We have a reserve fund amounting to more than 10 crores of rupees. The railway management is said to have been commercialised. I therefore think that the third class passengers are justified in expecting a reduction of fares, but unfortunately they have not secured practically any reduction in their fares. There is no doubt that on some lines the fares have been reduced for longer distances. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by stating how the fares have been reduced, but I can say this that in the North-Western Railway the reduction has taken effect over 50 miles, while the average lead of the travel of the third class passenger is only 40 miles. On the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the reduction of fares has taken effect over a distance of 150 miles, the average lead is 45 miles. On the East Indian Railway, the reduction of fares has taken effect for distances over 300 miles, while the average lead is 49 miles. On the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, the Bengal Nagpur Railway, and the Bombay, Baroda Central India Railway, the reduction has taken place only over a distance of 300 miles, while the average lead in these cases is 39, 49 and 33, respectively. You will thus see that for the average third class passenger there is absolutely no reduction. The reduction that has been made is a mere eye-wash and if the Railway Board had been honest they would not have said that they had made any reduction because they knew that that reduction was not going to benefit the large number of third class passengers. I think, Sir, the Railway Board has really no ground now not to reduce the third class wages.

Sir Darcy Lindsay (Bengal: Europeans): Wages?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Third class fares. I am sorry I am always thinking of wages. They used to state some time ago that in reducing fares they were taking a great risk, but as they now have got a reserve fund of 10 crores of rupees, there is absolutely no risk now left. Secondly, they used to say that they had no sufficient coaching stock. I hope the Railway Board does not now say that, because we shall ask them what they have done with our 150 crores of rupees. They used to say that the cost of services has gone up but only last year I saw that the freight charges on coal have been reduced, but if the cost of services has gone down for the carriage of coal, I suppose, Sir, that the cost of services has also gone down for the carriage of human beings. The old excuses given by the Railway Board do not exist now. The effect of their persistence in the policy of charging high fares is not even beneficial to the Railway Board from the financial point of view. Ordinarily there used to be in the pre-war years an increase of third class passengers by about 25 millions. I do not remember the exact figure. That increase is not now kept up although the rates have been reduced. It is quite clear that if a commercial undertaking is to be run on commercial lines the fares must be reduced if you want to attract traffic. In any undertaking like this, where large capital is sunk in the construction of lines and stations, the more traffic you attract the better results you will get

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

from the point of view of commercial management. Then, Sir, if you consider the service which is given to third class passengers you will find that reduction is absolutely necessary. Sir, I do not wish to tire the House with many figures but I propose to give only a few figures to show what service third class passengers get for the fares which they have to pay. Sir, the Railway Board have at present 33,495 first class seats. These first class seats are used by 1,122,900 first class passengers in a year. That gives on an average 34 persons using one first class seat in a year. Now I do not want to give the figures for the other classes, though I have them with me.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Is the Honourable Member speaking on this motion or his later motion "facilities for third class passengers"?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I am speaking of fares, and I want to show that the third class passenger does not even get what he ought to get for the fare he pays, and therefore the fare must be reduced. I want to show that the fare should be reduced. In the case of third class passengers, the Railway Board has got 973,741 third class seats, and those seats have been used in a year by 564,418,600 persons; that is, each third class seat has been used by 580 persons, while the first class seat is used by only 34 persons in a year. You will thus see that when there is a reduction of the first class fare by a large proportion, the third-class fare ought to be reduced by a much larger proportion. This is quite clear from what the third class passengers give you. As regards the earnings I also wish to give only a few figures. The 33,495 first class seats bring in on an average per seat Rs. 351 each in a year. Of course the first class seat is a costly seat. But each third class seat also brings to Government Rs. 340 in a year. Now, Sir, the first class seat ought to pay at least eight times as much as the third class seat; but actually the first class seat brings in only Rs. 351 as compared with the Rs. 340 which a third class seat brings in. That is to say the third class is paying as much as the first class passenger. Now, Sir, what more proof do you want and what more justification do you want for a reduction of the third class fare? Sir, it is highly unjust that a third class passenger should pay for his seat as much as a first class passenger pays for his. But that is what the figures show. The first class passenger gets ten times more comfort than the third class passenger for practically the same amount. Is it right that the Government of India should treat different classes of people in this differential manner? Sir, the treatment which is meted out to third class passengers is therefore highly unjust. I hope, Sir, that the Government of India for the sake of justice at least will not treat their best customers in a bad manner. I have heard so much that the railways are commercial concern. If the railways are a commercial concern, I hope they will not treat their best customers in this shabby manner. I hope, Sir, the fares will be reduced.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: Sir, however desirable it may be to reduce the fares of the third class passengers, I have not heard any views put forward as to where the money is to come from. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has favoured the House with a long list of figures which are very illuminating but after lunch a little difficult to follow. Sir, during

the past few days there has been a very strong demand made for increase in the pay of members of the subordinate service on the railways. The Honourable Member in charge, Sir Charles Innes, I think told the House the number of crores of rupees this demanded increase in pay will require. We have also had an appeal from my Honourable friend, Pandit Kunzru, for a reduction in certain freights. Now I again ask where is all this money to come from?

Pandit Hirday Nath Kunzru: May I explain, Sir, that I never asked for any reduction in freights.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I thought he asked for certain reductions for the sake of industries. Then my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has referred to the reserve of 10 crores. I feel, Sir, that those ten crores would be all eaten up and there would be no possibility of having any reserve at all. On these grounds, Sir, I cannot give my support to the motion.

Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand Haji (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Honourable gentleman who has just sat down inquired as to where the money is to come from to pay for the reduction in third class fares and for providing amenities to the third class travelling public. I am rather surprised, Sir, that even after lunch it should be impossible for the Honourable Member to find out that the easiest means of getting more money would be to Indianize the superior staff of railways and from the amounts you save thereby, to provide the amenities required and make the reductions suggested. Sir, if I began to speak on the question of Indianization, I am sure, Sir, that you would rule me out of order. Now that the question of Indianization has been permitted to be raised, I would just refer to one phase of Indianization if you will permit me. . . .

Mr. President: I am afraid I cannot permit the Honourable Member to refer to the question of Indianisation.

Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand Haji: I will show you, Sir, how it would be possible for the Government of India to reduce the fares and to provide the amenities

Mr. President: There is no question of amenities here. The only question now is the reduction of third class fares.

Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand Haji: Thank you, Sir.

Sir Darcy Lindsay: I am afraid it is the effect again of the lunch.

Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand Haji: So far as the question of fares alone is concerned, I think the figures given by the Honourable Mr. Joshi ^{3 P.M.} point out that it is quite an easy matter if the Government will take up the subject properly, because once fares are reduced, I am sure the Government Benches, which are very fond of quoting economic laws, will find that with the reduction of fares more people will travel, more money will come in, and thus there will be no deficit even if the present high superior salaries are maintained. Sir, with these words, I beg to support the motion.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I think that the Honourable Member who has just spoken, who suggested that the Government should take up this question in earnest, will be well advised to make

[Sir Charles Innes.]

himself acquainted with the previous history of this matter. Mr. Joshi stated that when separation was being argued in this House one of the advantages which I claimed for separation was that it would enable us to reduce rates and fares and to improve amenities faster than if we remained connected with the General Budget, and Mr. Joshi claims that experience has shown that the advantage which I claimed for separation has not materialised. Sir, I join issue with Mr. Joshi at once. I think that the House ought to deal fairly with the Railway Board and the Government in this matter. It was only last year that we put up before the Standing Finance Committee—and this is the document to which I wish to draw the Honourable Mr. Haji's attention—we put up before the Standing Finance Committee a most complete analysis of our passenger traffic and our railway fares on every single railway in India and we made certain proposals for the reduction of railway fares, third class as well as other class fares. Those proposals were scrutinised by the Standing Finance Committee and they were accepted by the Standing Finance Committee as being a satisfactory start in the reduction of passenger fares. Not only that, Sir, but, as I explained to the House in my budget speech a few days ago, we have made further reductions of fares on the East Indian Railway, the North-Western Railway and on the South Indian Railway. I must confess that I thought that I would be taken to task by the House for being rather rash in having sanctioned those additional reductions of fares, for, what has happened in the first eight months of this year? In the first eight months of the current year in spite of the fact that we have carried more passengers, our receipts from passenger traffic have dropped by 67 lakhs as compared with last year, and that loss is mainly on the third class passengers. That shows two things. The first thing it shows is that you have got to be very cautious in these reductions of fares. After all, what does the Railway Board do? We are just like any other business firm. Some firms will sell you it may be apples or oranges. We sell transport and in selling that transport we follow that principle which I am glad to say Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar laid down the other day; we charge according to what the traffic may bear. But we have to remember that every reduction of 3 per cent. in the general level of fares means, unless we have compensating increase of traffic, a loss to us of Rs. 1 crore. A reduction of only 3 per cent. in the general level of our fares, unless we get compensating increase in traffic, means a loss to us of Rs. 1 crore, and in the first eight months of last year, as I have said, we lost not less than 67 lakhs in spite of having increased our traffic. Then, Sir, Mr. Joshi went on to say that it was a mere eye-wash because we had not reduced fares on short distance traffic. That is not quite correct. The South Indian Railway, which one of the Honourable Members opposite attacked so much, has reduced its fares on the short distance traffic. But Mr. Joshi went on to say that because we had not reduced fares on short distance traffic, our reductions were mere eye-wash. He went on to point out that the average travel by passengers on the North-Western Railway was 40 miles and that on the East Indian Railway 45 miles. If that is the average distance a passenger travels, surely it is obvious that a great many passengers travel a great deal more than 50 miles. What I say is proved by the fact that I have just mentioned, namely, that in spite of having carried additional traffic we have lost 67 lakhs in the first eight months of this year. I claim, Sir, that we have

gone as far as we prudently can at present in this matter of reduction of fares. I make another claim, Sir. We have heard a great deal in the last few days about the extravagance of Indian Railways; we have heard a great deal about the inordinately high salaries paid to our officers. But the fact remains, and cannot be refuted, that travel on the Indian Railways is the cheapest travel in the world. I have the figures here and as I think they will prove of interest to the House I shall read them out:

			Pies.
Average rate per passenger per mile in England	.	.	9-22
Do.	do.	United States of America	15-58
Do.	do.	France	7-14
Do.	do.	Japan	5-21
Do.	do.	Sweden	12-6
Do.	do.	Norway	16-38
Do.	do.	India	3-73

That is to say—whatever explanation you may give—taking them broad and large, I claim that our travel in India is the cheapest in the world.

Mr. T. Prakasam: May I know whether the third class carriages in India are not as good as those in England?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: As I always travel third in England, and first class in India, the Honourable Member may draw his own conclusions.

That does not alter the fact that our rate of travel is the cheapest in the world. It is useless, I say it is wrong, for this House perpetually to attack the Government and the Railway Board on this matter of the third class fares. I claim that in the reductions which we made last year we had the support of the Committee elected by the House, namely, the Railway Finance Committee. I have shown that the result of those reductions was that we have lost 67 lakhs of rupees in the first eight months of the year; nevertheless we have made a further reduction on three railways on third class fares, and I may add that if the House is fair to me they will not accept this motion.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The motion was negatived.

Inconveniences suffered by the Travelling Public.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The object with which I have moved this motion is to place before Government some of the inconveniences to which the travelling public are subjected. My remarks will apply with especial reference to the Bengal and North-Western Railway. I shall be very brief.

The first point that I would like to place before the House is the difficulty of third class passengers in obtaining their tickets. The booking office is not opened sufficiently early to allow all passengers to take

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

tickets. I mentioned this point in course of my budget speech last year, and also made some suggestions in this connection, which I would like to read out to Government. I said:

"I have two suggestions to make, one that the opening hours of booking offices should be notified on posters in front of third class booking offices in the vernacular. That might help the passengers to understand when the booking offices are open, and that might serve as a reminder to the booking clerks to keep their offices open at proper times. Another suggestion of mine is that the station masters should be definitely instructed to see regularly that the booking offices are open at the right hours, and complaints in this respect should be swiftly dealt with."

In spite of this the booking offices for third class passengers are not opened sufficiently early to allow third class passengers to take their tickets. The next point is overcrowding of trains, and this overcrowding is specially serious on the Bengal and North-Western Railway. Other points are: dirty and insanitary conditions of lower class carriages; slow running of trains and unnecessary stoppages at roadside stations, inadequate arrangements for the provision of drinking water. The next point is the practice of conveying passengers in goods wagons. That was the point to which reference was made in the course of the discussion of an earlier motion, and my friend Sir Clement Hindley said I had recanted from my former position with regard to the Bengal and North-Western Railway. I have done nothing of the sort. I have constantly brought this matter before the House for the last three years, and pointed out that the Bengal and North-Western Railway made a practice of conveying passenger traffic in goods wagons during occasions of fairs and festivals. But during the last Sonapur fair they discontinued the use of goods wagons for passengers, and I acknowledge this fact with gratitude. There are two other points which are not germane to the present motion, and I shall not refer to them. One is the non-reduction of fares raised during the War, and the other is the inadequate pay of the employees of the Bengal and North-Western Railway. I hope my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes will deal with these points in the course of his reply, especially those with regard to the Bengal and North-Western Railway.

Mr. C. Duraiswamy Aiyangar: Sir, my points are these:

- (1) Third class passengers must be provided with through carriages to travel beyond a junction as first and second class passengers are.
- (2) Waiting accommodation at present consists of open sheds and is inadequate, unclean, unswept, exposed to rain and sun.
- (3) Fares and time-tables must be printed and exhibited in all vernacular languages. Tickets must be printed in vernaculars else there is scope for fraud; police and middlemen make profits.
- (4) Booking centres must be increased and booking offices must be opened at least an hour before the arrival of trains.
- (5) Children who are not charged at the starting station are charged in the course of the journey or at the destination. So far as I know children do not grow by years during a short railway journey.
- (6) Fruits and sweets are sold, but vendors have to pay heavy licencing fees. The company makes a profit, but the burden is on the passenger.

(7) Over-bridges at junctions are not lighted or sometimes not lighted properly. I complained in regard to this matter regarding Gudur Junction and the authorities had not the kindness to acknowledge my letter. The next time I went there, it was in the same condition.

***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Sir, previous speakers have dealt with other aspects of the question. I shall deal with one aspect of the question which has become intolerable, at least on the East Indian Railway, namely, the introduction of the crew system in consequence of which daily passengers are put to a good deal of trouble and harassment. Often they want to attend their offices at Calcutta after having their meals at 9 and running to the stations and at times they are thrown down on the platform. There was one life lost at Burdwan station, and there is immense harassment to the travelling public. I shall be glad if this crew system is abolished. That is the one aspect of the question I wish to put forward.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, I do not want to take up any time, but I wish to ask for an explanation about some figures I gave about a few minutes ago. I showed then that each first class seat was occupied in a year by 34 persons. . . .

Mr. President: That is repetition.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: No, Sir, I am asking now from a different point of view.

Mr. President: What is that other point of view. I hope the Honourable Member will avoid repetition.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: The present point is overcrowding. What I want to show from this is that you have not got sufficient third class coaches. When one first class seat is occupied by 34 persons and one third class seat is occupied by 540 persons, it is quite clear that the Railway Board has not got sufficient accommodation, or that you have more than enough first class coaches. One of the two things is clear. When you have one first class seat occupied by 34 persons and one third class seat occupied by 540 persons it is quite clear that you have got more than enough first class seats and less than enough third class seats. This is the point I wanted to make and this point makes it quite clear that the Government of India either spend much more money in providing first class coaches or does not spend sufficient money in providing third class coaches.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, this question of third class passengers is what I might describe as a hardy annual. It has been discussed at every budget debate which I have attended during the last 6 years, and I should be afraid to say how many speeches I have made on the subject, but each time I make a speech I am in the happy position of being able to say that considerable improvement has been made on previous years. I am sure there is no Honourable Member in this House who would deny that the position of third class passengers is ever so much better now than it was 6 years ago. One of the improvements we have made is that in the Administration Report of each year we devote a special chapter to the various things which have been done for the travelling public. (*An Honourable Member:* "That we admit.") And if Honourable Members would only read, mark and inwardly digest that chapter we should have

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

[Sir Charles Innes.]

less complaints than I have just heard. Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh was perfectly correct in saying that last year he brought up the vexed question of booking facilities. That is a disability with which I myself have very considerable sympathy. Well, I have always told the House that all these debates, after the budget debate all the speeches of all Honourable Members are examined and we do take action wherever we can on any suggestions made. Now that particular suggestion of Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh regarding booking facilities was made the subject of a circular which we issued to all Railway Agents. We drew their attention to this particular matter and to the suggestions made by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh and we are now just beginning to get in replies on the subject. All Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's suggestions have been examined.

Mr. Joshi referred to the question of third class passengers. I am not going to follow out the intricacies of Mr. Joshi's calculations regarding the relative seating capacity of third class passengers and first class passengers; but I will tell him this fact, namely, that there is very much greater disparity between the third and first class fares in India than third and first class fares in any other country. In England they charge the first class passenger $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as much as they charge the third class passenger. In India, on the other hand, we charge the first class passenger from 6 to 8 times as much as we charge the third class passenger. That is one point I wish to bring to Mr. Joshi's notice.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I interrupt and ask the Honourable Member what he gets per seat from a first class passenger and what from a third class passenger? I have shown that he gets Rs. 350 for a first class seat and that he gets Rs. 340 on an average from a third class seat.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member is treating the third-class passenger as a type instead of an individual. Now, Sir, what we have done in regard to this matter of placing additional rolling-stock on the lines is as follows:

Between the 31st March 1921 and the 31st March 1924, 1,047 additional coaching vehicles were placed on the line.

From then and up to 30th June 1925, 777 coaching vehicles were added and 1,706 were on order.

During the year ending 31st March 1926, 555 additional coaching vehicles have been placed on the line; and during the first quarter ending 30th June 1926 a further 155 have been added and 344 are on order.

Now most of these coaching vehicles are vehicles for third class passengers and our passenger statistics show for the last few years we have not had any very great increment in each year in the total number of our passengers. Other statistics show that in the last few years we have placed on the line a very large number of coaching vehicles, and I claim, Sir, that in the Railway Board in the last five years we have made the greatest impression upon this evil of overcrowding, and I am quite sure that most Honourable Members in this House will accept that statement of the position.

The only other point I wish to refer to is that brought up by Mr. Amar Nath Dutt, about the introduction of the crew system. None of us like the introduction of these special methods in order to prevent fraud on the

part of the public; but I think my Honourable friend knows that this matter of travelling without tickets has now assumed the dimensions of a very serious evil indeed. I forgot the exact figures; but I think I am correct in saying that in six months of one year we detected something like one million passengers travelling without tickets. It is the case everywhere that you get a certain percentage—it is the same in every country, it is by no means peculiar to India—you get everywhere a certain percentage of people who try to defraud the railway, and in order to stop that fraud we have had to resort to this system; but the Honourable Member may rest assured that we shall try and make the crew system as little burdensome to the general public as possible. I hope the House will recognise the efforts we have made and have been making every year during the last five years to provide in every way for additional coaches for the third class passengers, and I hope the Honourable Member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The motion was negatived.

Over-employment of Europeans in new Posts created and Vacancies filled.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): Sir, the motion that I have to move is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The point I wish to make out in support of it is of a very limited but important nature. It is not the general question of Indianisation which I want to touch: I am going to draw the attention of the House to what the Railway Board has done during the last year towards redeeming what I consider to be the promise that has been made by the Railway Board in this matter. The Members of this House know that the Railway Board has accepted the principle that the Indianisation of the railway services should be something like 75 per cent, in accordance with the recommendations of the Lee Commission; and it was also explained to us that in all future recruitment of superior services in India and in England this percentage of 75 per cent. of Indians would be necessarily and strictly adhered to. That was the understanding which was given to us and from that point of view it is necessary to examine whether that proportion has been maintained in the recruitment for the superior services in the last year by the Railway Board or not. I do not want to take a long time but I only wish to draw the attention of this House to the figures of recruitment to new appointments and vacancies filled during the last year, given in paragraph 82 of the Indian Railway Board's Report for 1925-26 at page 54. Of course I admit that there has been another corrigendum sent to us after the Report was supplied giving revised figures as regards this very point, but they do not materially affect the position given out in the original Report. Instead of reading the figures in the original Report, even if we look at the figures of the corrigendum, we find that the number of appointments created during the year is 139. The number of vacancies which occurred during the year is 138, and the number of appointments abolished during the year is 10, the number of vacancies not filled is 43, and the net number of vacancies filled during the year is 224. Out of

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

these 133 are Europeans, and the total number of Indians including statutory Indians or other classes whatever they are, comes to 88. This means that the proportion of 75 per cent. is not merely not adhered to at all but flagrantly departed from.

There is another thing also in connection with this. When this question was brought up in July 1925 before the Central Advisory Council, certain papers were supplied to the members of the Advisory Council and from those papers we found that the total number of officers in the Transportation Department was 263, of whom 190 were in the superior and 73 in the local service, and it was expected that to make good the normal wastage in that staff 10.5 recruits would be eventually required each year, of whom 7.5 would be for the superior services and 3 for the local service. Then certain calculations were made which went to show that the recruitment in England would be 2 for the superior service, and in India the recruitment would be 5.5 for the superior service and four for the local service. Similarly, figures were given for the Civil Engineering Department, and they also show that the total number of recruits annually required for superior and local service will be 16 only, and the figures for the Indian and European recruits for the Superior Service given conform to the standard of 75 per cent. which is accepted by the Government. Similarly, for the Mechanical Engineering Department, figures are given in that note which says this:

"The total cadre of the five State Railways will it is estimated number 224 officers; and the normal annual recruitment will be 9 officers. For some time dependence will have to be placed largely on English recruitment but eventually 7 officers will, according to the recommendations of the Lee Commission, be annually recruited in India. Of these 1.5 will be recruited annually by promotion of deserving subordinates by the methods given below" and so on.

Now, my point is this. The total requirements to fill up the annual wastage in all the three branches would come to 36 only. That is what is given here in this note. But if you will look at these figures in the annual report you will find that in the engineering service alone 98 new appointments have been created this year and of these 98 with 33 vacancies filled I believe something like 75 have gone to Europeans. Similarly in the Transportation Department, there is an extraordinary rise. My objection to this procedure is this. If we have to work up to the 75 per cent. of Indianization, then the one thing the Railway Board should immediately do as a matter of fact is to stop all recruitment in England. If not at least as the second best in all future recruitment the Board ought not to allow this percentage to vary at all. Unless that is done, it is impossible to expect Indianization in the real sense of the term within a reasonable length of time. If new appointments are going to be created, if Europeans are going to be appointed in excess of this proportion every year, then, there is, at least to my mind, no time that I can see in the near future when this 75 per cent. of Indianization in the railway service will be fully reached. That is one great difficulty which I feel, and that is why I have given this cut of Rs. 100 under this motion.

Secondly, Sir, there is also another difficulty. Whenever there is such an extraordinary recruitment of officers for the superior services from England, it will mean the building of additional staff quarters for them at an enormous cost. That again means an additional burden thrown upon us in an unexpected manner. For these reasons, Sir, I believe in the interests of economy as well as in the interest of the rapid progress in the

Indianization of the services itself, it is necessary that this House should not take this cut in a light-hearted manner, and if my arguments commend themselves to the House, I think it should mark its protest and accept my motion unless a satisfactory explanation is forthcoming from the Honourable the Commerce Member.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I will just say a few words to plead the cause of Indian engineers who have suffered very much under the cold and callous treatment that they receive from the Railway Board. My friend Mr. Aney has just now pointed out that the figure of 75 per cent. of Indianisation has not been reached. I am not going to refer to that aspect of the question. My Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett told us last year that they would take steps to Indianise the Railway Department up to the figure of 75 per cent. but the Government do not guarantee that 75 per cent. of Indian officers will be taken every year. I am not referring to that aspect. I will leave it to the honour of the Railway Board to take up the question of 75 per cent. of Indianisation. The Railway Board has got another department which is called "new construction." We have given them 150 crores of capital to construct new railway lines. They are undertaking various new constructions. We know that 6,000 miles of new railway are going to be constructed and we find that the Railway Board does not give any chance to Indian engineers on the plea that Indian engineers are not properly equipped with the knowledge and experience of railway engineering. For surveying a railway line or in the construction of permanent ways of railway lines, Indian engineers are not given any chance and temporary posts are created and either British officers from the Railway Department are transferred to these posts or officers are recruited from England. This is not working to the spirit that the Indian Railways are meant for Indians and I will challenge the Honourable Sir Clément Hindley or any other engineer on that side if they say that Indian engineers are not fit to manage Indian Railways. Indian railways in Indian States are managed by Indian Agents and Indian managers and are running most efficiently. In the Nizam's State Railway, where the Agent is an European, they do not employ so large a number of Europeans as we have in the Government railways or in the company-managed railways. For that reason, Sir, I strongly support Mr. Aney's motion and I commend it to the House. If Government do not give a satisfactory reply that they will fulfil the spirit of the letter that, whether it is new construction or permanent or temporary posts, 75 per cent. of the offices shall be filled by Indians, the House ought to vote down this Demand.

Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidzey: Sir, I have only a few remarks to make on this motion and I do so in support of it. The House realises, that 75 per cent. of superior railway appointments are to be given to Indians and 25 to Europeans. I do not believe, that in this transitional stage we can at once claim the 75 and 25 per cent. It will take time and there is no doubt that the Railway Board is trying its best to arrive at this proportion, but we object to the speed with which they are doing it. Sir, there is one aspect of this matter that I should like to mention and it is this. It is said that for every 10 official appointments 1·5 will be recruited from the subordinate grades. I am now speaking, Sir, for the subordinate classes and I hope the Honourable Member will not again caution me that my remarks will be read by the various Agents and might create a bad impression on their minds as far as my community is concerned. Let me

[Lt.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

assure the Honourable Member I care not what the Agents think. In this House I do not speak for the benefit of the Agents; I speak for the benefit of my people on the Railways, the upper subordinates. I want to know how these 1.5 appointments are to be filled up. Railway upper subordinates consist of covenanted Europeans, domiciled Europeans and Indians, in which statutory natives of India or Anglo-Indians are included—or as we are called in the new budget returns “other classes”. I desire to know to which percentage will promoted European subordinates be tacked on—the 75 per cent. Indians or the 25 per cent. Europeans? This is a point of some considerable importance to the Anglo-Indian subordinate. I respectfully offer it for the serious consideration of the Honourable Sir Charles Innes. I submit, Sir, that these 1.5 official appointments by promotions from the subordinate classes should be exclusively confined to the people of this country and that this percentage should not be reduced for us by including in it promoted Europeans who should form an initial part of the original 25 per cent. of European appointments. I do not grudge their promotion but do not let it affect this 1.5 per cent. This percentage is small enough, and I do not think that it should include Europeans. By this I do not mean that they will not make good officials or that they should not be promoted but now that this proportion of 1.5 per cent. has been fixed it is one that we can honestly claim from the Government for our subordinates. Sir, I hope that the Honourable Member will be good enough to give his attention to this matter when he replies to this motion.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: I am going to speak only a few words in support of this motion. The other day we had a special supplementary sheet given to us as Appendix G containing a statement of the number of appointments created, the number of vacancies that occurred and how they were filled up in 1925-26. The percentage of appointments in State-worked Railways of Europeans to the number of vacancies filled during 1925-26 is 56.1 and of Indians 43.9, or the total number of vacancies being 107, 60 were Europeans and 47 Indians. As regards other railways the percentage of Europeans was 60 and statutory Indians 40. Here are these statistics which clearly show that of the large number of vacancies that occurred during 1925-26, after all those promises had been made, by far the largest percentage went to Europeans—56.1, as I said, in the State-worked Railways and 60 per cent. in the other railways. On some individual railways they seem to be particularly fond of a still higher European percentage. For instance, on the Bengal and North Western Railway the percentage was 87.7 European, and 12.3 Indian and on the Bengal Nagpur Railway it was 81.8 European and 18.2 Indian. In Burma again it was 75 per cent. European and only 25 Indian. All these were new vacancies that occurred in 1925-26. I am aware that the number of top vacancies that occur is always small, and one thing that struck me when reading through these statistics—I am not an expert in statistics as my friend, Mr. Joshi—was this. I shall just give a single instance by way of illustration. In 1925 I find the name of a gentleman called Mr. T. G. Russell who was only a Deputy Agent in December of that year on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway drawing Rs. 1,850 a month. In June 1926 he was acting as Agent drawing Rs. 3,500. I am sure that even on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, there are many senior officers to him and there must be some Indians also senior to him. I find on reference

to records that he is a comparatively young man, only about 40 years of age, and that he joined service in November, 1913, so that he has not put in a very long period of service in the Department. I am told also that the post of Agent on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway as also the posts of Agent on some other railways are likely to fall vacant very soon; I hope that these junior men will not be put in; and as these are State-worked Railways I hope senior men will be put in, and if possible, senior Indians. The Honourable the Commerce Member was good enough to admit the other day that there were a number of senior Indians, both engineers and others—Haymans and Guptas and others on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, North-Western Railway and other Railways.

(At this stage an Honourable Member was seen standing in his place.)

Mr. President: The Honourable Member must not keep standing in that way. He must be in his place.

Mr. M. K. Acharya: I hope, therefore, that in filling the vacancies that occur the percentage of Indians will be raised and also that for the highest posts Indians—statutory Indians—should be preferred, as far as possible, if they happen to be fairly senior men. It seems to me that some preference should be given to Indians on the scope of the policy that has been recently inaugurated. We are not unaccustomed to the fact that on the Executive Councils of the Provinces as well as of the Government of India, Indians, even if they are not very senior in service, are still preferred in giving effect to this general scheme of putting in a certain number of Indians on those Councils. Therefore, even after the Indian proportion has been fixed at 75 it is a little odd that a large percentage of the vacancies that occurred in 1925-26 as many as 60 per cent. or even 56 per cent. has gone to Europeans. I hope that that will be satisfactorily answered, and if it is not answered, the House should by its vote make it clear that it will not agree to this kind of a disproportionately larger percentage of Europeans being continued eternally in the railways of India.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, since Mr. Das has pointed out how necessary it is that I should observe the spirit of the letter of the promise I gave I think it well to remind the Honourable Member of what the promise was. It was a promise based on the recommendation of the Lee Commission to improve the facilities for training in India as rapidly as possible so as to provide for the recruitment of 75 per cent. of the vacancies in India. I only mention that because it is well to remember what exactly the promise was and also it leads on to a very important point.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask the Honourable Member what was the recommendation of the Lee Commission as regards superior services on railways?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: That is what I have read. It leads on to an important point, namely, that in some of our departments we have not got these facilities for training, particularly in the Mechanical Engineering Department. I should also before going on further like to reassure Colonel Gidney who referred to the 1.5 per cent. reserved for promotion from the subordinate service. I may inform him that if a European subordinate is promoted it is taken against European recruitment and direct recruitment of the Europeans will be reduced. Perhaps that satisfies the Honourable Member. It is perfectly right and

[Sir Charles Innes.]

proper that this debate should come up because last year I gave a promise that in each year in the Administration Report I would give a list of the vacancies which actually occurred and how those vacancies were filled up, whether by Europeans or by Indians, in order that the House may see for themselves how the progress of Indianisation was going on. The trouble in this matter has been in the last two years that we have had a great deal of new construction on hand. I am informed by the Railway Board that in getting qualified engineers for that construction they advertised extensively in India and they took from India as many as they could get and for the balance they have got men from England; but the Railway Board got them definitely on short period contracts in order that the importation for temporary purposes of these men might not interfere with the progressive Indianisation of the railway services. It is the temporary recruitment from home which has upset the propositions and I have here the statement of the actual recruitment of permanent men for our Indian railway services in the months from 1st April, 1926, to the 22nd February, 1927, and, if we exclude temporary appointments, I find that the proportion of Europeans recruited on State Railways is 35.1 per cent. and the percentage of Indians is 64.9. Now, we should have more than attained 75 per cent., to which Honourable Members rightly attach so much importance, had it not been for the difficulty of the Mechanical Engineering Department. We have not in India yet proper facilities for training mechanical engineers and therefore at present there are not many mechanical engineers whom we can recruit in India. What we are doing in that matter is that we have taken on in the last year six apprentices, 2 Anglo-Indians, 3 Hindus and one Muslim, and have appointed them as apprentices in the Mechanical Engineering Department with the object of sending them home at a later stage for the necessary training in England so that they can come out and take their place in the Mechanical Engineering Department. I think, Sir, that that shows that at any rate on State Railways in the current year so far as permanent appointments are concerned we are working up to the figure mentioned by the Honourable Member, namely, 75 per cent., and that, had it not been for the difficulty about mechanical engineers, we should have attained that figure. It is perfectly true that we have recruited some temporary men from home but these are temporary men recruited for particular jobs on temporary agreements. We have adopted that course specially in order that we may not have to interfere permanently with the proportions in our services. As regards the Company Railways it was only last year that they came into the scheme and we are still engaged in corresponding with them. I am glad to say that some of these Company Railways have come into our newly formed recruitment schemes. I do not know whether Mr. Aney has seen those schemes. They were published in July last in the *Gazette of India*, very complete schemes for the recruitment of all our railway services. The Assam Bengal Railway has agreed to come into the whole of that scheme and the other railways we hope will take advantage of it. I do think we have shown that we are carrying out our promise, and I hope the Honourable Member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I ask the Honourable Member

for Commerce to inform this House how many men have been recruited on this temporary basis in the last year?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I think I am correct in saying it is 24.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—43.

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. Sessa.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
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.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
Jogiah, Mr. Varahagiri Venkata.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.

Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
Lajpat Rai, Lala.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
Mohammad Ismail Khan, Haji
Chaudhury.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Natique, Maulvi A. H.
Prakasam, Mr. T.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Rananajaya Singh, Kumar.
Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Rao, Mr. G. Sarvotham.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NOES—45.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
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.
Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
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.
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.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
Jawahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur
Sardar.
Kabul Singh Bahadur, Risaldar-Major
and Honorary Captain.
Keane, Mr. M.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Macphail, The Rev. Dr. E. M.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
Nath.
Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
Alexander.
Nasir-ud-din Ahmad, Khan Bahadur.
Paddison, Sir George.
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Ruthnaswamy, Mr. M.
Sassoon, Sir Victor.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Willson, Sir Walter.
Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: Amendments No. 54 of Mr. M. K. Acharya and No. 55 of Mr. Haji have already been disposed of.

(Mr. President then called on Mr. M. Ruthnaswamy and Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney to move amendments Nos. 56 to 61, but they were absent.)

Third and Intermediate Class Waiting Rooms for Indian Ladies at Moradabad.

Mauvi Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Administration’ be reduced by Rs. 10.”

The cut that I propose relates to a very small matter and in fact I would not have brought it before this Assembly if I had been able to get redress from the Railway Administration outside this House. I tried, Sir, to get this redress, but I failed. In September last I had a talk with a high railway official about this matter and he said that the Railway Board could not deal with matters like this and he advised me to see the Divisional Superintendent at Moradabad. Well, I saw the Divisional Superintendent and I had a talk with him, but I am sorry to say that I could not get the redress and therefore I am obliged to bring this petty matter before the House. This question of waiting rooms for Indian ladies may appear very trifling to those who are not acquainted with the life of Indian ladies. But to me, Sir, it is a matter of very great importance and this question has been agitating the minds of the people of Moradabad, my native place, to a very great extent. Several papers have written articles about this and several representations have been made to me to put it before this House. The fact of the matter is that in 1925 it was brought to my notice that the ladies' waiting room on the main platform at Moradabad was to be removed to a place outside the main platform near the newly built third class waiting hall. I asked some questions about the matter in the Assembly and the reply given to me was that it was not under consideration to remove the waiting hall from the main platform. But to my utter surprise I find that after a few months the ladies' waiting room was removed from the main platform to a distant place. Then, Sir, I again asked a question in the Assembly as to why it was that in spite of the statement made to the contrary this waiting room had been removed and the reply was that the room was wanted for some other purposes. Well, this is not enough. We had formerly, Sir, one ladies' waiting room on the main platform at Moradabad. That was used both by the ladies travelling in the intermediate and third classes. As it was, the arrangements were not quite satisfactory. After that, the present arrangement is that the waiting hall for Indian ladies has been removed to a place which is at a distance from the main platform and Indian ladies from this waiting hall have to cross a very long and troublesome bridge before they can reach the main platform of the station. Also, there is no separate waiting room for Indian ladies who travel in the intermediate class, and the House will be well aware that generally Indian ladies of respectable middle class families travel in the intermediate class and very few in the first or second class. Therefore the question of having a separate waiting room for Indian ladies travelling in the intermediate class is really very important. Now, Sir, as I just said, this present third class waiting room is very inconvenient, ladies have to pass over a long and tedious bridge and this waiting room is also too close to the third class men's waiting hall and sometimes it is very annoying

for Indian ladies to be so near the men's waiting room. What I suggest is that there ought to be a separate waiting room for Indian ladies travelling in the intermediate class at Moradabad and I suggest that there is a room near the main platform which is now used by the pay clerk or goods clerk, or something like that. They are building a separate building outside the station, so I propose that when this room is vacated by the Paying Office it should be made available for the use of the ladies travelling in the intermediate class.

As regards the present third class ladies' waiting room, I propose that a passage ought to be made from this waiting room to the main platform just at the back of the police office on the main station and this passage can be constructed by removing the sidings of the Rohilkund and Kumaon Railway by a few yards only; after that this passage should be screened by a wall and then it would be nearer and more convenient for the ladies to go from this waiting hall to the main platform, and they would also be saved the inconvenience of crossing the troublesome bridge.

These are the two points which I have been obliged to bring to the notice of the Railway Board. I do not want to detain the House any more than is necessary as this is a local matter though of great importance, and I hope that the Railway Board will give it their serious attention.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Sir, I think the Honourable Member's last remark sums up the whole case. It seems to me that it is an entirely local matter and neither I nor the Railway Board nor this House is in a position to say whether or not a separate waiting room for Indian ladies who travel by intermediate class is required at Moradabad station, or whether the present waiting room is well situated or not. In a matter of this kind we must, I think, trust to our Agents who are in the best position to decide whether the traffic in Moradabad would justify further facilities than exist at present.

I am glad to see that the Honourable Member has had the fullest opportunity of representing his case to the local officers, and the only suggestion that I can make to him is that, speaking frankly, I am quite unable to tell him whether his suggestion can be carried out or not, but that he should bring this proposal up in the Local Advisory Council. I put it to the House that we cannot decide local matters of this kind in this House.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 10."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: Mr. Das's question of stores purchase policy has already been discussed.

Mr. B. Das: My amendment is not a question of policy. It is a question of reduction of demand.

I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Working Expenses: Administration' be reduced by Rs. 30,000."

The other day my Honourable friend. . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is raising the question of stores purchase policy. That policy has been fully discussed in this House. It is not a question of cut on merits, but a discussion of the policy which I cannot allow now.

Mr. B. Das: I will just explain. The Stores Department under this head has one lakh and fifty-two thousand rupees, of which one lakh is non-votable and fifty-two thousand votable, of which I want thirty thousand deducted or reduced, so that the Railway Stores Departments will buy their stores through the Indian Stores Department.

Mr. President: That again is a discussion of policy.

Mr. B. Das: All right, Sir, I will bring it up on another occasion.

Mr. President: Do. The question is :

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,30,00,000 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 ‘Working Expenses : Administration’.”

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 5.—WORKING EXPENSES: REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 39,67,00,000 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 ‘Working Expenses : Repairs and Maintenance and Operation’.”

Repairs and Maintenance Charges of Rolling Stock.

Mr. B. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Sir, I move:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses : Repairs and Maintenance and Operation’ be reduced by Rs. 50,00,000.”

Whenever we move a substantial cut like this we are asked to specify under what items we propose this cut to be effected. I have indicated in my amendment motion that I want this saving to be effected in the item that comes under repairs and maintenance charges of rolling stock. I submit that the repairs and maintenance of rolling stock is not carried on by the railway administration as economically as possible and I suggest that, with more economical working, it would be very easy to effect a saving of Rs. 50 lakhs. Honourable Members will observe on page 10 of the Demands for Grants that the sum allotted for this purpose in the year 1927-28 is very nearly 10 crores of rupees :

Repairs to Locomotives	...	4.8 crores,
Coaching vehicles	...	2.7 crores,
Goods vehicles	...	3.0 crores,

making altogether a sum of over 10 crores. I submit, Sir, that with more economical and efficient working, it would be possible, in the year 1927-28, to effect a saving of at least Rs. 50 lakhs. My authority for making this statement is the Raven Committee's Report. When I speak of the Raven Committee's Report, I speak with some diffidence because when I quoted

the authority of this Report the other day, I incurred the wrath of the great Moghul, I mean Sir Clement Hindley. Even at the risk of incurring his wrath again I am afraid I ought to quote another passage. Sir Clement Hindley called me childish for having quoted one particular passage and he enunciated the remarkable statement that we ought to quote the whole book.

Sir Clement Hindley: I should explain that I used the word childish generally and not in reference to Mr. Chetty. I said it would be childish to base the whole argument on one portion of the book and it would behove Members to read the whole book before they could appreciate one particular passage.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Sir, if the passage I quoted on the particular occasion had to be read with a certain other passage, it was open to my Honourable friend to point out to this House the passage along with which it should be read and to show its real significance, and prove that the inference I had drawn from the particular passage was not a correct inference. Instead of doing that, he simply suggested it was childish to give one particular passage. Sir, I will quote again another passage. I do not propose to read the whole Report (Hear, hear) and I prefer in this particular matter to have a childish ignorance rather than the Socratic wisdom which comes, I suppose, as a result of what Lord Asquith once called the paralysing penumbra of a second childhood. On page 52 of the Raven Committee's Report the authors observe as follows:

"In the preceding paragraphs we have examined each of the important workshops in detail and recommended measures the adoption of which would enable them to deal with the work of maintenance and repairs economically and expeditiously."

—and this is the important passage—

"We regret to have to record that with the exception of one or two workshops the work of repair and maintenance of rolling stock is not being carried out either economically or expeditiously for the reasons we have stated. That the existing workshops have been able to maintain the rolling stock in safe running condition there is not the vestige of a doubt but this has been accomplished at the expense of more time and money than is called for by the conditions that prevail on each line."

Sir, the word "scandalous" has been used so often during the last two or three days that it is not necessary for me to use that word again. On page 33 the Report gives the actual charges incurred on the Indian railways under this head and compares them with the actual charges incurred under corresponding heads on English, South African and Australian railways. The table is very instructive; it is very instructive of the so-called efficient management of the railways in India. It is shown that the average cost per locomotive in England—the maintenance charge I mean—varies from £508 to £521 per locomotive, whereas in India it varies from £530 to £730. The average cost of maintaining a coaching vehicle in England varies from £71 to £80 and in India from £190 to £330. The average cost of maintaining a goods vehicle varies in England from £6 to £10 and in India it varies from £16 to £25. I ask the Honourable the Chief Commissioner for Railways whether this does not disclose a really scandalous administration of the workshops. Having given these figures the authors of the Report proceed to say:

"The cost we have worked out above for Indian railways are necessarily very approximate but they need not be accurate to lead to the inference that the work of maintenance and repair of rolling stock is not being conducted economically."

[Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty.]

(They have italicised the word "not".)

"The expenditure on coaching vehicles is particularly high and bears out what we have been led to expect. From an examination of the coach and wagon shops we have visited we feel sure that with better organisation and methods of production, the adoption of which we suggest in the next two chapters, it would be possible to work well within the English railways' cost in India, thus bringing about substantial economies in working."

Let us for a moment examine what would be the economies effected if the recommendations of this Committee are given effect to and if the cost of maintenance is brought down to the level that prevails on English railways. Sir, I pointed out that we are spending about 10 crores of rupees on this item and according to the calculations of the Raven Committee these costs as compared with the English railways happen to be at least 33½ per cent. higher in the case of locomotives, 100 per cent. higher in the case of coaching vehicles and 100 per cent. higher in the case of goods vehicles. 33½ per cent. on locomotives means Rs. 1½ crores; 100 per cent. on coaching vehicles means another Rs. 1½ crores; and 100 per cent. on goods vehicles means another Rs. 1½ crores. Altogether we would be saving Rs. 4½ crores per annum if the workshops in India are managed efficiently and economically; and every year we are losing on this particular item of repairs and maintenance of rolling stock the huge sum of Rs. 4½ crores.

I agree, Sir, that it will take some time to rectify this age-long mistake. I agree that it will take considerable time to give effect to all the recommendations of the Raven Committee in regard to the reconstruction and improvement of our workshop equipment. But the Committee reported some time in April 1926; and I put it to the Honourable Chief Commissioner for Railways whether we are not justified in expecting that at least some effect might be given to the report during the year 1927-28; and if any effect at all is to be given to these recommendations, may I ask what saving is expected to be effected in 1927-28? Comparing the budget figures for 1927-28 with the corresponding figures for 1925-26 and 1926-27, we are led to the painful conclusion that in the coming year no action will be taken on the Report. I suggest, Sir, that if even a part of these recommendations are put into effect, that if at least one step is taken towards improving our workshop equipment and management, some substantial saving can be effected in the coming year. I have just now shown that if full effect is given to these recommendations there would be a saving of Rs. 4½ crores per annum; and I put it to the House whether we cannot reasonably expect at least Rs. ¾ crore to be saved during the year 1927-28. I have no doubt that after having listened to these figures the House will accept my motion.

Sir Clement Hindley: Sir, I would first of all like to apologise to Mr. Chetty if he thinks that I called him childish on a previous occasion. I am sure I had no intention of using the word "childish" in special reference to him. I used it generally and I maintain that it is childish to attempt to extract the whole wisdom of a report like this, out of one or two extracts; but I certainly had no intention of hurting Mr. Chetty's feelings and I apologise to him.

Now, Sir, I was a little surprised to find that Mr. Chetty came forward with a cut of Rs. 50 lakhs on this head; because as the House is aware Mr. Chetty is a member of the Standing Finance Committee which considered our Budget before it came to the House; and during the consideration of that Budget the members of the Standing Finance Committee did

mention and propose certain reductions on this head of working expenses. If I may be allowed to read from the Report of the Proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee the House will see what I mean. The proceedings say that "Mr. Rahimtulla proposed that the Demand should be reduced by Rs. 6 lakhs under 'Operation other than Fuel' as the provision for the East Indian and Bengal Nagpur Railways appeared to be too high by about Rs. 3 lakhs each. The proposal was agreed to by the Committee. The Committee also agreed to a reduction of Rs. 6 lakhs in the miscellaneous minor heads of this Demand, thus reducing the total Demand by Rs. 12 lakhs from the Rs. 39 crores" (odd) "originally proposed. Four of the members of the Committee present were in favour of a further reduction of 17 lakhs in the Demand". Now, Sir, I assume,—I was not present there myself,—I assume, for Mr. Chetty was present on that occasion, that he was one of the members in favour of a reduction of 17 lakhs in the Demand

Mr. E. K. Sanmukham Chetty: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. Since my friend has drawn the attention of this House to the Report of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, I am bound to explain what actually took place there. No doubt, in the proceedings it is stated that 4 of the members, of whom I was one, were in favour of a further reduction of 17 lakhs in this particular Demand. Sir, our intention was to move a cut of not merely 50 lakhs but 67 lakhs of rupees. We thought we could have the unanimous verdict of the Committee if we brought down the figure, and we put it at 17 lakhs in the hope that we might be able to arrive at a unanimous verdict, and when we came to know that we could not agree, we thought it was no use proposing a cut of 67 lakhs.

Sir Clement Hindley: I must accept Mr. Chetty's explanation, and I was not there myself. But again, I say it seems to me a little bit inexplicable that members of the Standing Finance Committee who were there to discuss the matter on behalf of the House with the Financial Commissioner, did not point out to him their belief that 50 lakhs should be cut off under this head. I presume that Mr. Chetty had read the Raven Committee's Report well before coming to the meeting. If not, he may have read it up in a very great hurry and has therefore arrived at wrong conclusions. But if he had in his mind, with others on the Committee, the definite idea of moving this cut of 50 lakhs, I do think in fairness to the Financial Commissioner and myself, the members of that Committee should have made it plain to him. It is not fair to come up later with a further cut. However, Sir, I am not stressing that point very much. I only say that it was a little bit of a surprise to us to see this after what has happened in the Standing Committee.

I think, Sir, that I ought to explain what is really stated in the Raven Report. But before I do so, I would like to deal with certain superficial aspects of Mr. Chetty's speech. I would like to point out, taking his very last point first, this much.

He says on his calculations that if the Raven Committee's recommendations are given effect to, we should be able to effect a saving of 4½ crores per annum, and therefore he is justified in asking us in this year, when we may not have time to put them into effect, for a cut of 50 lakhs. He asked then what had been the result of the action which we have taken on this Report already, and stated that he was unable to find from our budget figures any indication that we were anticipating any

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

economies. Well, Sir, if he will look at the figures for last year and compare them with the figures for the present year under this head, he will see that there is a slight difference of 8 lakhs only in this large sum of 89 crores. We have in effect made a reduction of 8 lakhs as compared with last year. For the sake of argument, it may be considered that the amount is the same as last year, and Mr. Chetty would argue and would ask the House to believe, that therefore we do not anticipate making any economies as a result of this very valuable Report. Mr. Chetty appears to overlook the fact that year by year we are adding to our rolling stock. In the present Budget we have provided for 6 crores to be spent on rolling stock which will be added to the rolling stock of the railways. A somewhat similar amount was spent last year, and does he expect us to maintain a constantly increasing rolling stock without any addition to our working expenses? What we are doing is, we hope to repair the additional rolling stock or rather the increased rolling stock with the same provision of funds as last year, and that, Sir, I submit, is in itself a very substantial economy.

Then, Sir, Mr. Chetty has made a very careful and able analysis of certain figures which the Raven Committee have given in their Report on the question of the cost of maintenance and repairs in other countries. I hope I did not overlook anything or that I did not fail to catch all that Mr. Chetty said—I hope that is not the case—because I understood his argument to be somewhat as follows. He said the figures given under locomotives on page 33 of the Report show that the average cost per locomotive of repairs on Indian Railways is substantially higher than that on English Railways. I think that is Mr. Chetty's argument.

Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty: Yes.

Sir Clement Hindley: And then he went on to say that the Raven Committee said that if we could effect certain improvements which they prescribed there was no reason why we should not get our repairs down to the cost on English railways. Now, Sir, I do not want to go back to my former accusation of Mr. Chetty, but I wonder if he really read page 32 as well as page 33 because at the bottom of page 32, which is the first portion of the columns from which he was reading on page 33, I find the costs of repairs of locomotives in other countries besides England given. I do not know why Mr. Chetty should have fixed his attention solely on the figures for English railways and omitted the figures given for other railways. For instance, in the case of Indian railways, the average cost per locomotive is given on the East Indian Railway as £530, on the Great Indian Peninsula as £795 and on the North-Western as £770. Now, Sir, what do we find on the South African railways and the Australian railways? Sir, I submit that if Mr. Chetty is permitted to compare our figures with those of English railways, I should be permitted to compare them with South African or Australian railways.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Why?

Sir Clement Hindley: I am rather glad of that interruption from the Honourable Pandit, "Why?" What is the real basis? Is there any real comparison and can Mr. Chetty say that his index figure is better than mine and that there is a correct comparison between the actual figures given? Perhaps Mr. Chetty will study the index figures again. But to go on with my argument. On the South African railways, the average cost per locomotive is given as £1,111 against the East Indian Railway £530.

New South Wales spend £1,246 per locomotive against the East Indian Railway £580 and the Great Indian Peninsula Railway £795. There are several other cases—Victoria, Queensland and several others—where the figures are substantially higher than the figures which we spend on our locomotives in India. I do not think, therefore, Sir, that any calculation based on the difference in cost of repairs to our locomotives and those of English railways can really be held to substantiate a claim for reduction in our working expenses of $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores. The conditions are different and the conditions under which the work is done are different. Let me just give you a few instances of the difference in our work as compared with the work on English railways. In the first place, the size of our locomotives is substantially larger than those on English railways. (Laughter). Honourable Members behind me may laugh but it is a fact, for the gauge is 5 ft. 6 inches as compared with 4 ft. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches in England. But the comparison is based on what we consider to be a more important factor and that is the tractive effort of locomotives. Our locomotives are considerably higher in tractive effort than the locomotives of English railways and are very much larger. That, Sir, is a small point but it is one of the factors. Now, the conditions under which our locomotives work are very different from those in England. Here we have to put up with bad water and dust-laden atmosphere and much more wear and tear owing to difficulties in the maintenance of permanent way. Those are just a few facts to show that there ought not to be a direct money comparison between the cost of English maintenance of locomotives and our maintenance. I do not wish to argue that ours should necessarily be higher. I do not wish to say that we cannot get them down, because we are about to do so. But I do say that the comparison in pounds, shillings and pence—I do not know what ratio my Honourable friend took, I believe he took it at 1s. 6d.—between the English repair figures and ours is not a fair method of substantiating a $4\frac{1}{2}$ crore reduction or a Rs. 50 lakhs cut in this year.

On that point I believe I have shown to the House that Mr. Chetty has no definite and reasonable basis for this cut of Rs. 50 lakhs. I think therefore I am right in saying that he has based it on the value of his criticism. If he has no calculated basis which can stand the light of my examination for a Rs. 50 lakhs cut, it must be that he assesses the criticism which he wants to make against us at something like Rs. 50 lakhs. From the vehemence with which he argued the point the other day, I can well believe that he thinks that it is worth Rs. 50 lakhs.

I want to take up now one or two points in regard to this Report which have been referred to in the debate prior to to-day and I think they are cognate to the point which Mr. Chetty brought up. If I am not in order, perhaps you, Sir, will correct me, but the Report hangs together in such a way, and it is all connected in such a way with the question of repairs to our rolling stock that I do not think the point that I am now about to mention will be considered irrelevant in this connection. We have heard a great deal about the waste and extravagance amounting to a "scandal" as usual in our workshops in regard to the disposal of stores and I would ask any one who is sufficiently interested in the matter of voting a cut of Rs. 50 lakhs against us—any one who is sufficiently interested, to read a little further into this book. I do not mean that Mr. Chetty should read out the whole book to this House, but I do mean that in trying to assess the value of one particular page or one particular sentence he should attempt to realise what this Report means to us. There are four pages which describe very clearly the great criticism which this Committee laid against

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

us in the matter of stores. But, as I said the other day, if it is read carefully I do not believe that there will be found one word in those pages or in the Report which gives a handle to the statement that we have deliberately wasted and thrown away and lost stores. Sir, the thing resolves itself, if one cares to read it, into a comparatively simple matter of store-keeping and book-keeping. What the Raven Committee were aiming at in elaborating this criticism was this, that we had adopted what they considered to be an unsound method of store-keeping and store-accounting. Now, I am not going to quarrel with the Committee because I am firmly of opinion . . .

Mr. President: I do not understand what is the necessary connection between the wastage of stores and this particular cut.

Sir Clement Hindley: The attack on me is that we have had great extravagance in our workshops and that is one of the points on which stress has been laid in regard to that extravagance. If you rule that it is not in order I will drop the matter, but I did want an opportunity of just mentioning . . .

Mr. President: The Honourable Member will have his opportunity when the main question is put.

Sir Clement Hindley: I take it that I am not permitted to refer to the stores.

Now, Sir, I wish to explain to the House why we consider this Report to be of such great value, why we believe along with Mr. Chetty that it is going to eventually effect great economies. I wish to explain that the basis of the whole of the alterations which we are making to our workshops is the application of revised modern methods to the problem of repairs to our rolling stock. I may remind Members that these workshops of ours have been in existence for a very great many years. A properly equipped workshop is a necessary component part of a railway from its early start and therefore our railway workshops in India have a very long history behind them. At the time when they were subjected to the very greatest possible stress, that is to say, during the War, when we were in the greatest difficulties in getting raw material and manufactured articles to effect our repairs, we were at the same time subjected to grave financial difficulties and at that particular period, owing to the stress of the War in manufacturing centres in Europe and Great Britain, revised methods of workshop manufacture had to be evolved. This was a matter which was known to us. It was not known generally elsewhere and the whole world was astonished at the enormous amount of munitions and other articles that were produced in Western countries during the stress of the War. In effect a complete revolution was brought about in workshop methods and it was impossible for us at that time either for financial reasons or for other reasons to bring into effect immediately the changes which had been made in Western countries in regard to workshops. We were overloaded here for several years after the War with arrears of repairs. The railways had suffered very considerably during the War in various ways and our stock had fallen into arrears in the matter of repairs. Our workshops therefore were practically clogged with arrears of repairs for several years and it was not possible then to take up the changes which we were desirous of making in regard to the modernisation of our workshops. But gradually in one or two of our workshops new methods were introduced on the lines of these new modern methods evolved in Great Britain and in one particular

workshop extraordinary results were obtained in re-arranging the method of doing the work. I want to stress this fact. Really this method of doing repair work is in the nature of a new discovery. It is not a fair criticism to say that for years and generations we have been wasting money because we had not discovered this method. The workshops all over the world were following the same methods as we were up to the period I am referring to in the latter part of the War. There was nothing antiquated about our methods at that time, but, as I say, during the War this revolution in workshop methods came about and it is not quite fair to taunt us and say that we have for very many years deliberately thrown away money because by introducing these methods we can now do our work cheaper. I am sure Mr. Chetty would be with me on that point. I am sure he is not so biased against me as to think really that we have been throwing away crores of rupees because we had not made this discovery earlier.

I do not want to bore the House with technical details but I would like to explain the principle of the new method of repairs that are now being conducted and it is one of the main recommendations of the Raven Committee's Report. I am sorry I lost the thread of my story in thinking of Mr. Chetty because he is sitting here looking so nice that I could not refrain from referring to him again. The result of these experiments which were made in some of our workshops led me and others to think that the time had come when we should overhaul the whole of our workshop methods and see whether we could introduce the new method throughout. It was not a very easy matter because both men and machines have been wedded to old methods and they do not easily take in new ideas. But the opportunity was afforded to us on the Railway Board by having four large systems to manage, the East Indian Railway, the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the North Western Railway and the Eastern Bengal Railway, four of the largest railways in India and containing amongst them the largest of all our workshops. The opportunity which arrived then was taken and we decided the year before last to obtain the services of the best possible experts in order to show us how these new methods could be applied to our workshops. We had on our staff Mr. Wrench, a man who had successfully introduced this system in one of the shops on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and we obtained the services of Sir Vincent Raven, probably the most eminent mechanical engineer in Great Britain at the time. And, Sir, this Report is the result of their very careful investigations. In the first place they have given us a method by which we may reorganize our workshops on the new lines. They have shown us where we have had unnecessary workshops. They have shown us that by co-ordinating the work of the workshops on these four great railway systems we can in effect do away entirely with certain workshops. We are closing down the workshops at Karachi and Rawalpindi. They have already been closed down. We are going through the whole of the re-modelling schemes that we had in hand in regard to the other workshops and applying the principles which the Raven Committee laid down for us. We have, I am glad to say, been able to make even greater reductions of capital expenditure than the Raven Committee considered possible when they made their report, and we have further work to do. We have placed Mr. Wrench on special duty in order to see that these special recommendations in regard to the workshops are carried out.

In regard to other matters relating to the cost of repairs, which are concerned directly with store-keeping, we have put Mr. Victor Bayley on special duty in order to report on the whole question of store-keeping in

[Sir Clement Hindley.]

relation to mechanical workshops. And finally, in regard to our workshop accounts, which the Raven Committee condemned, we have got the services, as was mentioned here before, of Sir Arthur Dickinson, the celebrated accountant, who is now going into the whole matter of workshop costing and store-keeping accounting in our workshops.

Now, Sir, Mr. Chetty referred to the very high cost of our repairs and I want to mention one point which I overlooked before in connection with that. If he reads the Report he will find that the Raven Committee on page 86 of their Report mentioned amongst the contributory causes for the high costs in our shops, paucity of supervision, inadequate equipment, bad lay-out and so on.

“By far the most fruitful cause of inefficiency has been the absence of proper internal organization for systematic working.”

I want to draw special attention to “paucity of supervision”, because I do not want to be accused of making this Report an excuse for shoving in a lot more superior officers. I rather wonder it has not come up before. I suppose those words were so obscured in the text that no one got hold of them. I want to emphasise the fact that one of the essential things they impressed upon us is that we must have better supervision and better skilled labour; and that really means a certain amount of additional expenditure. Here I would add to the argument which I used before about the difficulty of making immediate economies when we have to incur much-needed expenditure. Now, Sir, on Mr. Chetty's general criticism, which has been voiced by others at different times during the budget debate, we were subjected to a great deal of abuse from the other side of the House and elsewhere in regard to this book; and I do think that it is not quite fair to me to point the moral by bringing in a cut of Rs. 50 lakhs on the top of that abuse that we have had. Sir, are we really to be blamed seriously for having had this investigation? Is it a matter for serious criticism that I and my colleagues on the Railway Board decided that we should have our workshops inquired into and to ask someone more expert than ourselves to point the way to economy? What is the reason of this excessive criticism on this particular point? Sir, in this Report which we have, I may say, perhaps had the courage to put before the public, there are, for technical people, very grave criticisms: they refer to technical methods of doing work, and we, I think, probably felt those technical criticisms in this book quite enough without having them added to by criticisms which I submit cannot be properly appreciated by laymen. I am not pleading, Sir; I anticipated this criticism. I knew when I asked Sir Vincent Raven and Mr. Wrench to make this report that they would find a great deal to criticize. If they had not anything to criticize, what was the good of getting them to report? And it was perfectly obvious that Sir Vincent Raven, as I knew him, would express himself in no measured language. He is a man who has been accustomed to running workshops of his own and is one of the greatest authorities on workshops in Great Britain and he has been noted all his life for saying what he thought and saying it direct. So we knew perfectly well that we would be getting something like this. But without it, Sir, I do not think I should have been in a position to carry out the improvements and the revolution in railway workshops which I believe we shall be able to carry out now, because it is always necessary, when you get a report, to have sufficiently eminent and qualified people to back up what is in the report. I do not know what the House would have said if the Raven Committee had come

out and said that we have got the best workshops in the world. They certainly would not have believed them but they are very ready to believe them when they say that our workshops are bad. (Laughter). I am therefore in a way grateful to the opposite side of the House for falling in with the views of this Committee, because I can assure you, Sir, that I really want a lot of support in carrying out the recommendations of this Committee. I do not believe that Mr. Chetty is going to effect anything by making this cut of 50 lakhs if he thinks that by doing so he is going to force economies on to me, because we are pledged to carry out the recommendations of this Report whether he makes the cut of 50 lakhs or not; the fact that he has lent very great support to the recommendation of this Committee, I consider, gives me also wholehearted support in the work that I am carrying out in getting the improvements made now. I think, Sir, now that I have explained the matter so fully, that Mr. Chetty might reasonably see that his point of view is really exactly the same as mine and that there is no necessity for him to continue to move this cut of 50 lakhs.

May I mention, Sir, one point which I just omitted. I think perhaps the House would like to have this assurance that in carrying out these recommendations that we shall hasten to carry out, we shall I hope make economies; in that case the money which the House is granting for our general repairs to rolling stock may not be spent in full. It does not follow that we shall spend the amount that is granted. It is the best estimate we can make.

Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar: Then accept the cut and come up with a Supplementary Demand.

Sir Clement Hindley: I am not prepared to accept any cut of that kind. It is the best estimate of what we shall have to spend. I submit it is not necessary, if the House considers the matter worthy of censure, to make a cut of Rs. 50 lakhs to carry out that censure.

Mr. President: The question is:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Working Expenses: Repairs and Maintenance and Operation’ be reduced by Rs. 50,00,000.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—41.

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. Sessa.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
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.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Iyengar, Mr. S. Srinivasa.
Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
Jogiah, Mr. Varahagiri Venkata.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jannadas M.
Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Prakasam, Mr. T.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Rajan Baksh Shah, Khan Bahadur
Makhdum Sved.
Rananiava Singh, Kumar.
Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Rao, Mr. G. Sarvatham.
Rov. Raj Bahadur Tarit Bhusan.
Singh, Mr. Gava Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.

NOES—52.

Abdul Axis, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sanibzada.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Akram Hussain Bahadur, Prince
 A. M. M.
 Allison, Mr. F. W.
 Anwar-ul-Axim, Mr.
 Ashrafuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur
 Nawabzada Sayid.
 Ayyangar, Mr. V. K. A. Aravamudha.
 Ayyangar, Rao Bahadur Narasimha
 Gopalaswami.
 Bhore, Mr. J. W.
 Bhuto, Mr. W. W. Illahibakhsh.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
 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.
 Ghusnavi, 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.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Jowahir Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar.
 Kabul Singh Bahadur, Risaldar-Major
 and Honorary Captain.
 Keane, Mr. M.
 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.
 Natiq, Maulvi A. H.
 Paddison, Sir George.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Ruthnaswamy, Mr. M.
 Sassoon, Sir Victor.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.
 Suhrawardy, Dr. A.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Willson, Sir Walter.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 39,67,00,000 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 'Working Expenses: Repairs and Maintenance and Operation'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 6—COMPANIES' AND INDIAN STATES' SHARE OF SURPLUS PROFITS AND NET EARNINGS.

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,41,25,000 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 'Companies' and Indian States' share of surplus profits and net earnings'."

The motion was adopted.

(It being Five of the Clock, Mr. President proceeded to put the remaining Demands.)

DEMAND NO. 9—APPROPRIATION TO DEPRECIATION FUND.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 11,50,00,000 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 'Appropriation to Depreciation Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 10—APPROPRIATION FROM DEPRECIATION FUND.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,00,00,000 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 'Appropriation from Depreciation Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 11—MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 20,56,000 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 'Miscellaneous'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 12—APPROPRIATION TO THE RESERVE FUND.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,61,58,000 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 'Appropriation to the Reserve Fund'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 14—STRATEGIC LINES.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,55,10,000 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 'Strategic Lines'."

The motion was adopted.

Expenditure charged to Capital.

DEMAND No. 7—NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,35,51,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1928, in respect of 'New Construction'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 8—OPEN LINE WORKS.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 16,82,29,000 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 'Open Line Works'."

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 15—STRATEGIC LINES.

Mr. President: The question is:

“ That a sum not exceeding Rs. 74,39,000 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 ‘ Strategic Lines ’.”

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Five of the Clock on Monday, the 28th February, 1927.
