

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

SATURDAY, 23rd FEBRUARY, 1929

Vol. I—No. 17

OFFICIAL REPORT



CONTENTS.

Questions and Answers.

Unstarred Questions and Answers.

The Railway Budget—*contd.*

List of Demands—

Demand No. 1—Railway Board.

Cost of an additional Member on the Railway Board
and his establishment.

DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1929

Price Five Annas.

CONTENTS—*concl.*

	PAGES.
Wednesday, 20th February, 1929—	
Questions and Answers	981-96
Unstarred Question and Answer	986
Nomination of Members for the Standing Advisory Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands	987
Election of the Members for the Standing Finance Committee	987
Bill passed by the Council of State laid on the Table	987
✓ The Public Safety Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	987
✓ The Abolition of Deferred Rebates Bill—Referred to Select Committee	988-1022
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill (Amend- ment of section 552)—Motion to circulate adopted	1022-27
Thursday, 21st February, 1929—	
Statement of Business	1029
Election of Members for the Central Advisory Council for Railways	1029-30
The Railway Budget—General Discussion	1030-86
Saturday, 23rd February, 1929—	
Questions and Answers	1087-1105
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1106-08
The Railway Budget— <i>concl.</i>	
List of Demands—	
Demand No. 1—Railway Board—	1108-56
Cost of an additional Member on the Railway Board and his establishment	1109-56

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Saturday, 23rd February, 1939.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

TRANSFER TO STATE MANAGEMENT OF THE BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

685. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that the provincial Legislative Council of Bihar and Orissa has unanimously passed a Resolution requesting the Government of India not to renew the lease of the Bengal and North Western Railway when it will expire in 1932 and to get the said Railway managed directly by the State?

(b) Have Government come to any conclusions in the matter of accepting the said Resolution?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) Except for the Honourable Member's question, the Railway Board were not aware that a Resolution to this effect had been passed by the Legislative Council of Bihar and Orissa. No doubt, they will be addressed by the Provincial Government in due course.

(b) Does not arise.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Are Government aware that 58 Members of this House have given notice of a Resolution to be moved in the Assembly recommending to the Governor General in Council that, on the termination of the lease of the Bengal and North Western Railway Company, the lease should not be renewed?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I have seen the motion on the Notice List.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Are Government aware that the dissatisfaction against the Bengal and North Western Railway Company is not confined only to the members of the various Legislatures in the country but is almost universal?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I should not like to express an opinion. I am aware that there have been articles in the press occasionally expressing dissatisfaction with certain aspects of the administration of the Railway.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Are Government aware that the Bihar Provincial Conference at a meeting which was held in Patna in December last unanimously passed a Resolution recommending that the administration of the Bengal and North Western Railway should be taken over by the State on the expiry of the present lease?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I was not aware of that fact, but I am quite prepared to take it as correct from the Honourable Member.

Mr. B. Das: May I enquire if there is no department in the Railway Board which keeps in touch with what is happening in the provincial Councils, and how is it that the Honourable Member had no knowledge of the Resolution that was passed in the Bihar Legislative Council, and which was reported in every newspaper?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: As I have explained, the Provincial Government will no doubt address us on the subject of that Resolution, but we have not actually received any communication from them so far.

Munshi Iswar Saran: Are we to understand that no formal communications have been addressed by the Bihar Government to the Railway Board, or are we to understand that the Railway Board is in blissful ignorance of the fact that such a Resolution has been passed by the Bihar Legislative Council?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: We have not yet received a copy of the proceedings of the Bihar Legislative Council.

Kumar Ganganand Sinha: May I know when the matter of taking over the management of that Railway will be considered by the Government of India?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: In due course, no doubt, the question will be considered by the Government of India. The contract cannot be terminated, I think I am right in saying, until the end of 1932.

Mr. B. Das: Is it not the accepted policy of the Government that State-management is the best for the Indian Railways?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I do not think that Government has ever made a statement of policy in those terms.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: What is the latest date for giving notice to the Bengal and North Western Railway if the Government propose to take it under State management?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I should have to look up the contract, before giving an absolutely definite answer, but I think the date on which we could terminate the contract is the 31st December, 1932, and the date by which notice should be given is then probably a year before, namely, the 31st December, 1931. The Honourable Member can, however, find the date by looking at the History of Railways, a copy of which is in the Library.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: When is it likely that the Government of India will have this question under their consideration?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: If the dates I have mentioned are correct, during the course of 1931.

SCALES OF PAY IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT AND ATTACHED OFFICES.

686. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state in detail the distinction between the scale of pay in the Secretariat and the attached offices in the several departments of the Government of India.

with special reference to the amount and nature of work, pay and prospects of the employees working under the two said systems?

The Honourable Mr. J. Cressar: A statement showing the scales of pay of the ministerial establishments of the Government of India Secretariat and of its attached offices is being forwarded to the Honourable Member. In reply to the latter part of the Honourable Member's question, I would refer him to the reply given by the late Sir Alexander Muddiman to question No. 943 on the 15th September, 1925.

ACCOMMODATION IN NEW DELHI FOR EMPLOYEES WORKING IN THE IMPERIAL SECRETARIAT.

687. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh:** Have Government already got a sufficient number of quarters built to provide accommodation for all the employees of Government working in the Imperial Secretariat in New Delhi and if not, what are the compensations allowed to those who have not been furnished with quarters in New Delhi and have therefore to attend offices in time from their distant residences in the old city and thus incur certain expenditure every day for conveyance?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The answer to the second part is also in the negative. The city is within comparatively easy reach of the New Secretariat. No conveyance allowance is granted to clerks living there. Bicycle advances are freely sanctioned for those who apply for them.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: May I know whether the Honourable Member can walk this distance and attend office in time?

Mr. President: Mr. S. C. Mitra.

SPECIAL PAY FOR ASSISTANT DIRECTORS GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

688. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please state whether the Assistant Directors General in the office of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs get a special pay in addition to their already high rate of pay of Rs. 1,000—50—1,500?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: It is a fact that the Assistant Directors General get a special pay, in addition to pay on the scale of Rs. 1,000—50—1,500. This however is not considered by Government a specially high rate of pay, having regard to the work required of these officers.

REDUCTION OF THE GAZETTED STAFF OF THE INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

689. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the Public Accounts Committee, in their Report on the Accounts for 1922-23 remarked that the gazetted staff of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department was in excess of requirements, and that retrenchment has left them practically untouched and has spent its force on the rank and file?

(b) If so, will Government please say what measures have so far been taken to reduce the gazetted staff?

(c) If no steps have been taken, do Government propose to take immediate steps in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) The facts stated by the Honourable Member are substantially correct.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to paragraph 25 of the Finance Department Resolution No. 8665-A., dated the 14th April, 1925, inserted as Appendix I to the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Accounts of 1923-24, Volume I, and to item 28 in Appendix II of that Report. It was stated therein that the proportion of gazetted officers to non-gazetted staff was not considered high.

(c) In view of what I have stated in my reply to part (b), Government do not consider it necessary to take the action suggested.

REDUCED SCALE OF PAY FOR ASSISTANT DIRECTORS GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

690.* **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government please say what reasons and considerations weighed with them in granting the scale of pay of Rs. 1,000—50—1,500 for the Assistant Directors General in the office of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs?

(b) Will Government please state in detail the reasons why they did not consider that a scale of Rs. 800—40—1,000 was quite sufficient for these officers?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to paragraph 25 of the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for the 26th January, 1928, where the Committee agreed to a revision of the rate of pay of Assistant Directors General to Rs. 1,000—50—1,500 for reasons placed before them and detailed in the document referred to.

NUMBER OF OFFICIALS IN CERTAIN OFFICES DRAWING Rs. 1,000 AND ABOVE.

691.* **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the number of officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and above in the office of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a similar statement with regard to:

- (i) the Department of Industries and Labour,
- (ii) the Department of Commerce,
- (iii) the Railway Board?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The figures, taking the offices in the order in the question, are 19, 7, 6 and 17.

NUMBER OF CLERKS, EXCLUDING SUPERINTENDENTS, DRAWING Rs. 100 AND ABOVE IN CERTAIN OFFICES.

692.* **Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing the number of clerks, excluding Superintendents, drawing Rs. 100 and above in the office of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a similar statement with regard to—

- (i) the Department of Industries and Labour,
- (ii) the Department of Commerce,
- (iii) the Railway Board?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) and (b). The numbers in the offices named are, in the order given, 163, 84, 44 and 108.

PETITION TO THE VICEROY FOR A REDUCTION OF DUTY ON GLASS BANGLES.

693. ***Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya:** (a) Have Government received a petition, dated September, 1928, addressed to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General in Council by the President and Members of the Bombay Glass Bangles Merchants' Association, praying for a reduction of import duty on glass bangles from 30 per cent. to 15 per cent.?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what orders have been passed on the petition and to what extent the import duty on bangles is proposed to be reduced?

(c) If no orders have been passed in the matter, when do Government expect to pass them?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The Association was informed that its views had been noted.

Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya: May I know if similar representations have been received from bangle merchants of Calcutta and Madras also?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question. That fact is not within my knowledge.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Is it the intention of Government to refer this question to the Tariff Board?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I do not think that has been suggested to us by any one, and I am not sure that this particular matter would be appropriate for a reference to the Tariff Board. If the Honourable Member desires that that suggestion should be considered, I am quite ready to do so.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Is it not a fact that the import of glass bangles from abroad goes into a crore of rupees worth every year?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Yes, but the particular representation which we received asked for a reduction in the duty.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Are glass bangles manufactured in India?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I understand so, Sir. I cannot speak positively on that point.

Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya: Is the Honourable Member aware that, according to a recent Government publication, the Government is reported to have helped the bangle industry in the United Provinces?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I am afraid I cannot answer that question at the moment.

REDUCTION OF POSTAL STAFF RECOMMENDED BY RAI BAHADUR J. P. GANGULI.

694. *Mr. M. S. Aney: (a) Is it a fact that Government had appointed Rai Bahadur J. P. Ganguli as a special officer to consider and report on the possibility of the reduction of postal staff?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state what recommendations were made by that officer as regards reduction of the staff and the creation of any additional selection grade appointments, and what final orders were passed by the Government of India on the same?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) Rai Bahadur J. P. Ganguli has been placed on special duty to inquire into the working of large post and telegraph offices and of circle and divisional offices of the Posts and Telegraphs Department, and into the adequacy of staff in these offices.

(b) The reports on the several offices submitted by him are under examination by the Director-General.

SANCTION OF ADDITIONAL SELECTION GRADE APPOINTMENTS BY THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

695. *Mr. M. S. Aney: (a) Is it a fact that the Presidency Postmaster, Bombay, has carried out certain reductions in the staff; if so, under whose orders?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Director General has sanctioned any additional selection grade appointments up till the end of January, 1929?

(c) If not, does the Director General propose to sanction additional selection grade appointments at least to the extent of reduction already carried out by the Presidency Postmaster, Bombay?

Mr. H. A. Sams: (a) Yes, under my orders certain clerical appointments in the time-scale found surplus on inspection have been brought under reduction.

(b) None as a result of the inspection.

(c) The Postmaster-General has been asked to submit his proposals for additional selection grade appointments in the Bombay General Post Office.

HARDSHIPS OF TOWN INSPECTORS OF POST OFFICES.

696. *Mr. M. S. Aney: (a) Will Government be pleased to state for each circle separately:

(i) the number of the posts of Town Postal Inspectors at 1st class head post offices which have been abolished since 18th October, 1928;

(ii) the number of vacancies in the Bombay Circle since November, 1928;

(iii) whether the Town Inspectors, who lost their posts on account of the policy, are being appointed as Inspectors in the mofussil as the vacancies occur?

(iv) how many such Inspectors were appointed till the end of January, 1929?

(b) Are Government aware that a considerable number of the Town Inspectors have to undergo great hardship and suffering on account of being unemployed?

(c) Do Government propose promptly to inquire to ascertain whether the Postmaster General, Bombay, has been unnecessarily delaying the passing of orders to fill the vacancies both in the Presidency town and the mofussil?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: (a) The position relating to appointments to the posts of Town Inspectors of post offices in the revised scale of Rs. 160—10—250, introduced from the 1st September, 1927, is explained in the Government of India, Department of Industries and Labour letter No. 14-P. T. E., dated the 2nd October, 1928, a copy of which was laid upon the table of this House in reply to Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan's unstarred questions Nos. 98 and 133 on the 28th January, 1929. Government understand that the Director-General is taking steps to ensure that the orders contained in the above letter are being properly carried out by Heads of Postal Circles and that the officials appointed or restored to the posts of Town Inspectors, in accordance with these orders, are suitably qualified. In view of this position, no useful purpose would, in the opinion of Government, be served by an attempt to collect all the particulars necessary for a detailed reply to the Honourable Member's question.

(b) There can be no hardship, as the displaced Town Inspectors have not been kept unemployed without pay.

(c) There has been no delay on the part of the Postmaster-General in dealing with the matter.

COMPARATIVE COST OF ELECTRIC POWER AND STEAM COAL ON CERTAIN RAILWAY LINES.

697. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what was the consumption of coal in tons and its value annually on lines which are now being run electrically?

(b) What is the cost of electrical power required annually to run those lines?

(c) What is the total mileage of the lines run by the electric power at the end of the year 1928?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) I am afraid it is impossible to obtain the statistics for which the Honourable Member asks, since figures of coal consumption were not kept separately for the portions of the line which have now been electrified.

(b) It is estimated at 80 lakhs in the current year and 40 lakhs next year.

(c) On the 31st of March, 1928, 80 miles on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and 23 miles on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway.

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I ask the Honourable Member whether, when the scheme for electrification of certain railways was placed before the Standing Finance Committee, an estimate of the coal expenditure was not included in the proposition statement?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Will the Honourable Member give me notice? I am not sure whether it was in my time.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Will the Honourable Member collect the information and supply it to me later on?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: If it was in the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways the Honourable Member will be able to find it himself from the copies of the proceedings.

IMPROVEMENT IN PROVIDENT FUND FOR EMPLOYEES OF CURRENCY OFFICES.

698. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** (a) Is it not a fact that the question of improvement in the provident fund and the bonus of the currency office employees has been under the consideration of Government since 1924?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for this delay?

(c) Is it a fact that the employees of the State railways are given some gratuity at the time of retirement? If so, how much?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state whether the staff of the Treasurers department in the currency offices get similar concessions? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) Consideration of the question was in the first instance delayed, because, as the law then stood, Government had no power to recoup from a contributory provident fund losses due to the fraud or negligence of a subscriber. Such a power was considered desirable in the case of employees in Currency Offices as in such offices fraud or negligence might result in serious loss to the Government. Subsequently the consideration of the question was dropped owing to the proposal to establish a Reserve Bank to which the Currency staff would probably have had to be transferred. The question has now been revived and, as stated in the reply given by me on the 4th of this month to Mr. Rahimtullah's question No. 380, a final conclusion is likely to be reached before long.

(c) Employees of State Railways may be given a gratuity on retirement as a reward for faithful service, but are not entitled to a gratuity as a matter of course. For the amount of the gratuity which may be granted, I would refer the Honourable Member to rule 19 of the State Railway Gratuity Rules, copies of which are in the Library of the House.

(d) The staff in question do not get such gratuities for the reason that Government have so far seen no justification for setting up such a system of rewards in Currency offices.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE ALL-INDIA CURRENCY OFFICES CONFERENCE AT RANGOON.

699. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** Will Government be pleased to state whether their attention has been drawn to the Resolutions passed at the All-India Currency Offices Conference held at Rangoon in December last? If so, what action have Government taken on each of the Resolutions?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The Resolutions are under the consideration of Government.

SALARIES OF SHROFFS IN CURRENCY OFFICES.

700. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the shroffs are required to pay heavy debits from their monthly pay? If so, what is the highest amount recovered as debits from a shroff working in defective coins? What is the pay of these shroffs?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state if they propose to revise the scale of the salaries of the shroffs in view of the heavy monetary responsibility which they have to undergo? If not, why?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether, in all the currency offices the shroffs are made to deposit additional security over and above the insurance security as required by the Currency Code? If not, why should such a rule exist exclusively in Bombay?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The Government are obtaining certain information to enable them to reply fully to the Honourable Member's question. A further answer will be sent to him as soon as possible.

PAY OF SHROFFS IN THE BOMBAY CURRENCY OFFICE.

701. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the number of shroffs in the Bombay Currency Office, their pay and the amount of debit paid by each of them during the term of the last two years from January 1927 to 31st December, 1928?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: An enquiry is being made and a reply will be sent to the Honourable Member in due course.

REVISION OF PAY OF THE STAFF OF CURRENCY OFFICES.

702. ***Mr. M. S. Aney:** Will Government be pleased to refer to Mr. N. M. Joshi's starred questions Nos. 88, 89, 90, 140, 141, 142 put in February last and state whether they have supplied the information as promised? If so, will Government be pleased to lay on the table the same for the information of the Members?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: As stated in my reply on the 4th instant to part (a) of Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtullah's starred question No. 382, final replies to Mr. Joshi's questions Nos. 88 to 90 and 140 to 142 were sent to him on the 15th February, and 1st May, 1928, respectively. Copies will be found in the Library of the House.

PROVISION OF A RAISED PLATFORM AT CHINIOT RAILWAY STATION.

703. ***Mr. Muhammad Rafique:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the Agent of the North-Western Railway has taken any action with regard to my starred question No. 374, dated 7th March, 1928?

(b) Is it a fact that no action has been taken by the Agent, North-Western Railway to construct a raised platform at the Chiniot Railway Station?

(c) Is it a fact that the residents of the town have made several requests to the Agent for a raised platform as it causes great inconvenience to the lady passengers to alight from a height of 4 feet?

(d) When do Government propose to construct the platform?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I am ascertaining from the Agent of the North-Western Railway whether he found any action necessary and will pass on the information to the Honourable Member.

SUPPLY OF COW AND BUFFALO HIDES TO THE GOVERNMENT HARNESS TANNERY, CAWNPORE.

704. *Mr. Muhammad Rafique: (a) Will Government be pleased to state separately the quantities of cow and buffalo hides tanned daily by the Government Harness Tannery, Cawnpore?

(b) Is it a fact that formerly tenders used to be issued for the supply of cow and buffalo hides to the tannery? If so, when was the last tender issued?

(c) Is it a fact that an European firm has been entrusted with the supply of cow and buffalo hides to the tannery? If so, what are the arrangements? What is the name of the firm?

(d) Is it a fact that the said firm buys on commission for Government? If so, did Government extend this offer to any Indian firm at Cawnpore or elsewhere?

(e) Is it a fact that the said firm is allowed to draw Rs. 50,000 before the goods are supplied?

(f) If the answer to (e) be in the negative is it not a fact that a sum of Rs. 50,000 is paid in advance by the Government to the said firm for the purchase?

(g) Is it a fact that the firm buys mixed lots from the market and supplies the Government only with the good selection?

(h) If the answer to (g) be in the affirmative, what are the rates at which good selection hides are supplied to Government?

(i) If the answer to (g) be in the negative, is it a fact that a joint account is kept by the firm and is yearly audited by the Government Auditors?

(j) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the report of the Auditors for the years the supply has been made by this firm?

(k) Is it a fact that formerly tenders were issued for hides out of lime?

(l) Is it a fact that after liming the lower grades,—hides are resold to this firm at a very low rate?

(m) Will Government be pleased to state the numbers of cows and buffaloes slaughtered during the last three years in the United Provinces?

(n) Is it a fact that the price paid by this agent of the Government during the month of December, 1928, was 40 per cent. to 45 per cent. higher than that of the exporters of raw hides in India?

(o) Are Government prepared to invite tenders for the supply of cow and buffalo hides in future? If so, when do Government propose to commence?

(p) Will Government lay on the table a statement showing the selection of raw cow and buffalo hides purchased during the year 1926, 1927, 1928, and also the selection of tanned cow and buffalo hides for the respective years?

Mr. G. M. Young: The information is being obtained and will be furnished to the Honourable Member when received.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MENIALS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT.

705. *Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim: Will Government be pleased to state what are the various grades of menials in the Government of India Secretariat at New Delhi and Simla? Are they guided in their promotion by any time scale? Are they allowed any house-rent and conveyance allowance? If so, how much? How do they fare compared with the postal peons and constables? Do they get any pension?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: A statement showing the various grades of menials in the Government of India Secretariat and their scales of pay is being forwarded to the Honourable Member. Menials who cannot be provided with free quarters in Simla draw a house-rent allowance of Re. 1 a month. They are all provided with free quarters in Delhi. No conveyance allowance is granted. I am afraid no comparison is possible between Secretariat menials on the one hand and postal peons and constables on the other as the nature of the work and the conditions of service differ materially. Secretariat menials are entitled to compensation and invalid pension in accordance with Article 481 (b) of the Civil Service Regulations.

NUMBER OF CLERKS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SECRETARIAT PROVIDED WITH QUARTERS IN NEW DELHI.

706. *Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim: Will Government be pleased to state how many of the clerks in the Government of India Secretariat are provided with quarters in New Delhi? Have they got to pay any rent for the occupation of those quarters in New Delhi—married and single?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: 687. In addition to this, 100 single clerks are accommodated in the orthodox chummeries leased to the Imperial Secretariat Association and 62 in the unorthodox chummeries.

The answer to the last part of the question is in the affirmative.

CONVEYANCE AND HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCES PAID TO CLERKS LIVING IN OLD DELHI.

707. *Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim: Will Government be pleased to state what conveyance and house allowances they pay to their clerks who live in Old Delhi? On what basis are they assessed?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I am sending the Honourable Member a statement showing the rates of conveyance and Delhi house-rent allowance admissible in certain circumstances to clerks living in Old Delhi. The allowances vary according to pay.

GRANT OF CONVEYANCE ALLOWANCE TO CLERKS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

708. ***Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim**: In view of the reply given by the Honourable the Leader of the House to Mr. Mohammed Shafee to his unstarred question No. 487 on the 21st of September, 1928, will Government be pleased to state whether they have come to any decision with regard to the conveyance and other allowances of those clerks who reside in places mentioned in the said question in its (e) and (f) clauses?

The Honourable Mr. J. Crerar: Yes. I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply to Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan's unstarred question No. 164 of 28th January last.

Conveyance allowance was the only allowance in issue.

NUMBER OF MUHAMMADANS APPOINTED TO THE OFFICE OF THE AUDIT OFFICER, INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

709. ***Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim**: Will Government be pleased to state whether they have yet been able to collect information with regard to my starred questions Nos. 526, 527, 528, 529, put on the 26th of March, 1928?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Final replies to the Honourable Member's questions Nos. 526 to 529, to which an *ad interim* reply was given in the Assembly on the 26th March, 1928, were sent to him with a letter from the Finance Department, No. 1608 R. II., dated the 5th April, 1928, and copies were placed in the Library. Further copies of the replies have since been sent to the Honourable Member.

EMPLOYMENT OF MUSLIMS IN THE BENGAL AND ASSAM CIRCLE OF THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

710. ***Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim**: Will Government be pleased to state if there is any Muslim Inspector of Post Offices, Postal Superintendent, and Head Clerk in the Bengal and Assam Circle? If the reply is in the affirmative, how many are Muslims out of the total strength? When were these posts created?

Mr. H. A. Sams: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative, presuming that the Honourable Member intends to include in the categories mentioned, officials of the Railway Mail Service and that by Head Clerks he means Head Clerks to Superintendents. With respect to the second part, out of a total strength of 152 of such officials there are 7 Moslems. With respect to the third part it has not been possible to obtain precise information, as the appointments have been in existence for many years.

APPOINTMENT OF A BENGAL MUSLIM TO A SUPERIOR POST ON THE ASSAM BENGAL RAILWAY.

711. ***Mr. Anwar-ul-Azim**: Will Government be pleased to state whether so far any Muslim from the Province of Bengal has been appointed to any superior service under the control of the Railway Board and in the Assam Bengal Railway?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Yes.

GRANT OF PROVIDENT FUND BENEFIT TO DAILY RATE WORKMEN EMPLOYED CONTINUOUSLY.

712. *Pandit Nilakantha Das: (a) What is the principle of distinction between the daily rate workmen and monthly rate workmen in our railways and railway workshops?

(b) Are there men on the daily rate for years working continuously?

(c) Do such daily rated workmen get the benefit of provident fund and such other facilities?

(d) If not, are Government going to do anything to give them such facilities?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) There is no principle involved. It is a matter of practice, some railways rating their men one way and some the other. In any case, the men are paid monthly.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes, provided the conditions laid down in rule 6 (d) of the State Railway Provident Fund Rules are fulfilled.

(d) Does not arise.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS IN POSTS ABOVE RS. 250 A MONTH IN THE RAILWAY WORKSHOP AT TATANAGAR.

713. *Pandit Nilakantha Das: (a) How many posts are there above Rs. 250 a month in the newly started railway workshop at Tatanagar?

(b) How many of these posts are occupied by (1) Indians and how many by (2) Europeans and Anglo-Indians?

(c) What arrangement has been made there to take Indian apprentices?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) 20.

(b) (1) 9 Indians.

(2) 10 Europeans and Anglo-Indians. One vacancy is unfilled.

(c) No arrangements have as yet been made for the training of Indian apprentices, but there are at present under training 3 apprentices who were taken over by the East Indian Railway from the late Peninsula Locomotive Company.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: On a point of order, Sir, in regard to a question which speaks incidentally of Railways, but involves generally the policy of the Department of Industries and Labour the question should be answered by the Industries Department. The other day I put a question and the Railway Board replied to me and then I put a supplementary question expecting a reply from the Member in charge of Industries. I was told that notice of that question was necessary. I could not possibly table a notice of the self-same question again. Now, I want that you should order that such questions in which the Department of Industries is involved primarily should be answered by the Member in charge of Industries. This question is of that nature.

Mr. President: There is nothing to prevent the Honourable Member from addressing a question to the Honourable Member for Industries.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: The same question over again?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: May I explain, Sir, that. The question relates to the purchases by railways of a certain commodity and for that reason it has fallen to me to answer it.

CAST IRON SLEEPERS SUPPLIED TO RAILWAY COMPANIES IN INDIA.

714. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the statement by the Bihar Chamber of Commerce published in the *Capital* of Calcutta of 3rd January, 1929, pp. 17—19?

(b) Have Government ascertained how and why the Tata Company has joined the Pig Iron Trust considering the fact that they themselves (Tatas) sell a very little quantity of pig iron outside India and that they have no foundries of their own?

(c) Is there a combine amongst the Bengal Iron Company, the Indian Iron and Steel Company, Burn and Company, the Eastern Light Casting Company, and Martin and Company, who are the manufacturers of railway permanent way materials, such as, cast iron sleepers, as well as producers of raw materials such as pig iron?

(d) Is it a fact that this combine is almost the sole supplier of cast-iron sleepers to the State and other railways?

(e) Is there any truth in the allegation made in the statement referred to in part (a) above which runs thus:

"A large firm engaged in cast iron sleepers was ruined on account of its inability to get pig iron at a reasonable price."

"In 1926, the North Western Railway asked for tenders for cast iron sleepers. The "Trust" was selling pig iron at Rs. 68 per ton to outsiders, and the Bengal Iron Co. quoted Rs. 68 per ton for the finished cast iron sleepers."

(f) What price are they charging the railway companies for cast iron sleepers after the failure of the above firm (i.e., Mallan and Company)? Is the price still Rs. 68 per ton, or more? If more, what is it?

(g) Are steps being taken to protect other concerns against the ultra-profiteering tactics of this combine, with a view to ensure healthy competition in the cast iron sleeper business? If so, what are they?

(h) Does the above combine get any special railway freight facilities, specially in rain water pipes and other sanitary fittings?

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

(b) No. I am also doubtful if the Honourable Member is correct in his assumption that the Tata Iron and Steel Company's sales of pig iron outside India are small.

(c) It is understood that Messrs. Martin and Company now control the other companies mentioned by the Honourable Member.

(d) No. There is a large foundry of the Tatanagar Foundry Company at Tatanagar to which big contracts for railway cast iron sleepers have been given, and Messrs. Richardson and Cruddas, Bombay, supply cast iron chairs.

(e) Government are not in a position to express an opinion as to the truth of the allegation. It is a fact that in 1926 the Bengal Iron Company quoted Rs. 68 per ton for cast iron plates for the North Western Railway; and the market rates for pig iron in August 1926 were from Rs. 62 to Rs. 68 per ton for the various grades.

(f) During 1928-29 Messrs. The Tatanagar Iron Foundry Company tendered successfully for L. K. type plates at Rs. 77 per ton F. O. R. Tatanagar and for 9 S/T. S. C. plates at Rs. 80 per ton F. O. R. Tatanagar.

During the same year Messrs. Martin and Company obtained a contract for K. K. type plates at Rs. 84 per ton F. O. R. Tatanagar.

(g) As the Honourable Member will see from my reply to part (f), there has so far been competition.

(h) The East Indian Railway quote a special rate for cast iron products when booked from Kulti and the Eastern Light Casting Company's siding, which is, I understand, between Kulti and Barakar. There are also various other special station-to-station rates quoted in the East Indian Railway tariff for iron and steel products from Asansol, Barakar and Kulti, and in the Bengal Nagpur Railway tariff from Burnpore to numerous stations; these rates apply equally to all consignors and are not restricted to consignments from particular firms.

Mr. B. Das: Is it not a fact that, quite recently, on the representation of the Bihar Chamber of Commerce, the Tariff Board is going to inquire into the question of the import and export policy with regard to the pig iron industry in India?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I understand that the Tariff Board are considering the question of a possible reduction in the duty on pig iron, but I am not in possession of the views which they have formed on the subject, and I don't know at what stage the inquiry is now.

Mr. B. Das: Is it not a fact that the Bihar Chamber of Commerce have stated that the high price of pig iron does not in any way encourage the Indian engineering industry to manufacture sleepers and other articles?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I should imagine that a high price for any product would encourage manufactures of that product in any country.

Mr. B. Das: Is the Honourable Member aware that the sale of pig iron by these combines at so high a rate as Rs. 68 per ton does not permit Indian manufacturers subsidiary industries to compete with imported articles, while the same pig iron is exported abroad at Rs. 40 per ton?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I think it very undesirable that I should express any opinion on a matter which is already before the Tariff Board.

Mr. B. Das: Is it the intention of the Honourable Member to direct the Tariff Board to inquire into that aspect of the question, namely, whether the price of pig iron sold in India is the same as that sold outside?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I have always found that the Tariff Board is very competent to decide for itself what aspect of the case should be considered.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Are Government aware that the policy of selling pig iron at a lower rate to outsiders is a policy of dumping in foreign countries at the expense of Indian interests and is one which should be discontinued for the present in the interest of our own Indian industry?

RETENTION OF THE GOODS SHED AT TRICHINOPOLY STATION.

715. *Mr. M. S. Satha Ayyangar: (a) Is it a fact that the goods shed at Trichinopoly Fort Station on the South Indian Railway has existed there since 1860?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the South Indian Railway authorities propose to shift the goods shed, Trichinopoly Fort Station to the classification yard near Golden Rock, a distance of three miles from its present place?

(c) Are Government aware that this proposal is opposed to the express wishes of the public, including merchants, of Trichinopoly and the unanimous resolution passed by the Trichinopoly Municipal Council on the 31st January, 1929, and also the opinion of the South Indian Chamber of Commerce, Madras?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state if they propose to instruct the Agent, South Indian Railway to retain the goods shed at Trichinopoly Fort Station, at least till Trichinopoly Fort Station is converted into a broad gauge station?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) It appears to have been opened in 1862.

(b) Owing to the remodelling of the Trichinopoly Junction Station and the conversion of the Erode Branch from broad to metre gauge, the site of the present goods shed will have to be abandoned and a new site has been selected at the junction of the broad and metre gauge lines. The distance of this site from the principal business centres of the town is approximately half a mile longer than the distance from these centres to the old goods shed.

(c) and (d). A letter was received by the Railway Board from a certain gentleman protesting against the closing of the old shed and forwarding a resolution passed at a public meeting held in Trichinopoly. The matter was referred to the Agent of the South Indian Railway, and he has explained to his Local Advisory Council and to the leading petitioners the necessity for moving the goods shed, and has further agreed to keep the old goods shed open until the conversion of the Erode branch from broad to metre gauge has been completed.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS AS MECHANICAL ENGINEERS ON STATE RAILWAYS.

716. *Mr. Mukhtar Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the system on which the mechanical engineers on the different railways are employed? Will the Government be pleased to state further if the recruitment is made by the Railway Board for all the State railways or the Agents of the different railways are at liberty to employ them?

(b) Are the posts of mechanical engineers, whenever they fall vacant, advertised in the Indian papers?

(c) How many posts fell vacant during the year 1927-28 and how many applications were received from Hindu and Mohamadan mechanical engineers and how many of them were appointed? How many out of the Hindu and Mohamadan applicants were qualified to hold these posts?

(d) Is there any dearth of qualified Hindu and Mohamadan candidates for the posts of mechanical engineers? If so, do Government propose to state the steps taken to remove this deficiency?

(e) Are there any scholarships awarded for Indians to qualify themselves as mechanical engineers on the Indian State railways? If the answer be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the amount contributed by the railways towards the aforesaid scholarships? If the answer be in the negative, are Government prepared to consider the advisability of creating scholarships for Indians to qualify themselves as mechanical engineers for railways?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) A copy of the Regulations for the recruitment in India for the Mechanical Engineering, Transportation (Power), Electrical Engineering, and Signal Engineering Departments of the Superior revenue establishment of State Railways has been sent to the Honourable Member. Other copies have been placed in the Library.

(b) Yes.

(c) Three posts were filled in India in 1927-28, one by the promotion of a Parsee apprentice on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and the others through the Public Service Commission. Of the latter posts one was in the Transportation (Power) Department for which 88 applications in all were received, 82 from Hindus and one from a Muslim. The Muslim and one Hindu had the qualifications required for the post, and the Muslim was appointed. The other post was that of Works Manager in the Mechanical Engineering Department, for which 18 applications in all were received, six from Hindus and none from Muslims. None of the Hindus had the requisite qualifications and a European was appointed.

(d) Yes. It is not easy at present to obtain a sufficient number of qualified candidates in India for the posts of Mechanical Engineers. But by the appointment of special class apprenticeships, details of which the Honourable Member will find in the regulations for recruitment which I have sent to him, Government hope to overcome this difficulty.

(e) No scholarships are awarded, but financial assistance is given to selected apprentices, the conditions of which are fully explained in the regulations.

Mr. B. Das: Is the Honourable Member aware that in this matter of recruitment of mechanical engineers for the State railways the percentage is far below 75? Last year the percentage of recruitment was much below 20 per cent. in the matter of mechanical engineers. Will the Honourable Member take steps to bring the recruitment up to 75 per cent., as he is doing in the matter of the Transportation and Civil Engineering Sections?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I have not got the statistics with me; but as I have already explained the difficulty has been so far to obtain qualified candidates for these posts of mechanical engineers. But I hope that the regulations with regard to special apprenticeships which we have introduced will overcome that difficulty, so that in future we shall be able to get more Indian boys for these posts.

Mr. B. Das: Giving the view of the only engineer on this side of the House is the Honourable gentleman aware that there has been, so far, no intention on the part of the Railway Board to give effect to that part of the recommendation of the Lee Commission in the matter of recruitment of mechanical engineers? From the report of the Railway Board

published recently I find that no attempt has been made, except in the case of recruitment of one or two Indians.

Mr. President: That is the Honourable Member's opinion.

COST AND EARNINGS OF CERTAIN FAST MAIL TRAINS.

717. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the average income per trip by (i) the Imperial Indian mail during the year 1927-28 and (ii) the Punjab Limited since the time of its inauguration?

(b) Are only first class passengers allowed to avail themselves of these trains or are passengers of any other classes also allowed to travel by these trains?

(c) Are the passengers travelling in these trains charged the same fare as is charged from passengers of the same class travelling by other trains, or are they charged something extra? If so, how much?

(d) What has been the total cost of (i) the Imperial Indian mail train, and (ii) the Punjab Limited?

(e) What is the average cost of running (i) the Imperial Indian mail train and (ii) the Punjab Limited train per trip?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) I will see if I can obtain the figures for the Honourable Member.

(b) Only first class passengers and their servants are allowed to travel by these trains.

(c) First class passengers by the Imperial Indian Mail are charged Rs. 25-8-0 over and above the ordinary first class fare. Passengers by the Punjab Limited pay the ordinary fares.

(d) and (e). I am seeing whether the remaining information for which the Honourable Member asks can be obtained for him without undue trouble.

LOW SPEED OF GOODS TRAINS ON CERTAIN RAILWAYS.

718. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** (a) What is the average speed per 24 hours of goods trains on the (i) East Indian, (ii) Great Indian Peninsula, and (iii) North Western Railways?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons of the low speed?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) On the East Indian Railway 9.85 miles; on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway 10.4 miles; and on the North Western Railway 9.68 miles, per train engine hour, *i.e.*, from the time the train starts till the time it reaches its destination.

(b) The Railway Board are most anxious to see an increase in the speed of goods trains, and this matter is carefully watched. I am doubtful, however, if the present speeds can correctly be described as low. I believe, for example, that in the United Kingdom, the speed of goods trains average 8.71 miles an hour, *i.e.*, less than on any of the three railways for which I have given figures, and in the United States of America 11.9 miles an hour.

Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya: Will the Honourable Member kindly compare the figures of the running of the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway and the South Indian Railway?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I am quite ready to do so. As a matter of fact the Railway Board look into these figures once a month.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: As well as for the Bengal and North Western Railway.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Perhaps it will stop further supplementary questions, if I give an undertaking that we will look into the figures of all the railways.

QUANTITY OF FOREIGN AND COUNTRY LIQUOR CONSUMED IN CERTAIN YEARS.

719. ***Mr. Mukhtar Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total amount of (1) foreign, and (2) country liquor consumed in the year 1919-20, 1920-21 and 1927-28 in (i) the whole of British India, and (ii) the area under the administration and direct control of the Government of India?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the steps taken to prohibit the consumption of foreign liquor in the country?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) Since the policy of the Government of India is not one of prohibition, they have taken no steps which can properly be described as "steps to prohibit" the consumption of foreign liquor in the country.

Statement showing consumption of country spirit and potable foreign liquors during the years 1919-20, 1920-21 and 1926-27.

NOTE.—Figures for 1927-28 are not yet available.

	British India.			Central Administrations.		
	1919-20.	1920-21.	1926-27.	1919-20.	1920-21.	1926-27.
Country spirit, L. P. gallons .	10,800,186	9,969,590	6,209,724	265,106	258,246	159,084
Other spirit (imported and Indian "foreign liquor") L. P. gallons.	1,283,694	1,561,248	792,499	111,004	100,184	47,852
Wines (imported and Indian), Bulk gallons.	264,207	266,684	178,320	11,102	24,644	13,738
Beer (imported), Imperial gallons.	1,961,520	2,159,821	2,191,365	113,209	128,815	172,369
Beer made in India, Imperial gallons.	4,928,662	3,389,946	2,829,782	510,263	510,248	392,920

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

SOURCE WHENCE ABDUL RASHID OBTAINED A REVOLVER USED TO MURDER SWAMI SHRADDHANAND.

246. Kumar Rananjaya Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether they have tried to find out the source from which Abdul Rashid obtained the revolver with which he murdered Swami Shradhdhanand?

(b) If the reply to the above is in the affirmative will the Government be pleased to state the results of that enquiry?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: (a) and (b) Every effort was made to trace the source from which Abdul Rashid obtained the revolver, but without any result.

FALSE STATEMENTS REGARDING ABDUL RASHID MADE BY CERTAIN WITNESSES.

247. Kumar Rananjaya Singh: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that, in the case against Abdul Rashid, the murderer of Swami Shradhdhanand several witnesses from the defence side stated that the accused was mad?

(b) Is it a fact that medical experts declared the accused to be quite sane?

(c) If replies to (a) and (b) are in the affirmative, what action have Government taken against those persons who made false statements on oath before a magistrate?

(d) Have Government taken any action against those witnesses under section 476 of the Indian Criminal Procedure Code?

(e) If no action has been taken, why?

The Honourable Mr. J. Orerar: I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given in this House on the 8th February, 1928 to Pandit Thakur Das Bhargava's non-oral question No. 57 on the subject.

INTRODUCTION OF UNIFORM FARES, ETC., ON STATE-MANAGED RAILWAYS.

248. Kumar Rananjaya Singh: (a) Are Government aware of the fact that in different State-managed railways different rates of fares, different standards of seating arrangement, different rates of concessions for return journey tickets and different occasions on which concessions are given, exist and thereby the passengers are put to great troubles?

(b) If so, why uniformity in all things in State-managed railways is not brought about?

(c) Do Government contemplate moving in this direction very soon?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) Government are aware that there is not entire uniformity as regards rating, passenger seating and passenger concessions on all State-managed lines, but have no reason to believe that passengers are incommoded thereby.

(b) Financial and other conditions on different State Railways prevent entire uniformity in such matters.

(c) Steps are being taken to standardise rolling stock so far as this is desirable. For the reason given in the answer to (b) entire uniformity in the other matters mentioned by the Honourable Member is not in contemplation.

COST OF NEW RAILWAY STATION AT CAWNPORE.

249. **Kumar Rananjaya Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) when the new railway station of Cawnpore will be ready;
- (b) what the estimated cost of the new railway station is;
- (c) what the requirements for building the new station are, which are not found in the old one;
- (d) whether it will be as large and expensive as the Lucknow Railway Station;
- (e) whether Government are contemplating the building of more such stations on the East Indian Railway;
- (f) whether the Allahabad Railway Station is also going to be built anew?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: (a) By March 1931.

(b) Rs. 77 lakhs.

(c) The object of the remodelling is to co-ordinate the railway facilities of the four railways entering Cawnpore so as to secure more expeditious and economical working. One station will take the place of the four existing stations.

(d) The cost of the remodelling is expected to be slightly higher than that of Lucknow.

(e) No further scheme has so far been sanctioned.

(f) Proposals are shortly expected from the Agent, East Indian Railway, for extensions and improvements at Allahabad.

PROVISION OF A WAITING ROOM FOR 3RD CLASS PASSENGERS AT AJODHYA STATION.

250. **Kumar Rananjaya Singh:** (a) Are Government aware of the fact that Ajodhya (Lakarmandi Ghat) is the railway station on the Bengal and North Western Railway for pilgrims to Ajodhya, a place of Hindu pilgrimage; that a very large number of pilgrims go to Ajodhya via this station throughout the year; and that there is no waiting room or shed for third class passengers at the station to protect them from rain or sun?

(b) If Government are aware of these facts, do they intend to instruct the Bengal and North Western Railway Company to make arrangements for the convenience of the passengers there?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Government are not aware of the exact arrangements at Ajodhya Station. They are sending a copy of the Honourable Member's question to the Agent of the Bengal and North Western Railway in order that he may consider the matter.

UGLY RUINS IN NEW DELHI.

251. Kumar Rananjaya Singh: (a) Are Government aware of the fact that there are some ruins of old buildings just in the centre and populated area of New Delhi, and that these ruins, as they are not put to repair, give an ugly look to the vicinity?

(b) If so, do the Government intend to do away with them or to put them to repair?

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: 1. There are a number of buildings in various stages of dilapidation in the centre and populated area of New Delhi which are too dilapidated or of insufficient historical interest or artistic value to justify their repair or their being classified as protected monuments under the Act.

2. Time has mellowed these ruins and the majority of them are not unsightly although naturally they do not fit in with the lay out of the New Capital. They are beyond repair, and restoration would mean in many cases rebuilding. This would destroy the historical interest and value in case where they have any such value, and would render them even more out of keeping and time with the design of the New Capital.

3. For these reasons Government do not propose to spend money on the repairs of these ruins.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Expenditure from Revenue.

DEMAND NO. 1—RAILWAY BOARD.

Mr. President: The House will now proceed with the second stage of the Railway Budget.

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,61,000 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, 1930, in respect of ‘Railway Board.’”

Mr. President: Pandit Nilakantha Das.

(Pandit Nilakantha Das stood up, but hesitated to move his amendment No. 1).

Mr. President: Mr. Mukhtar Singh.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I want to reduce the sum in my amendment.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is cut of order in moving his motion as it stands on the agenda.

Mr. Mukhtar Singh: That is why I wait your permission to move a cut of Rs. 64,000 instead of the Rs. 84,000 which I have mentioned in the amendment.

Mr. President: There is a similar cut that follows. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): Was I also out of order, Sir, may I know?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member was hesitating whether he should move his amendment or not. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta.

Cost of an Additional Member on the Railway Board and his Establishment.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 64,000 (Cost of an additional Member on the Railway Board and his establishment).”

Sir, I am sorry that the Honourable the Member for Commerce and Railways has been misled by his department into proposing this addition to the cost of the Railway Board. I am afraid the real facts have been kept from his knowledge, with a view to throw dust into the eyes of the Legislative Assembly, and he has been an unconscious instrument of the attempt to mislead the House and put on the tax-payer an additional burden, for which there is absolutely no justification and I am sure that, when I put the full facts before him, he will accept the amendment which I have just moved. The Railway Board, as a board, was constituted in 1905, and till the Acworth Committee reported, that Board went on with slight modification. The Acworth Committee found that the Railway Board was overburdened with work, that the Board was spending one-half of its time in doing the work of its subordinates, work which the subordinates themselves should do, and that it was spending the other half of its time in asking the Secretary of State for India and the Government of India for permission to do the work which it should be permitted to do itself. The result was that endless references had to be made between the Railway Board and the individual railway administrations on the one hand and between the Railway Board and the Secretary of State and the Government of India on the other. In both these directions, delay, discussion and hampering of work were the inevitable results. Therefore the Committee strongly recommended that the Railway Board should be relieved of certain kinds of work, which the Agents themselves should do, and the Government of India and the Secretary of State should delegate many of the functions to the Railway Board, for which prolonged and protracted references six thousand miles away were then necessary. It will perhaps interest the House to know what kind of reference was necessary in 1920. If an engineer died, the payment of a gratuity was a question which the Secretary of State should settle before the Railway Board could give it. If some amount was to be given to the widow of an engine driver, that required a reference to the Secretary of State. If the Railway Board wanted to give a motor car to one of its officers, its right to

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

do so was strictly limited, and it was obliged to make a reference to the Secretary of State for permission before it could increase the amount of the cost of the motor car, or the period within which it was to be repaid by the officer who purchased the car. In this way, as the Acworth Committee said, the work which the head of a sub-department of an English railway would do was the work which the Members of the Railway Board were being called upon to do. More than 70,000 references were made to the Railway Board in one year. All this clogged the machinery, made it inefficient, and prevented the Board from doing its real duty, namely, the formulation of policy and management of the railways on the best commercial lines, according to strict financial propriety. At this time the strength of the Railway Board was only 11 and the total annual cost of the Railway Board was Rs. 8,20,000. On the recommendation of the Acworth Committee, the Government of India appointed the Chief Commissioner of Railways. Sir Clement (then Mr. Clement) Hindley was appointed to make definite proposals for reconstituting the Board on the lines recommended by the Acworth Committee, and Sir Clement Hindley made a long report to the Government of India, a reference to which is made in the annual report for 1923-24. In that he accepted the main lines of recommendation of the Acworth Committee and laid down a scheme for the reconstitution of the Railway Board. In the report which Sir Clement Hindley made to the Government of India, he anticipated future developments and provided for them in his scheme of reconstitution. All the complexities of modern railway management and administration, all the labour problems, all problems of staff—in fact everything that is urged today as justification for adding to the cost of the Railway Board—was anticipated and provided for. Sir Clement Hindley also said that the additional cost of the reconstituted Board would be Rs. 1,50,000. The Railway Board was then costing Rs. 8,20,000, and the re-constituted Railway Board was to cost Rs. 9,70,000. On account of the delegation of the work to local administrations on the one hand, and the delegation of the work to the Railway Board from the Government of India and the Secretary of State on the other hand, the work of the new Railway Board was very largely to be reduced, thus enabling the Board to devote itself to the broad questions of policy for improving our railways. Now, Sir, the Railway Board has been reconstituted accordingly, but within a few years its cost began steadily to go up, and in 1923-24 it was over 15 lakhs, in 1924-25 it was Rs. 18,75,000, and in 1925-26 it again increased to 14 lakhs. According to Sir Clement Hindley, the greatest expert the Government could lay hands on in the whole country and who was the head of the Railway Department for five years, Rs. 9,70,000 was to be the cost of the reconstituted Board, and yet, Sir, such was the extravagance that, in less than 3 years, the cost mounted to nearly 15 lakhs. You, Sir, in 1925-26 (*An Honourable Member*: "1925")—it was in 1925 but for the Budget of 1925-26—you, Sir, saw that, instead of practising retrenchment and economy, as the Incheape Committee had advised, the Railway Board was going from bad to worse in the matter of its expenditure, and that when Rs. 9,70,000 was supposed to be the proper cost of the reconstituted machinery, it was going at a breakneck speed in its career of extravagance, and a cut of Rs. 77,000 was proposed, which the House carried. The Government themselves felt that the cost of the Railway Board was

going up unnecessarily, and in a memorandum to the Railway Finance Committee in 1925, the Financial Commissioner of Railways wrote as follows :

"The question of effecting retrenchment in the cost of establishment of the Railway Board has been under the consideration of Government for some time, in view of the reduction in work which has resulted from the enhanced powers delegated to the Agents of State Railways and the Boards of Directors of Companies' lines."

This is the statement the Financial Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Sim, made in 1925. He says that the question of reducing the establishment of the Railway Board has been receiving the attention of the Government for some time past, and that, in view of the delegated powers to Agents, the work having decreased, it has become more urgent. The cut of Rs. 77,000 was not only accepted by Government, but they went one better, and even reduced the amount further by some Rs. 8,000 or Rs. 9,000, and the strength of the personnel was reduced. Three posts of Deputy Directors were held in abeyance, one post of Assistant Director and one post of Assistant Secretary were also held in abeyance, and one post of Superintendent was abolished. Thus in 1925 the Railway Board, after a careful consideration of all the facts, and after taking into account the reduction of the work which the Board had now to face on account of delegation, came to the deliberate conclusion that six superior posts were not necessary. Therefore, they reduced the strength of the staff by that number and the cost was reduced by Rs. 85,000.

Now, Sir, may I know what has happened since 1925-26 that this cost of the Railway Board, from 14 lakhs should now mount up to Rs. 17,50,000? It will be necessary for me to quote the Railway Board's Report, in order that the House may be convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that, when the Railway Board was reconstituted as Sir Clement Hindley recommended, all these problems of complexity,—the question of labour, the staff question, the personnel question and the establishment question—all these questions were anticipated and dealt with.

Mr. H. G. Cocks (Bombay : European) : For ever?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta : In any case three years' time is not eternity even for Mr. Cocks! Here is page 11 of the Report of the Railway Board for 1923-24. The Honourable the Railway Member gave us a most imaginative picture of Mr. Sheridan working in perspiration, and perhaps burning midnight oil, with only 3 stenographers and 3 *chaprassis*,—all the work falling on him—but as a matter of fact when Mr. Sheridan's post was created here is what was said :

"The growth of traffic, the consequent necessity for more scientific methods and the complex problems which have arisen in recent years out of the relations between the public and the staff have accentuated certain fundamental weaknesses, etc."

Now, Sir, is there anything new that has been said in the speech of the Honourable the Railway Member or in the memorandum of the Financial Commissioner, which was not foreseen by Sir Clement Hindley, as shown by the above quotation from page 8 of his memorandum? I will mention one more fact to enable the House to know what exactly was the heaviness of the work. As the Acworth Committee pointed out, there were 125

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

pages of text and 25 pages of index with 400 heads under which the Railway Board's powers were restricted. All these clogging and hampering restrictions were to be removed, and for that purpose the present machinery has been organised. Sir Clement Hindley, at the end of his report says that the work may increase, but in that event "the increase in work thrown upon the Railway Commission will not be an addition to the classes of work, but mainly an increase in quantity and the organisation will readily adapt itself." Now, Sir, since 1922-23, when Sir Clement Hindley reported, we have added to the strength of the Railway Board, which was then 11, six or seven more superior officers, making the present strength 17; and yet, from the way in which Sir George Rainy described the work of the General Member, it would almost seem that Mr. Sheridan had only three stenographers and three *chaprassis* to help him, and all the rest of the work of establishment, transport and traffic was falling upon him, to the great detriment of efficiency, and throwing a heavy strain on that great expert. Is it really a fact? If the House will turn to the Demand for Grant, the House will find that two Directors are working under Mr. Sheridan, one to assist him in the establishment work, and one to assist him in transportation and traffic. And, Sir, do not by any means imagine that these Directors are only dealing with questions of detail. We have got under the Member General, a Director of Establishment and a Director of Traffic. The Director of Traffic is further assisted by a Deputy Director of Statistics, who, in his turn, is further assisted by an Assistant Director of Statistics, who in his turn is assisted by a Superintendent on Rs. 800 a month. I think that ought to convince the House that Mr. Sheridan is by no means isolated in his great labours and that he gets ample expert and experienced assistance to do his work. Who are these Directors, Sir? They are not ordinary superior clerks. Their salaries are from Rs. 2,500 to Rs. 8,000—very nearly that of the Agents of big railway administrations—only a few hundred rupees less—and as much as the head of a department on the big railway lines. These Directors are officers of great experience, great expert knowledge, and of great authority; and their remuneration is equal practically to that of the Agents of the great railway administrations. Therefore they are not to be treated as not doing anything to assist Mr. Sheridan, and they were not intended merely to deal with details. Sir Clement Hindley has laid down that the Directors should be directly responsible for the work of their departments, except in matters raising large questions of policy. Further he says:

"It is true that the organisation needs strengthening on the traffic side, but it has also to be remembered that the appointment of a Director of Wagon Interchange under the Indian Railway Conference Association in connection with the pooling of wagons, and of a Coal Transportation Officer in connection with the coal traffic has already relieved the Railway Board of some of the most difficult problems of current transportation work, which would otherwise have to be dealt with direct, and further the appointment of a Rates Tribunal will eventually also relieve them of some part of their work in connection with the rates question."

So that, Sir, as a result of the expert assistance which he has got from the two directors under him and the further delegation of work regarding wagons, coal and rates, Mr. Sheridan's work has considerably decreased and not increased, as is sought to be made out. Nor is this all; since the reconstitution of the Board, the references from and to it, have, we are

told, decreased by 60 per cent. As I told the House before, 71,000 references were sent or received in a single year before the reconstituted Board came into existence, and Mr. Sheridan told us the other day in the Standing Finance Committee that the number of references now was something like 8,000 to 14,000. I am willing to be corrected if that is not what he actually stated. So that from 71,000 in 1920 we find that a very large decrease has taken place in the number of references, and Mr. Sheridan mentioned that only 14,000 references were now received. In addition to that, the delegation of powers to the Agents, and from the Secretary of State for India, the constitution of the Rates Advisory Council, the Wagon Interchange and the Coal Transportation Officer—all these things go further to reduce the burden on the shoulders of the Railway Board, and particularly on the shoulders of the General or Traffic Member. Sir Clement Hindley has said that these Directors and Assistant Directors are experts. He says that the Assistant Secretaries are railway officers with considerable experience, having as much as 16 or 20 years' service, and that their designation does not give a proper idea of their duties and responsibilities; so that even the Assistant Secretaries are not ordinary clerks, or even superior clerks; in the ordinary secretariat nomenclature they would be at least Deputy Secretaries. But above these people, as I said, there are Directors of Traffic and Establishment and a Deputy Director of Statistics. So that, whether you look to the amount of work since 1921-22, whether you look to the cost of establishment, whether you look to the strength of the Railway Board, whether you look to the pronouncements of the various authorities on the subject—the Financial Commissioner of Railways, the Chief Commissioner of Railways, the Railway Board themselves and the Acworth Committee—this proposal to add to the strength of the Railway Board one more Member and an additional establishment is nothing but a pure waste of money.

Sir, when this proposal was made and was lost in the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, I requested the Financial Commissioner that as this was an important matter of reconstitution of the Railway Board, it ought to be brought up first before the House by way of Resolution, and until the House had approved of the reconstitution of the Railway Board by adding a fifth Member, this should not be included in the Demands for Grants. But that was not agreed to, and, as if this was merely a matter of adding two typists or a clerk or a *chaprassi*, in spite of the advice of the Railway Finance Committee, the Government have shown that they care nothing whatever for the view held by the representatives of the Assembly on the only financial committee they have got on railways.

Sir, much has been made of labour problems and of Indianization. The House will remember in 1924-25 that Mr. Acharya moved a Resolution to inquire into the grievances of railway subordinates, their pay and salary, wages, conditions of service and so on. Sir Charles Innes, the predecessor of Sir George Rainy, got up in his seat and delivered a most violent philippic against those who supported Mr. Acharya's proposition. Those who will care to refer to those debates of 1925 will find that Sir Charles Innes stood adamant like a rock, against any attempt on the part of the Assembly to tell the Railway Board what should be done about railway men. He maintained that their wages were ample and more than ample, that they had been recently increased, that no question of further increase of wages could be thought of and that no interference with the Agents could be tolerated.

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

Then, Sir, Sir Charles Innes went on to say that if the Assembly interfered in the internal administration, the Railways would corrupt politics and politics will corrupt the Railways. 12 NOON. In spite of all that threat, the Assembly carried Mr. Acharya's Resolution. For five years the Railway Board sat tight upon it. While going through the budget, I found that, in 1927-28, the minimum wage of a workman on the Bengal Nagpur Railway was Rs. 9 per month. (An Honourable Member: "Question?") It was Rs. 9 a month, Sir, and I repeat it, and you will find it stated in that year's budget. When this point was raised, the late Lala Lajpat Rai was moved into making one of those speeches characteristic of his great humanity and great patriotism, pleading for an increase. What was the official reply? Sir Charles Innes said that people were accepting Rs. 9 because they did not get Rs. 8 elsewhere; that the agricultural wages were even lower than that; and we had an Honourable gentleman from Madras, a professor of some Madras College to support Sir Charles Innes. (An Honourable Member: "Who was that?") I forget his name at the moment. Last year, Sir, I pointed out that the statement that the agricultural wages were lower than Rs. 9 was absolutely incorrect and unsubstantiated so far as the Bombay Presidency was concerned, and that the wages were somewhere in the neighbourhood of Rs. 14 and even higher. After all this, the Railway Board suddenly wakes up and finds the necessity of looking after the interests of labour. All to the good. It is your duty to look after the interests of labour. You should have done it long ago. Do it by all means now at least. But do not ask for extravagant expenditure for doing your duty. It is a duty which you should have done in the past, and now that you are attempting only to make a beginning, do not ask for more money for doing what has been your duty all along. Sir George Rainy, I did not know, was a great tactician with a very skillful strategy behind him. Twenty-eight lakhs are provided for increasing the wages of labour; what a great increase of work for the Railway Board! Thirty lakhs are to be spent on improving the housing conditions of labour. Does it require another Member? And the Geneva Convention and the Washington Convention are brought into requisition to bolster up a case, which has absolutely no foundation, as will be clear from their own official records.

Then, Sir, the day before yesterday, we witnessed in this House a humiliating scene, which, at any rate, I had hoped a mighty Government like this would not subject itself to. It was a humiliation to Government; it was an insult to the House. The Railway Member went out of his way to get support for his proposition by dangling before this House these appointments which he was going to create. He said "I shall appoint Indian 'A', I shall appoint Indian 'B'." Sir, if an Indian is to be appointed to the Railway Board, it is because it is the birthright of an Indian to manage and control his own Railways; he ought to be there; in fact he ought to have been there long ago. The whole of the Railway Board should be composed of and manned by Indians and Indians alone, and a non-Indian, as I said last year, must be an exceptional affair, to be solely justified in emergent cases. The General Member, I think, has no place at all in this Board. I want a Member for some particular work, and not a General Member; and I say, Sir, that the Director of Establishment, can attend to labour work. It is wrong to say that the Director of Establishment is not responsible for questions of policy. Sir, you will find in the memorandum

of Sir Clement Hindley that the Directors are very responsible officers and are in charge of questions of policy, and not merely of routine. They have a direct responsibility for all work that comes within their sphere, and it is only on important questions of policy that they have got to refer to the General Member. Therefore, Sir, over the Director of Establishment and the Director of Traffic, I do not see any necessity for a Railway Member at all, much less of two Members. I say that these two people should make direct references to the Chief Commissioner in important matters. The Chief Commissioner, as the House probably knows, has no particular portfolio assigned to him, and Sir, it has always been my point that the two Directors for Establishment and Traffic should have direct access to the Chief Commissioner in urgent cases, so that all the work of management of office and all matters of policy can be done by the Directors themselves under the direct control of the Chief Commissioner, whose aid can be invoked in exceptional cases. If the work has increased—and I do not admit it for a moment—a Deputy Director may be appointed. I proposed this in the Standing Finance Committee, and Mr. Jayakar suggested that a Director might be appointed. We might inquire in the Standing Finance Committee, find out if the necessity for a Director or Deputy Director exists, and consider the whole question on its merits. But so far as an additional Member is concerned, there is at present absolutely no case at all. And so far as Indianisation is concerned, Sir, it is our birthright to become Members of the Railway Board. You have kept us out of those posts on frivolous and preposterous grounds. (*An Honourable Member from Swarajist Benches*: "Shame.") You have all the time treated these posts as jobs for the men in your Services. Sir George Rainy gave us the name of Mr. Hayman. I have great respect for Mr. Hayman. He is an extraordinarily brilliant man, but all his life has been spent in the Audit and Railway Finance. We do not want a square peg in a round hole or a round peg in a square hole, or whatever you may call it. If a Labour Member is necessary, then we should have been given the name of somebody who is a labour expert. To put one man in any kind of work simply on account of his seniority, whether he is experienced or not is absurd. Your decision shows that you are not caring so much for labour as for the Services. As for Mr. Rau, he will simply go in and come out in three or four months.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Six months I hope.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It may be six months, but by the time he has got in he will get out. What is the use of such slipshod Indianisation?

Finally, Sir, I say the Assembly will be doing the greatest disservice to the taxpayer if it accepts a bribe of this kind in order to be given its birthright. In the time of George III, Sir, Parliament was managed by bribery, corruption, and jobbery. We are fast coming to that most humiliating and degrading position. Sir George Rainy came forward, yesterday, to the great humiliation of Government and insult to the dignity of the House, dangling certain jobs before us, if we accepted the fifth Member, knowing full well that there is absolutely no justification for the post. I say, Sir, it would be the height of irresponsibility on the part of the House if they accepted so degrading a proposal.

Sir, I oppose this demand and move my amendment.

Sir Purnohandas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): Sir, I rise to support the amendment of my Honourable friend,

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

Mr. Jamnadas Mehta. (*Mr. B. Das*: "Hear, hear".) The Honourable the Commerce Member says in his budget speech that the question which is now under discussion before the House is "the most important proposal included in the present budget." Further on, he says, that he attaches "the highest importance to this addition to the Railway Board." For a person like me, who has considerable deference for any conclusion which Sir George Rainy may come to after full consideration, I can assure the House that I have not come to my decision to support this amendment in either a light or frivolous spirit. I am convinced that the proposed addition to the Railway Board is neither necessary nor justified. I think the Honourable Member himself, when introducing yesterday two personal names in connection with this subject, did it with an apology to the House and with great hesitation, and I am sorry that any question that may have been put by my Honourable friend, Mr. Fazal Ibrahīm Rahimtoola, should have given my Honourable friend either the provocation for, or the excuse to bring in names of officers in a matter which should be discussed more on principle than on personalities. I fully support the grievance of my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, in connection with this, and I trust that the Honourable Sir George Rainy, would have preferred to keep out names of individual officials of the Railway Board in this connection in order that this debate might be on the usual high level that it should be.

This proposal was put in all detail, I presume, before the Railway Standing Finance Committee and by a majority that Committee turned it down. Whilst there is no objection to this House revising the opinion of the majority of that Committee, I think very strong grounds will have to be adduced before this House upsets the opinion of the majority of its own Committee. And whilst I attach no sanctity to the decision of the Committee *per se*, I am convinced that the decision of the majority of that Committee was right and that it should now be confirmed by this House. My Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, having had the opportunity of working on the Railway Standing Finance Committee, practically ever since that Committee was formed, has been in the know of most of the details of the literature put before the Committee in this connection. I propose, therefore, not to go over the same ground again; indeed, it is not necessary for the purpose of the basic principle from which I would like this House to look at this question.

I would like to inform the House, from official records, of the central idea underlying the very conception of the appointment of the Railway Board in 1908. At page 79 of the Incheape Committee report the following quotation occurs:

"The conception of a Railway Board is not new: it has been advocated and considered on various occasions for many years past. Its central idea is that there should be a body of practical business men entrusted with full authority to manage the railways of India on commercial principles and freed from all non-essential restrictions, or needlessly inelastic rules. There are two distinct classes of duties with which the new authority will have to deal. The first is deliberative, and includes the preparation of the Railway programme and the greater questions of Railway policy and finance affecting all lines. The ultimate decision on such questions must, of necessity, rest with the Government of India. The second class of duties is administrative, and includes such matters as the construction of new lines by State Agency, the carrying out of new works on open lines, the improvement of railway management

with regard to both economy and public convenience, the arrangements for through traffic, and the settlement of disputes between Railways."

The Incheape Committee comment upon this in one sentence :

"This conception of the functions of the Railway Board fell into disuse."

From 1908 till 1920 this very important basic principle, on which the Railway Board was started, was over-looked. The Acworth Committee comments upon it in no ambiguous language. Mr. Jamnadas Mehta referred to 71,000 references made to the Railway Board in 1920. I think that, if Mr. Jamnadas Mehta refers to the pertinent paragraph of the Acworth Committee's Report, namely, 107, he will find that it was not 71,000 references but 71,000 inward and outward letters to the Railway Board, which is hardly the same thing.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Even a postcard is a reference.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Well, that makes it clearer. We now understand better what is meant by references. The total number of letters, inward and outward, which were handled by the Railway Board went to the figure of 71,000. The Acworth Committee said in paragraph 110 of their Report—I will not worry the House regarding the criticism of the Railway Board till 1920, as given by that Committee—the Acworth Committee go on to say :

"The proper function of the Railway Board is not to carry out routine duties but to shape policy, to watch, to think and to plan."

They then outline a new scheme for reorganisation of the Railway Board which is given in paragraph 111 of the Report. They indicate in that scheme the appointment of a Chief Commissioner for Railways, and four Commissioners, one for finance and three for three divisions into which the Acworth Committee desired that the whole railway system should be divided, namely, western, eastern and southern. It has to be noted, however, that the Acworth Committee's whole plan was that both the railways and the ports of India should be under the Railway Board. The ports of India have still to be brought under the Central Government. What little reference there may be regarding major ports is dealt with by the Commerce Member's Department directly. The ports of India, therefore, having yet to come in into the scheme which was accepted by the Government of India, they instead of having four Members, as suggested by the Acworth Committee, accepted three, namely, one Finance Member and two other Members. Now, I wonder whether it is the intention of the Honourable Member that, when the ports are brought in,—and this is likely to be before very long,—the Government of India will ask for an additional member in order that somebody may be there to look after the ports. But the modification made by the Government of India, in accepting the Acworth Committee's recommendation, was that instead of dividing the railways in India into three territorial sections, they said, "We would have, besides the Finance Member, two more Members." Now, I feel, Sir, that the reasons given then for having an expert Member, namely, one Technical Member, are reasons which are responsible for this demand for an additional Member. Let me, Sir, now refer to the Railway Board Report for 1927-28, page 99 :

"The Railway Board as now constituted consists of the Chief Commissioner as President, the Financial Commissioner and two Members. The proposal of the Acworth Committee that the Indian Railways should be sub-divided into three territorial divisions with a Commissioner in charge of each was not accepted and the work of the members of the Board is now divided on the basis of subjects and not on a territorial

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

basis. . . . The reorganisation carried out in 1924 had for one of its principal objects the relief of the Chief Commissioner and the members from all but important work so as to enable them to devote their attention to larger questions of railway policy and to enable them to keep in touch with Local Governments, railway administrations and public bodies by touring to a greater extent than they had been able to do in the past."

Then they go on to say—I presume that this has been drafted by the Railway Board themselves—

"This object was effected by placing a responsible Director at the head of each of the main branches of the Board's work, namely, Civil Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Traffic and Establishment. The former Chief Engineer and the Chief Mechanical Engineer who had been employed mainly in consultative work, became Directors and together with the Directors of Traffic and Establishment have been made responsible for the direct disposal of the work of their branches under the general orders of the Railway Board."

In a subsequent paragraph they say that the posts of Joint Secretaries and four Assistant Secretaries were replaced by six Deputy Directors. The main lines on which the reorganisation of the Railway Board was undertaken were that as expert advisers there are to be Directors and Deputy Directors. In spite of that, Sir George Rainy now says "Oh, of the two Members one is Technical and therefore looks after technical matters. There is only one other Member left, the General Member and he has got to do the routine work." I wish to ask whether it is not high time for the Government of India to get out of this old old policy, wrongly followed since 1908, of overlooking the main underlying principle of the appointment of the Railway Board and of having experts on the Board. Is it any wonder, that one so often hears that it is mainly for the purpose of providing railway officials with seats on the Railway Board that the unexceptional principle laid down in 1908 is not being observed? The Director's and the Deputy Director's posts on the Railway Board are the posts meant for experts, whether they be in engineering or any other line. When the Railway Board was formed, it was laid down that Government should have as Members, men with commercial experience, who have a broad outlook and who are capable of thinking out policy, and with, if I may use a colloquial phrase, driving power, so that the Agents of our railways either State-managed or company-managed may work on common lines. I am afraid that, if this House today sanctions under a misapprehension, as I am sure it would be, the additional appointment of one more Member, it may not be many years before the Honourable Member in charge of Railways asks for several additions, because I submit the lines on which they are working are absolutely wrong and unjustified. It is not, Sir, a question of personalities today at all and I wish to keep out names and personalities. It is a question of on what basis the whole scheme was conceived. Two committees since 1908 have reported on the constitution of the Railway Board. Both of them condemned the lines on which the Railway Board appointments were made since 1908. Each of these two committees—I have not heard anybody say that these committees were prejudiced in their criticism of the Railway Board—said, without any hesitation, that the underlying idea regarding the appointments made in the Railway Board was all wrong, and I feel that it is not today question of having a tussle with the Honourable Member regarding acceding to his request, which involves an additional expenditure of half a lakh a year or so, although even that is quite a considerable amount in the present financial condition of India as a whole. We shall however know

within a week what is the financial position of the Central Government. But it is more a question of keeping in view, in a very correct manner, the whole idea underlying the very conception of the Railway Board. If before the addition of ports to the portfolio of the Chief Commissioner, the Honourable Member in charge is prepared to press before this House, with all the fervour and sincerity at his command, the additional appointment of one more Member, what is he going to do when ports are brought in? And I understand it is the intention of Government to bring directly under the control of the Government of India the major ports, and not to allow them to be managed through the agency of Provincial Governments as at present. I ask, as our railways go on expanding, is it the Honourable Member's intention to ask for a few more members within the next few years? And what, after all, is the period which has elapsed since the Incheape Committee reported? In fact the whole scheme was put into practice in 1924. I think the memorandum from Sir Clement Hindley which my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta read out

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: It is dated 1923. It was carried out in 1924.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: At that time I understood from my Honourable friend that three appointments of Assistant Directors were kept in abeyance, and they have been filled up since then. Still you want one more Member now and I am afraid Government will ask for a few more Members on the Railway Board if they continue to work in this wrong groove, in spite of such unanimous and unambiguous reports from at least two committees, none of which can be said not to have understood the problems on which they were reporting.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Since then, there have been more labour troubles.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: They were not overlooked by these committees. I have, Sir, read the memorandum which was submitted by the Financial Commissioner to the Standing Finance Committee. I see there this statement:

"The transfer to State management of the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and Burma Railways has added enormously to the volume of the Railway Board's work, not only in dealing with labour questions but also in dealing with the other classes of establishment which are directly under their control."

I wonder under whose control the Honourable Member meant, when he said that?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: The Railway Board.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Are not the Agents there to deal with these questions? Is it the work of the Railway Board to look after them from here?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: The Railway Board have under their control two main services—the Indian Railway Service of Engineers and the Superior Revenue Establishment of State Railways, and a great many questions dealing with these two establishments cannot be settled by an Agent, because they affect officers on more than one line.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: And what about the staff on company-managed railways? If the Railway Board have to look after the staff of State-managed railways, what happens to the staff of company-managed railways?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: They are not Government servants.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: But are not the others too servants of railways? Why this distinction between servants of company-managed and State-managed railways?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I am afraid I have not made myself clear. The position is that officers of State-managed railways, including the East Indian, Great Indian Peninsula and Burma Railways (which have now come under the Government of India) belong to two superior services, and questions relating to those services must therefore come to the Railway Board. The officers of company-managed railways are not servants of Government, and are not members of those services at all, and therefore we have not got to deal with individual questions with regard to them.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: No new appointment can be made without consulting us, even on company-managed railways.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Without the agreement of the Railway Board, no new superior appointment on a company-managed railway can be created. But I am referring to questions of personnel. There are many questions which come to the Railway Board with regard to State-managed railways, which have not got to come to us with regard to company-managed railways.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: I thank the Honourable Member for his courtesy in the explanation which he has just given, but I must confess that I cannot see the point of his explanation. These officers, when they were in the employment of, say, the Great Indian Peninsula and East Indian Railways, before these two railways were taken over by the State—which is not more than a matter of five or six years back—did not require the attention of the Railway Board, but as soon as they come within State management, their cases must have the superior watchfulness of the Railway Board Members! I would like to pursue this question further, but must give it up, because I am afraid you will not allow me, Mr. President, to continue the conversations on the floor of the House. I cannot, however, help saying, with due deference to Mr. Parsons, that his explanation is quite unconvincing, because he does not explain why the Railway Board Members should give such special attention to routine matters such as engineers and others on State-managed railways, while if those same engineers happened to be on company-managed railways, they would not require the attention of the Railway Board. I am afraid that, in spite of the Acworth Committee's and the Inchcape Committee's criticisms, the Railway Board continue still to worry themselves about petty questions regarding these officers. If that is so, I demand to-day that that system should be stopped at once, and we will not vote a single rupee more in order to enable you to carry on that comparatively petty work, for which the Railway Board is not intended at all. If this be not so, perhaps the Honourable Member will explain, when he gives his reply, but I felt when I read this memorandum that the transfer to State management would involve other big questions, such as whether freight rates were uniform, etc., but not petty questions with regard to staff. I should have thought that the question of the staff was a question, which of course was of sufficient importance to the personnel of the staff, but could be entrusted for final decision to the Agents of respective railways.

In that connection I must read a sentence from the Inchcape Committee's Report:

"As stated in the Acworth Committee's report, many references on trivial questions have to be referred by the Agents of the railways to Delhi, involving a great amount of correspondence and delay. We are told that in almost every case the result is approval of the Agent's proposals. We agree that this excessive centralisation is wrong. The General Manager of a great railway should not have to refer minor matters connected with the working of his railway to a centralised headquarters in Delhi or Simla, but should be empowered to give decisions and be free to attend to the working of his line. His management should be judged by results and, if it is unsuccessful apart from fortuitous circumstances over which he has had no control, he should be relieved of his duties."

If, therefore, the General Member is burdened with all these details about management and details of staff appointed on State railways, the correct thing I suggest to the Honourable Sir George Rainy is to relieve the General Member of those details and to let him get on to other bigger and more important questions of policy regarding labour.

There is just one more reason which the Honourable Member gave why he thought this appointment was necessary. He referred, Sir, to the Geneva Convention. Now, whilst I think that the Geneva Conventions to which India may have been a party, must be put into practice as early as possible, I am sure it is not necessary to ask the House to override a very good principle on which appointments are made to the Railway Board, or to spend unnecessarily an amount like Rs. 60,000 a year in order to be able to put through the Geneva Conventions. India has genuinely put through the various conventions much earlier than other countries in the world, and whilst I am for carrying out all these responsibilities that may have been undertaken by the Government of India, I personally attach no importance to this ground for increasing our expenditure. These can wait for a little longer if necessary, because there are many other countries over which India has fair lead in this matter. I feel, therefore, that whilst I started with a prejudice in favour of the proposal, owing to my high opinion about whatever Sir George Rainy takes in hand—and always examines with such thoroughness,—I have, after looking into the whole question, unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that this House would be completely misguided and misled if it sanctioned this appointment. This House must say "No", with the deference due to the Honourable Sir George Rainy, and must draw his attention to the basic principle involved in appointments to the Railway Board and the subsequent criticisms of the appointments to the Railway Board. I understand that the Standing Finance Committee of the Railways did offer to vote it, if they thought the appointment of an Assistant Director was necessary, but the question of an additional Member must, I am afraid, be turned down. I therefore very strongly oppose the Honourable Member's proposal and support the amendment before the House.

Mr. H. G. Cocks: Sir, I have listened with considerable interest to the speeches of my Honourable friends who are so well acquainted with railway affairs, and with whom I cannot compete in their knowledge of railway history, of what has happened at past meetings and of what has appeared in various committee reports, etc., but it has appeared to me that they have dealt rather too largely with the past and not sufficiently with the present. After all, even if the Acworth Committee Report was a very excellent report, and the Inchcape Committee Report

[Mr. H. G. Cooke.]

was a good report, and Mr. Hindley's memorandum of 1924 was a very good memorandum, it does not follow to-day that the recommendations of those bodies are all that is wanted at the present time to meet the changing conditions.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: What is the alternative for those conditions?

Mr. H. G. Cooke: I did not interrupt the Honourable Member, although I wanted to on several occasions, and I hope he will not interrupt me.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: The Honourable Member who is so good at interrupting others may very well stand a pertinent interruption. I have always noticed that interruptions are the monopoly of that Bench (the European Group Bench).

Mr. H. G. Cooke: If the Honourable Member has finished with his interruptions, I will resume my speech.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Not until the Honourable Member has given reply to my query?

Mr. President: Order, order. Mr. Cooke.

Mr. H. G. Cooke: We have some details given to us in the Budget memorandum as to the railway development in the past few years. We are not standing still. Company lines have been taken over, and considerable new construction has gone on, and is going on. In addition to that, we have the altered circumstances as regards labour. The Honourable Member, Mr. Jannadas Mehta went into the figures of the past about the cost of the Railway Board, and the extent to which the cost had increased. Well, I do not want to go into the past, but it seems to me that the whole thing is a business question, for to-day, whatever mistakes might have been committed in the past, if one takes the increased cost of the Railway Board for a period and compares it with the increased earnings, and the increased receipts, then the increased cost for the direction of the headquarters office is not very large. But, Sir, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas says we are altering the conception of the control at headquarters. I do not quite know, but I think he told us that the Acworth Committee said that the purpose of the Railway Board was to watch policy and to think out schemes. Well, that is all very well. Of course it has got to do that and we all know that. But the question is to what extent it is possible for the Railway Board to keep clear of detail. For example we were told the other day that a certain new piece of line was being opened which would enable a train to go direct from Peshawar to Bangalore, and the Railway Board pointed out the desirability of starting a through train so that passengers would travel from one point to another without change. Well, that is a very small matter, but it was pointed out to us that it was a very difficult one to get put in practice because the various Agents did not see eye to eye and they could not alter their timings so as to enable a through train being run. In such a case Agents have to be dictated to from headquarters to alter their timings so as to allow the train to run. That is one small example, and there are many others. Therefore, while the Railway Board is accused of going into too much detail it is very difficult to draw a line. Where it is a question of staff, whether lower or upper, it seems

to me there ought to be co-ordination, because, as I said the other day, if a question comes up as to whether a certain kind of labour is to have quarters, and if the Agent of a particular railway takes a line on that question, he more or less commits the other railways to that course. Then it would come to the Railway Board and it would have to approve or oppose similar development on another line. Therefore, though in theory it may be very excellent for the Railway Board to remain a thinking body and not an administrative body, it seems to me, in practice, it is very difficult to prevent the Railway Board duties getting more and more spread and more and more detailed. Particularly with this labour question, I do feel that it is a matter which does demand the attention of a separate Member, and particularly when we are told that the present General Member, who is a Transportation Expert, has in the last year not been able to devote more than about one-third of his time to his own subject. There are schemes which I have no doubt have been held up, schemes of remodelling stations and yards and so on, which will bring in increased revenue to railways. These schemes have been held up because the General Member has had too much to do on the labour side. Therefore it is false economy, it is not good business, to keep one Member for all this work. The Honourable Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas seemed to indicate that, what you wanted was a General Member, with no particular expert knowledge but having under him various experts. That is all very well, but it has been explained to us that it is very difficult for the General Member to go round the country, visiting and advising Agents, being consulted by them on subjects, in which he is not an expert. The Honourable Mr. Jamnadas Mehta said that, if we are going to have a Labour Member, then for Heavens sake let us have an expert. I quite agree with him. But he rather contradicted himself a few minutes earlier when he said that he did not want any European on the Railway Board. If you do not keep Europeans on the Railway Board, it is questionable whether you could get the necessary experts on that Board to-day.

Honourable Members: Oh! Oh!

Mr. H. G. Cocke: That is a matter of opinion. A subject like rates and fares is a very technical and difficult one. It is a life-education, and it does not necessarily follow that the best member to look after rates and fares, or labour and transportation, or whatever it may be, would necessarily be an Indian. I do not want to bring that matter into the discussion, but it does arise. The Honourable Member wanted a labour expert. I quite agree with him, if it is possible to get one. With all due respect to the name that has been mentioned, I think that gentleman has been employed on auditing and accounts all his life and he is not necessarily the right man to be put into this post. Coming back to the main point, is it possible for one General Member to have many experts under him doing expert work in rates and fares and various other expert departments? Is it possible for one Member to give the supervision which is necessary? It seems to me that you do want an expert with the standing of a Member to look after these various points. I quite agree with Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas that we are heading towards another member, and possibly more.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: The cat is out of the bag.

Mr. H. G. Cooke: Prevent it if you can. The idea that we are departing from the original scheme of the Railway Board may be right or wrong. But it does not seem to me that you can prevent this because you have got to have the best man available to control the different branches of the administration. If it were possible for Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas or for Mr. Jamnadas Mehta to take their seat on the Railway Board and to have under them the various experts, I personally think they would find that they had not the knowledge about rates and fares or the commercial working of the railways to be able to be in charge of those branches of administration.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Will there be two Commerce Members if there is too much work for one Member?

Mr. H. G. Cooke: I would prefer to have two, three or even four Members who are experts, who have been through the mill, and who have been trained in the particular subjects which they have got to administer and control, and in connection with which they have got to dictate to the Agents of the various railways. That seems to me to be the matter put briefly. The question is whether we can carry on with one General Member who has got to control two or three lines in which he is not an expert—he is possibly an expert only in one or two of them—the question is whether we should not have separate experts for the different subjects. It seems to me that the time has arrived, with all the railway development which has been going on in India, the time has arrived when we have got to face facts, when our Railway Board headquarters have got to have different experts to control the several heads of railway administration.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): I have already tabled an amendment which is lower down in the agenda dealing with the point raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta in his amendment. So I want to take advantage of this opportunity for expressing my opinions on this subject. Probably if this amendment is carried, I may not move my own. The question before the House is this, whether we should have any new additional Member for the Railway Board. In putting this question to the House, the Honourable the Commerce Member tried to mix with this issue certain extraneous considerations also. The question of Indianisation of the Railway Board ought to be kept severely aloof and apart when we are considering this question of an additional Member for the Railway Board. The real point which the House has to take into consideration is whether, on account of the complexity of the problems which the Railway Board has to face, or on account of the multiplication of the problems which it has to solve, a case has been made out for an additional Member or not. The fact that the additional Member may or may not be an Indian is entirely extraneous, and if that is being prominently mentioned, I can only say that it is not very fair to the House that any responsible officer should do it. It is clouding the real issue before the House. That Indians should have a seat on the Railway Board is undoubtedly a long-standing demand of this House. There is no question about that. In fact the House has expressed that demand so definitely and so persistently that it has gone to the length of throwing out the entire Demand for the Railway Board on more than one occasion simply to record, and to register, its protest against the exclusion of Indians

from the Railway Board. So the House should not be misled by the fact that there is a possibility of an Indian being appointed if this additional post is sanctioned. That sort of thing appears to me to be introducing a sort of bait to angle the fish. I think the House

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member knows that a specific question was put from non-official Benches and the Honourable Sir George Rainy gave a reply.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Well, probably it was my misfortune I was not here when the answer was given by Sir George Rainy and I have not heard it; but my contention is that, even in the original speech of the Honourable Member the matter should not have been confused like that. Secondly, Sir, when we are considering this question of the additional work which the Railway Board have to transact, much has been made about the extension of railway lines, as well as of certain new lines that have been taken under its management by the Railway Board during recent times. The real work which the Railway Board have to transact is, in my opinion, of such a nature that mere extension of existing lines should not materially add to the nature of the problems which the Railway Board have to solve. It may extend its field of operation and supervision, but it would not in any way multiply the problems of vital importance which the Railway Board have to tackle and on which they have to lay down the policy. The policy has to be laid down on certain broad general lines. It is to apply to a number of persons, passengers or servants. That number may be a thousand, ten thousand or one lakh, but the policy will be the same. So that if that aspect of the Board's work be firmly grasped and careful attention fixed on that point, the consideration that during some years extensions are being made to already existing lines and certain new lines brought under direct State management should not furnish any material support in favour of the present proposal.

Then, Sir, I would also remind the House that the Railway Department is said to be a commercial concern in a way. If in the year 1923-24 and 1924-25 it was found necessary that a policy of retrenchment should be pursued and its justification was then conceded by those who were responsible for running the Railway administration, then it must be now clearly demonstrated to this House as to how and why that policy has to be abandoned now. I do not want to read out once more all the relevant extracts which Mr. Jannadas Mehta has already just read out, to prove that it was a policy to which the Railway administration was committed. It promised that it would try to carry out that policy to its ultimate logical consequences; but we find that, immediately after conceding that point in one session, there is a deliberate move on the part of the Railway Board to give the go-by to that policy and to augment the number of officials on the Railway Board. It has frequently come forward with certain proposals for increased staff before the Standing Finance Committee and this House. And we find to-day that the expenditure which stood approximately at 9 lakhs in 1923-24 has now come to be Rs. 17,50,000. It has gone up approximately to twice of what it was in that year. That is a matter which is required to be seriously considered. If the Railway administration is a commercial concern, the Railway Board ought to come before this House and justify their demand to this House to sanction double the expenditure like that on some very strong or exceptional grounds.

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

They have to show that they have discharged their trust in these five years in such a way that the gains which the country is making out of these railway transactions have also doubled. They must justify the proposition from that point of view. I would only request the Railway Board to start with the gross and net earnings of the year 1924-25 and then gradually come down to the present year. They will find we are not making much improvement. If such a proposition were put before a commercial concern, the shareholders would at once ask the Directors not to talk of adding to the expenditure but to talk, if necessary, of retrenchment. That is the position to which they would be reduced.

Then, Sir, there is another point. It was a special case for a labour Member that was made out by the Honourable the Member for Railways in his speech. In the first place, I want to ask those who are experts, or who come before us as experts on railway matters, whether they know of any special Member for labour on any railway management in the United Kingdom or in the United States of America. That is precisely what I want to know from them. I have tried to see in the Library certain standard books on railway organisations and ascertain the various kinds of members who are in charge of the management of the different railways there. I have found that they have got this arrangement—a President and a number of Vice-Presidents for different subjects. I have not been able to find, at least among some of the important lines in the United States of America and the United Kingdom, any special Vice-President in charge of labour. The question of labour always seems to have been taken as auxiliary to the duties of the Member General in charge of Transportation and Traffic. He may have a special officer to look after the labour problem working under him, but an independent Member is not placed in charge of labour itself. Now I want to know whether, whatever may be the troubles of labour in India, it is seriously contended in this House by the Railway Board that there are aspects of the labour problem in this country more serious, more ticklish and more difficult to be tackled than labour problems that have arisen or do arise in the countries aforesaid. If responsible railway managements in other countries can deal with these labour problems by entrusting them to certain persons who are also responsible for other work, why should it not be possible for an expert like Mr. Sheridan to tackle these problems in this country along with his other duties. Allow me to have my doubts. Any how I have not yet seen a specific portfolio anywhere created in a railway administration for labour and a Member placed in charge of that.

There is another aspect also to which the attention of the Financial Commissioner was drawn by an Honourable friend of mine on the Standing Finance Committee for Railways while this question was under discussion. It was asked, in view of the fact that there was so much pressure of ordinary work and additional new work that had to be done that there was not sufficient time left for the present Members to discharge efficiently their other important duties; whether the question of further decentralising some of their work was considered or not. Now the nature of the duties which the Railway Board was expected to do under the recommendations of the Acworth Committee is indicated to be such that they should not include routine work, which can be ordinarily done by subordinates. We

are not going to sanction fat salaries like that for Members of the Railway Board to do duties which ordinary men can certainly do on smaller salaries. So, if the present work has increased on account of Members being entrusted with duties of that nature, an attempt should be made to find out and explore all the possibilities of decentralising and delegating a part of the miscellaneous work to some other subordinate authority. To illustrate my position, I can give a specific instance, *viz.*, the question of rates and fares. The Acworth Committee advised and recommended that a Rates Tribunal should be created. We find that an Advisory Rates Tribunal has been created in India. What I really want to know is this. Has that Advisory Rates Tribunal been entrusted with all the duties and all the powers which it was the intention of the Acworth Committee to invest that body with? In fact in the report of the Acworth Committee a reference was made to the Railway Act of England which specifies the duties of the Rates Tribunal created under the provisions of that Act in England. The present Advisory Rates Tribunal in India, however, is only engaged in trying a few selected cases of individual applicants specially forwarded to it by the Railway Board. The whole problem of rates and fares and the injustice

1 P.M. it causes is still left to be solved by the Railway Board itself, and the Rates Advisory Committee is not given any liberty to go into it.

So also the question of staff. If the Agents of the various railways are allowed to do that work to a great extent, and if the duties of the Public Service Commission are properly enlarged, I believe that much of the responsibility that falls on the Railway Board today might be lightened. So, Sir, there are ways and ways: There are possibilities which can be explored of decentralising the power and diminishing the responsibility which at present is creating a good deal of hampering and leaves no time for the Railway Board Members to do their proper and legitimate work. I believe a question was asked in the Finance Committee whether any such possibilities had been explored before the formulation of the present proposal and I believe, if I mistake not, the reply given was that the question had not been examined from that standpoint. If I am wrong I stand open to correction, but to the best of my recollection some such reply was given.

Again, Sir, the labour aspect of the question has been very much emphasised. I remember distinctly the reply that was given to us when Mr. Sheridan was particularly invited to enlighten the members of the Standing Finance Committee and which he very kindly did. He was particularly asked the question as to what was the total number of the labour problems with which he had to deal last year. He said that one-tenth of his work was connected with labour and nine-tenths dealt with questions about the staff. So that, labour figured only to the extent of one-tenth of his work. Besides this, Sir, I want to know what is the peculiar nature of the labour problem on railways. I have not been able to understand that. There is a Member in charge in the Government of India who deals with the question of labour. If the general policy regarding labour is laid down by the Government of India, it would be binding upon the Railway Board to carry it out, and I do not want that the Railway Board should tackle this question for itself independently. And, Sir, as regards the general problem of labour in India, a Labour Commission is also being appointed to explore the whole question and to find out proper solutions; and therefore I think it is a problem for the Government of India to solve; and the conclusions arrived at by the Government.

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

of India should be binding on and should be the main principles of the Railway Board in regard to these matters. Therefore, Sir, today, at any rate, the creation of a post for labour is to anticipate the conclusions which the Government of India may arrive at so far as railway labour is concerned and enable the Railway Board even to give effect to their conclusions according to their own unaided lights. I do not think it will be wise policy for this House to create a separate Member in charge of labour for railway management only at this time and ask him to initiate and carry on any labour policy in the way he likes, when the whole problem is under consideration by the Government of India and a commission appointed for that purpose. It would not be justifiable on the part of this House to allow the Railway Board a free hand in this matter. If we have to wait at all, let us wait for some time more. Let us have the conclusions arrived at elsewhere after proper inquiries and mature deliberations, and let those conclusions be then translated into action in so far as they are related to the labour problems under the railway management by the Railway Board.

There is one more point that I would like to touch upon. It was emphasized by the Honourable Sir George Rainy that the problems relating to labour on railways stand on a somewhat different footing from other problems with which the Member for transportation and commerce has to deal. I believe he said that there must be a greater human factor—some such word was used,—in so far as these problems were concerned. I believe, Sir, that the human factor is a thing common for every man entrusted with some responsibility about a business in which humanity is concerned. No man in charge of commerce or transportation can afford to deal with these questions, ignoring altogether the human aspect of the questions. Human life and human happiness are closely connected with everything which a responsible officer has to do; and if one officer in that capacity is wanting in that particular sense of humanity, I am afraid he is not fit to hold the post. Do you mean to say that you are going to appoint a humanitarian like the Revd. C. F. Andrews to take charge of the question of railway labour? If it is alleged that, out of the many officers who have been doing all sorts of work in the Railway Department, financial, commercial or transportation, only a few have got an appreciation for the "human factor", then it is undoubtedly a reflection upon the other Members. I do not think that they really can be accused of that. They are as human as possibly they can remain under the service conditions, and I don't believe that they can be more human if they are entrusted with this labour work. Therefore, Sir, that aspect of the question does not appeal to me in the least. It was no doubt an appeal—a sentimental appeal—and I consider a very injurious appeal also. I do not think it makes any material difference to the way in which this question should be considered. If we bear in mind that any person, called upon to tackle this question, will have to make exhaustive inquiries to find out how labour suffers before coming to any conclusions, then there is no valid reason to imagine that a man who is doing commercial or transportation work can not be able to do this kind of work. There is no doubt about it. It is only a question of the officer using his brains and coming to conclusions on stated points. The alleged absence of a human factor in the Member General is not in itself a reality, and cannot be seriously urged as any ground to justify the necessity for the creation of a special separate post on that account.

These are some of the points, Sir, on which I think the necessity for the creation of a separate post has not at all been made out; and the fact that the Indianisation problem is likely to be partly solved by acceding to this demand, ought not to be a consideration in the minds of Members of this House in giving their vote on the motion moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, which I support.

Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya (Madras: Indian Commerce): Sir, I do not pretend to be a railway expert, nor have I very carefully studied the railway questions. But what strikes me as very curious in this connection is that, in the long speech made by the Honourable the Commerce Member, and in the memorandum supplied to us, much stress has been laid on three points. Just as the Home Department is very fond of using law and order to explain so many things, similarly the Commerce Member and other departments find it very convenient to speak about "efficiency," "responsibility" and "experience". Now, regarding efficiency—I do not know how "efficiency" has been defined by Dr. Johnson in his dictionary—but from the dictionary of the Government of India I find that what they understand by efficiency is to try to find out how two or more men could be appointed to do the work of one man, so far as the upper services are concerned; and their idea of efficiency in the lower or subordinate departments is how one man can be made to do the work of two or more.

(At this stage Mr. President vacated the Chair which was taken by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.)

Next, Sir, I come to the matter of "responsibility". I was very much amused by the long statement of the Honourable the Commerce Member, and I was reminded of a small story. A young school boy was asked by his teacher to define "responsibility"; and pointing to the single button on his lower garment, he told his teacher "The whole responsibility hangs on this." Now, evidently, to cover the railway administration, a new garment has to be prepared and one more button has to be stitched to it, and it is just possible that, without it, the railway administration will appear in its true nakedness; and I do not see why, for the sake of this responsibility, so much fuss has been made and all these arguments have been advanced with a view to add one more Member to the already top-heavy management of the Railway Department. Now, Sir, I will come to this matter about which my friend, the Honourable Mr. Cocks, spoke so much. He said that there are gentlemen with long experience, who have worked in the mill, and all this experience of the Railway officers already there must be utilised, and it is very difficult for anybody else, to solve the questions relating to rates and all such things. In that connection I may say that, on one occasion when a certain matter was being discussed in one of the Executive Council meetings of the Governor of Madras . . .

Mr. H. G. Cocks: Were you there?

Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya: I know enough of it. As I said, when a certain matter was being discussed in one of the Executive Council meetings of the Governor of Madras, it was urged by one of the Members of the Indian Civil Service, who had been in service for nearly 25 years, that he had accumulated an experience of 25 years of Indian service, and said "It is no use putting a new man from outside". The Governor went on listening patiently to the story of the I. C. S. Member and replied to him "May I say then that you are by 25 years out of date and out of touch

[Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya.]

with such matters?" As such, Sir, it is no use making too much about efficiency, responsibility, experience and such like things. The best thing is to keep to the original idea of the Railway Board. They should mind their business in the best manner possible and they should not complicate it by bringing in extraneous matters. For these reasons, Sir, I would earnestly appeal to the Members of this Honourable House to vote for the amendment of Mr. Jamnadas Mehta.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I do not know whether my Honourable friend Sir George Rainy realises to what extent he is held in esteem by the non-official Members on this side of the House; but I never suspected that to his many qualities my Honourable friend adds that of diplomacy of a very high order. For in this proposal of his he is attempting rather the difficult operation of killing, not two, but as many as three birds with one stone. First of all, he wants this to be an effective answer to our demand for the Indianisation of the Railway Board, and I find, Sir, in referring to the gentleman who has been designated as the nominee for this appointment, no less a person than the special representative of the *Statesman* who, I suspect, is a Member of this House, describes him as belonging to the Indian Christian community. I do not know whether Mr. Hayman will confirm this description, but there it remains. It is intended to advertise to the world that the Government of India have, after all, taken an Indian in response to the demands made by the non-official Members of this House. That is the first bird which my Honourable friend the Commerce Member wants to kill.

Now, Sir, the second is to demonstrate his solicitude for labour and satisfy those well-meaning gentlemen who have the interests of labour in India and outside at heart. (*An Honourable Member*: "They are all absent.")

The third point which my Honourable friend has in mind, and which is the most important point, is to give a guarantee to the Anglo-Indian employees of the railways that their prospects will not suffer in any way under the scheme of Indianisation which the Government have adopted. Sir, I hold in my hand two memoranda of the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled community of India which they had prepared for the benefit of a particular Commission which is now, I am told, touring in India, and I find that, among other things which they demand, one is that there should be a definite enactment, a sort of statutory enactment, guaranteeing the Anglo-Indians their enjoyment of the loaves and fishes in the Railway Department. They have the frankness to admit, in one of their memoranda, that they "still enjoy a favourable percentage of appointments on the railways," but that their "future position is anything but assured." Now, my Honourable friend wants to convey the much desired assurance in this form. Ever since 1926, when the Anglo-Indians sent a deputation to England, we have been hearing a good deal about the assurances for that community in regard to their enjoyment of loaves and fishes, particularly on the railways. Now, I believe, only a few months back, the Government of India in the Home Department issued a circular to all the various departments of Government, on which the Railway Department laid very great stress, desiring that nothing should be done in the

process of Indianisation of the services which would jeopardise the position of Anglo-Indians. When the representatives of this community put forward their claim for statutory guarantees, they were openly given to understand that a statutory guarantee was out of the question. And I am absolutely confident that one of the reasons which prompted this new proposal was that the Government were anxious to secure to the Anglo-Indians what they wanted without having to take recourse to statutory guarantee which was not practical politics.

Now, Sir, when I read my Honourable friend the Commerce Member's epoch-making speech, particularly the portion that deals with this particular point, I imagined that there must have taken place a very great change in the railway administrative policy of India between the date when I was at Delhi and when I was reading that speech in Calcutta.—I imagined that, so far as the Railway Board was concerned, the Directors had all been abolished, the Deputy Directors were all loafing about the streets of Delhi adding to the unemployment problem of the country, and the Agents had all booked their passages for England, and, as a matter of fact, I thought that when I would be going back to Delhi this time, I would find no less a person than the General Member himself selling my ticket at the ticket window at Howrah and that he would again be in charge of the train as a guard, I mean the train that would take me to Delhi. For the duties, which my Honourable friend enumerated in his speech, which belong to the General Member, led me to think that perhaps he is not merely omnipresent, but also omniscient and omnipotent, and in his numerous incarnations he would be doing all the various duties that are required of all the numerous railway officers at the present day. But, Sir, when I came to this Chamber, I was reminded by my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta that the General Member was all the while closetted with no less than three stenographers, and that he was perspiring all the time in the cold of Delhi due to sheer overwork. Well, Sir, I do not know why my Honourable friend laid so much stress on his three stenographers, but this I can say; that if Mr. Sheridan is able, by his arguments, to convince the Government into creating this new job he, like his famous namesake, would perhaps be creating a School for Scandal at the Railway Board.

Now, Sir, what really are the Members of the Railway Board expected to do? Reference has already been made to the Acworth Committee's Report and to the Railway Board's Report. I will for one moment again turn to the Acworth Committee report, paragraph 110.

"The proper function of the Railway Board is not to carry out routine duties, but to shape policy, to watch, to think and to plan."

This has practically been confirmed by the Railway Board in their Administration Report, to which also reference was made by a previous speaker. In the latest Administration Report that is to hand, we find:

"The reorganisation carried out in 1924 had for one of its principal objects the relief of the Chief Commissioner and the Members from all but important work so as to enable them to keep in touch with Local Governments, railway administrations and public bodies by touring to a greater extent than they had been able to do in the past."

In connection with a question that was answered only this morning, it seems that the Railway Board has failed to achieve this primary object with which they were charged. My Honourable friend, Mr. Parsons, was

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

blissfully ignorant of what was going on, for instance, in the Bihar Legislative Council, regarding a proposal which very nearly concerns his Department. He has not cared to keep himself informed of what Resolutions may be passed by a Provincial Conference. But that is exactly what the Railway Board was expected to do, and I very much think that the Railway Board has been unnecessarily meddling in matters which really do not pertain to their legitimate functions. My Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, referred to the fact that, when the Acworth Committee recommended the creation of four Memberships, apart from the Chief Commissionership, they had in mind the possibility of the ports being added to the Railway Board. It is not merely that. If my Honourable friend will turn again to the Acworth Committee Report, he will find it is not merely the ports, but it is also internal navigation and even road transport that were expected to be included among the functions of the Railway Board.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas : Quite right.

Mr. K. C. Neogy : My Honourable friend will find from paragraph 111, for instance, that there is a Director designated there as Director of Ports, Inland Navigation and Road Transport. It is not merely the ports that they contemplated. Even the subject of inland navigation, which at the present moment forms a provincial subject, was contemplated by the Acworth Committee to be included among the many departments with which the Railway Board should be concerned, and also road transport. Therefore, I think, although they recommended four Memberships, there is ample justification for us to ask that the present number should not be exceeded. If my Honourable friend, Sir George Rainy, who, as I found last year about this time, had not made a very careful study of the Acworth Committee Report,—if he has in the meanwhile studied the Report, he will agree with me when I say that the Acworth Committee contemplated the Member for Railways concerning himself almost solely with railway problems. They recommended the creation of a portfolio of Transport of which the railways must form the most important element. If my Honourable friend were to turn to paragraph 97 of the Report he would find :

“All we ask is that there shall be a Member of Council in constant touch with railway affairs, and who feels that railways are entitled to his full attention.”

Is it because my Honourable friend, due to the reshuffling of the portfolios, does not find sufficient time to attend to his legitimate work in the Railway Department—is it because of that fact that my Honourable friend has come up for the creation of an additional Commissionership? Is he sure that he has been doing his utmost, that he has been keeping up the standard of control which his predecessor in office used to maintain over the Railway Department? Is he sure that he is not being imposed upon by people whose interest it is to create additional jobs? Is he sure, again, that he could not have made a better selection for the General Membership? It is not my intention to go into personalities, but as my Honourable friend coupled the announcement of the Government policy with the announcement of the name of the particular individual whom the Government had in mind, I cannot altogether let this opportunity go without enquiring as to what has happened to Mr. S. D. Gupta, who, I believe, up to this time last year,

held very creditably the position of the Director of Establishments? Will my Honourable friend say what is the reason that a man who has absolutely no acquaintance with the establishment branch, is being brought in for the purpose of filling this job, and what is the reason that led him to send away an experienced and more senior officer like Mr. Gupta last year?

An Honourable Member: Because he is an Indian.

Mr. B. Das: Because he is a Bengali.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: He did not satisfy the test which my Honourable friend has laid down in his heart of hearts for this appointment. He wants an Anglo-Indian. Now, Sir, I have no desire to say anything uncomplimentary about the gentleman who has been selected to fill this job. But may I inquire whether the Honourable Member in charge has kept his eyes and ears open, whether he has ever heard things which do not make out this particular gentleman to be the best fitted for being appointed Labour Member, whether he has satisfied himself that he commands, or that he would command, the confidence of the 800,000 railway employees? I have no desire to say anything further than this, that at one time I had seriously thought of moving a motion asking for an inquiry into certain allegations of jobbery with which this gentleman was associated in the past, and which to my mind do not make out this gentleman to be a very suitable candidate for the appointment which my Honourable friend wants to create?

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

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

Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, this morning, as I came into the House, an Honourable colleague of mine put me this simple question, and I want to dispose of it before proceeding into the merits of the present motion. He asked me if the House was going to give its sanction for an expenditure on railway administration for an amount in the neighbourhood of 95 crores, why is it that we are standing and protesting against this small trivial expenditure of Rs. 64,000. The answer is obvious. The friend who put me the question apparently forgot the maxims that govern the consideration of such a question. Thrift of public money is most important; and we must also resolutely resist all wasteful expenditure contemplated; and thirdly, in the working of the administration of the vast machinery of State, nothing is a trifle. We have seen also that during the last few years the expenditure on the Railway Board has nearly doubled itself; and it is almost a truism that, with the growth of expenditure, also grows a spirit of expenditure. That spirit has to be exorcised. It is for these reasons that we must see to the fact whether or not a clear case has been made out for the creation of this new appointment. Now, in this connection I would refer to the speech of the Honourable the Railway Member, who, in paragraph 25, pleads for the creation of this new appointment. He has also brought to bear upon that question his own personal experience as

[Mr. M. S. Seshu Ayyangar.]

to what he has been able to observe and also his conviction upon the point he is on. Ordinarily the words of the Honourable Member for Railways certainly do carry conviction, and I will assume for a moment that all that he says or imagines is really true. I will assume again, for the moment, that there is a case made out for thinking that there are multifarious duties which now devolve upon the Railway Board's Member General; and that he is made to perform impossibilities. Without admitting that, but assuming it for the moment, I would go further and consider whether, by a reshuffling of the portfolios of the several Members of the Railway Board, the relief wanted cannot be sought. My Honourable friend Mr. Duraiswamy Aiyangar, referring day before yesterday to the genealogy of agnates and cognates, as he chose to call them in his own humorous way, alluded to Annexure A to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, dated the 10th, 11th and 15th February. Here we are given a table showing the position of the Chief Commissioner of Railways, and of the other three Members, and we also see the various items of work, or portfolios as I may choose to call them, which pertain to the Members of the Railway Board; and I would invite the attention of the House to this fact, that the Chief Commissioner has been given absolutely no duties whatsoever; and the Honourable Member, in his speech the other day, said that the function of the Chief Commissioner is to concern himself with every aspect of the Railway administration and that he is the recognised adviser of Government in all railway questions. Taking that speech in its literal sense, and also looking at the explanatory memoranda given by the Honourable Mr. Parsons, and Annexure A attached to the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways, I find that there is absolutely no function allotted to the Chief Commissioner of Railways, except this question of general supervision. I would assume for a moment that there are multifarious duties now devolving upon the Member General and there is a special need for the purpose of providing a portfolio for labour questions and assigning it to a separate Member. If the General Member is really in need of relief, I would pertinently ask whether it is not possible to assign this labour portfolio to the Chief Commissioner of Railways. I see from the various papers put into our hands that there is absolutely nothing in the nature of a special duty attached to his office. In this connection I might also bring to the notice of the House that even higher dignitaries than the Chief Commissioner of Railways have been assigned specific portfolios. Take the case, for instance, of the Prime Minister of England. Is he without a portfolio? Take the case of His Excellency the Viceroy. Is he not provided with a portfolio? Are not foreign affairs and the relations with Indian States in that portfolio? If that is so, I would ask whether it would not be expedient to carve out this particular portfolio from out of the duties devolving upon the General Member and assigning it to the Chief Commissioner. Now, I am assuming that a case has been made out for the creation of this additional appointment, because I for one certainly appreciate the testimony of the Honourable Member for Railways. He is also sincere when he says that, from his personal experience, he did really find that the General Member is made to perform impossibilities.

I assumed that that statement was correct and upon that assumption I wanted to find a way out by making this suggestion. Sir, I said I assumed

it without admitting it, but, Sir, after honestly weighing the reasons that the Railway Member gave on the floor of this House in the speech he made the other day, which I propose to take categorically, I stand quite unconvinced of the fact that a case has been made out for the creation of this new post. My Honourable friends who preceded me, especially the last speaker, Mr. Neogy, referred this House to page 100 of the Administration Report of the Railway Board for 1927-28, where we find:

"The reorganisation carried out in 1924 had for one of its principal objects the relief of the Chief Commissioner and the Members from all but important work, so as to enable them to devote their attention to larger questions of railway policy."

Lower down in the same page we see:

"Further experience of the reduction of work resulting from the large delegation of powers and responsibility to the Agents of State-managed railways and the Board of Directors of Company-managed railways enabled a re-arrangement of work to be made."

So that it now transpires from these extracts that, even in 1926-27, the railway administration thought it advisable to curtail their staff. But what has happened since, during 1927-28 and 1928-29, which has emboldened the railway administration to say, "We want this post now very badly"? We are not given any materials which show what has occurred, to support the special plea that has been made for the creation of this new post. The responsibility that has been allotted to the Agents of State-managed railways and to the Board of Management for company-managed railways has been such that we see on page 5 of the same Report that it has given occasions for the Railway Board Members to indulge in several very pleasant trips; because on page 5 we find:

"The Railway Board held general meetings with the Agents of the principal railways in October 1927 at Simla and in March 1928 at Delhi when a number of important subjects were discussed. Visits were also paid to the Board at different times during the year by several Agents."

Thus, there are opportunities given for Railway Board Members to acquaint themselves in detail with the subjects which concern the several railways. Visits were also paid to the Board at different times by several Agents.

"Apart from these meetings and visits, 37 visits were paid by the Chief Commissioner, Financial Commissioner or a Member of the Board to the headquarters of Railway Administrations and 11 to Local Governments."

These Members have had so much relief, that under the new dispensation, they were able to find occasion to make as many as 37 visits to the several Agents. That showed clearly that they have not had enough work to do at their headquarters, since they had occasion to make as many as 37 visits to the mofussil. That makes out a case for thinking that there is not so much work falling on the shoulders of these Members as we are now asked to believe. I would also submit to the House that, taking the reasons mentioned by the Honourable Member for Railways categorically, there is no case made out. What he has chosen to say is that, of the three persons who constitute the Railway Board, apart from the Financial Commissioner, who has important financial functions to perform, there is the Member, Technical, who concerns himself with technical questions of railway engineering, etc. We will not disturb him nor the Financial Commissioner. Now from this table we find that the General Member has got two portfolios, Establishment and Traffic. Now this Traffic is

[Mr. M. S. Sessa Ayyangar.]

subdivided into two categories. Traffic, we are told, includes transportation and commercial. That is not a new classification as it did exist before. I daresay he has been attending to these duties under "commercial" or "transportation". But under these two enlarged sub-divisions the scope of his work has become so large that it is impossible to ask this General Member wholly to devote himself to these duties as well as his own; so by merely mentioning commercial and transportation, his work becomes larger. I don't know if, by this verbal sub-division the work is increased or is simply divided into two parts, as distinct categories. But they take the two heads and then split them into two or three sub-heads.

Then it is said under the heading "Commercial" there is the problem of rating, the fixing of rates and fares, and working towards securing the maximum volume of traffic. Now in this connection I may bring to the notice of the House that, in pursuance of the demand that was made some time ago that a special tribunal be set up, a Rates Advisory Committee was established; but we do not hear of this Advisory Committee at all during any portion of the financial year; but once in a year we come across the existence of the tribunal, because there is a special heading given to it in the Demands for Grants. On page 49 of the Demands for Grants, Annexure D to Demand No. 11, we come across the existence of this Committee. But what are the duties which they have performed? In the Railway Administration Report we are told that, during the year 1927-28, there were only four cases reported by this Committee. I pertinently ask the Honourable Member for Railways, is it not high time really that the powers of this Rates Tribunal are enhanced like what obtains in England, enabling them to make a uniform classification of rates, and also to find out whether a particular rate adds unduly to the cost of manufacture? By enhancing the functions of this Tribunal, it would afford also the relief which the Honourable Member for Railways is so much in need of. This Committee, if I can venture to say so without disrespect, has for the last two or three years done nothing, for it has only been able to dispose of four cases during the last year. This Committee has not justified its existence, and I therefore say that any relief that the General Member of the Railway Board must have in certain directions can be obtained by enhancing the powers of this Advisory Committee.

Then, Sir, it is said that the Railway has to administer an establishment and this establishment is divided into two compartments under the new dispensation, namely, staff and labour. Did not the staff exist before? Did not labour exist before? They say that they have to look after the staff, which now amounts to about eight lakhs of people. All that entails additional work, and therefore they want an additional Member. It is also said that it is possible that they can take into their account under State-management certain company-managed railways, and that problems connected with the incorporation of the staff of those company-managed railways into State railway service may arise. If that were so, I would expect the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways to say so plainly and frankly. He will tell us whether the Government are going to take such and such a company-managed railway into State management, which would entail additional problems relating to staff, management, and so on. No such thing was done. In the light of the answers to the persistent questions that were raised this morning on behalf of the Bengal and North Western Railway, I am led to think that there is no

occasion in the immediate future to take any company-managed railways into State management. If there is a possibility of any company-managed railways being taken into State management in the immediate future, I can understand questions arising such as the incorporation of that railway staff into State railway service; and such problems would certainly entail additional labour, which may have to be assigned to a new Member.

Then it is said that the welfare of labour will be better looked after and also looked into in greater detail. Let us now see the so-called advantages pertaining to the welfare of labour. In para. 27, the Honourable the Commerce Member says:

“Here it may suffice to give only one or two illustrations of the kind of question which, under our existing organisation, it is almost impossible to handle adequately or expeditiously. One is the organisation of the method by which labour disputes on the railways should be handled and the relations of the railway management with the trades unions.”

Now I ask, Sir, whether it is not a fact that the recognition of the trades unions is now assigned to the Agents of several railways. Does any Railway Member look into the question of recognition of trades unions? As a matter of fact it occurs in almost every railway: The recognition or otherwise of any trade union is a matter pertaining entirely to the Agents of the railways concerned. Yet we are told that this is one of the multifarious duties consequent upon the new organisation of labour and that it would entail additional labour and responsibility on the shoulders of this already hard-worked General Member, and therefore we are told, that they want relief by the creation of this new Member, called the Labour Member. It is also said in para. 24:

“The General Member, as I have said, must, on the commercial side, pay particular regard to the interests of the railway customers, and his main anxiety must be to keep down costs, so that rates and fares may be kept at a level which will attract the maximum volume of traffic.”

So it is suggested that there is really a conflict of interests and decisions, which the Honourable the Commerce Member envisages, consequent upon the labour question being taken more largely into consideration; that is to say, the Member who chances to sit on labour questions has to devise means, which, according to him, may militate against the interest of the Traffic Member who has to minister to the wants of his constituents or customers. I ask, Sir, whether the Railway Board to be newly constituted with the addition of one Member, is to be so constituted that conflicts in decisions really will arise between one Member and another. Do they not work as a happy family of four or five Members all put together? Do they not all work in unison with absolutely no ground whatsoever, or with no possibility of any conflict of decisions arrived at between two Members? If there is this potentiality of dissensions creeping in, and if you want to obviate this possibility of dissensions, is there any hope that, by the separation of labour questions and giving them to a labour Member, this question will be solved? Lastly it was said, almost in the closing words of that speech, there was a mild threat, so to say, that if the House would not consider the advisability of granting the creation of the additional labour Member, there was the possibility that important interests might suffer. I take it, Sir, that, even if the House does not agree to the creation of this new Membership, the Honourable the Commerce Member will consider it expedient to see that no important interests will suffer as a matter of fact.

[Mr. M. S. Seshu Ayyangar.]

In another portion of his speech hopes are held out for labour. With the creation of a new Member for Labour, who will be put in charge specifically of labour questions, it is possible that that Member may strive his best to raise the standard of life of the staff and would also look to the ministrations of the wants of the staff. I take it also that we do not understand these sentiments as meaning that, if the House does not agree to the creation of this new post, these things will be held in abeyance. These, in short, are the various grounds that are detailed in these paragraphs in the latter portion of the speech of the Honourable the Commerce Member, and these require consideration. I submit to the House that none of these considerations has really appealed to me and we are firmly convinced that, not only has no case been made out for the creation of this new Membership, but also it is possible, as I started stating that, by a reshuffling of the portfolios, so to say, it is perfectly possible, under the existing arrangements, to devise means, for making the Chief Commissioner of Railways attend to this question also—labour questions specially—and thereby providing the means of securing the remedies which the Honourable the Commerce Member has so much at heart in the case of labour. I therefore support the motion of the Honourable Mr. Jamnadas Mehta.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, in intervening in this debate at a very late stage, my sole justification is this, that being a representative of this House on the Standing Railway Finance Committee, and one of the members who was not convinced at that time as to the necessity of a special Member in addition to the present Members on the Railway Board, and who still remains unconvinced about that necessity, I think it is due to the House that I should make a few observations for the consideration of my Honourable friends. Sir, I do not pretend to have that intimate acquaintance with the working of the Railway Board which my predecessors have claimed. My acquaintance with the Railway Board arises through the luxurious saloons in which Members of the Board travel from time to time which are the envy and despair of all of us who often travel on the same trains in crowded compartments. Therefore I am speaking purely from the point of view of a layman who is anxious to consider this question as carefully as he can, and, as far as possible, to give his vote in the right way. I do submit, Sir, that it is by a side door that this question is being introduced into this House. I should have very much preferred that a much larger debate, with much greater material in front of us, had taken place on this question as to the necessity of enlarging the Railway Board by the addition of a new Member. I should have preferred a much bigger debate in the sense that we had better material in front of us, better data, better figures than are available when a Demand cut is discussed in this House. I will begin by pointing out that my own mind was originally somewhat inclined towards the proposal when I read the statement in the memorandum which was submitted to me as a Member of the Railway Standing Finance Committee. It reads as follows:

"First the problems relating to labour have in the past three years been rapidly growing in number, importance, and complexity and would in any event have required increased attention and investigation by the Railway Board, even if the number of railways directly under State management had remained the same."

I thought for a few minutes—but the opinion did not last for a long time, when I came into close proximity with the facts of the case—that there was going to be a Member specially in charge of labour problems, whose whole duty would be to revise labour policy, to go into labour questions and their complexity, and to arrive at a solution. Therefore, Sir, I demanded further information in the Railway Standing Finance Committee. An important Member of that Board came and gave us information, as a result of which it turned out that, so far from this additional Member being required for problems of labour, he was necessary, because the work of the General Member had increased. I must admire, Sir, the frankness with which the admission was made by that Member of the Railway Board who gave evidence before us, that nine-tenths of his work was at present concerned with establishment and other allied questions, and only one-tenth was concerned with labour

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: Sir, may I correct Mr. Jayakar's statement as to what happened in the Standing Finance Committee and what was said by Mr. Sheridan there? I am sure he is under a misapprehension, Sir.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar: The statement was likewise made by Mr. Aney this morning.

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: I did not either quite catch what he said or I may not have been in the House. But what Mr. Sheridan said was that nine-tenths of his time was occupied with staff questions, which of course included labour questions also, and that only one-tenth of his time was left to deal with transportation work.

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I take the liberty of correcting Mr. Parsons? A question was put to Mr. Sheridan as to what was the time occupied by him in considering labour questions, and to that question the reply was, nine-tenths was occupied with staff questions, and one-tenth with labour.

Mr. M. R. Jayakar: That is exactly my own recollection, Sir. That reply was given to a straight question put to the Member who appeared to give evidence before us as to what time proportionately was taken up by labour questions in comparison with the questions which did not relate to labour. I have a very clear recollection, Sir, that the proportion was admitted to be nine to one. But I do not want to labour that point further if my Honourable friend Mr. Parsons says that that was not what the Member intended to say. But, apart from that, even on the note submitted to this House, Sir, it is perfectly clear from the first two paragraphs—which I do not wish to weary this House by reading—that labour constitutes only a small fraction of the work which this new Member will be called upon to do. That cannot be denied; I do not think even my Honourable friend Mr. Parsons will deny that, that labour problems will be only a small fraction of the work which this new Member will be called upon to do. It will only be a small part of his duties. Therefore, those Honourable Members who are inclined to take a favourable view of this proposal on the ground that here we are going to have some kind of special expert machinery which will deal with labour problems, in the form of a Member who specially and exclusively deals only with labour questions on railways, are going entirely on the wrong track. Practically what we are asked to do, if I may say so without being unfair to the other side, is to give one more additional Member to the present four Members of the

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

Railway Board. That is the real situation. When the question is so presented, Sir, to a person like me who knows a little of the origin of this Railway Board, he has a very vital objection to this proposal. That objection, Sir, is grounded on a sound principle, and takes this form. We are, by giving this additional Member to the Railway Board for such a general purpose, departing very widely from the original conception of the Railway Board. (Hear, hear.) We are practically converting the Railway Board into a group of departmental heads. That was not the original conception of the Railway Board, as Mr. Jamnadas Mehta made clear this morning, as also my Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. The Railway Board is not a group of departmental heads like, *e.g.*, the Executive Council of the Governor General. It was intended to be a group of a few expert people,—and from this point of view the fewer they are the better for the Board—whose main function was to initiate policies, to evolve principles, and to perform that detached mental work which cannot be done by mere departmental heads immersed in departmental details. It is something bigger than a departmental head's work. It has to look at large problems from a distance in a sort of bird's eye view and initiate policies on broad principles affecting the entire system of railways in India. *Ex hypothesi*, when we take such a conception of the Railway Board the fewer Members there are on the Railway Board, the better. We are now asked to embark on a policy which, apart from its expensiveness, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, is, on general principles, not desirable. I will mention only a few figures. The Railway Board began with Rs. 8·20 lakhs in 1921. Then Sir Clement Hindley brought forward suggestions and recommendations for expansion and consolidation, based upon the proposals of the Acworth Committee. He added another Rs. 1·50 lakhs; that means Rs. 9·70 lakhs. Then the figure was raised at a subsequent stage to Rs. 12 lakhs and odd. Now, if my Honourable friend will turn to the figures given in the statement relating to this demand, they will find the figure now is Rs. 17 lakhs and odd. Therefore, there is no doubt that we are proceeding at a very rapid pace. If my Honourable friends will only look at the expense side of this question, they will agree with my view. We are really proceeding at a very extravagant pace. Besides, if once we accept the principle that the moment work increases in some departments, departmental heads are to be created to sit as additional Members of the Railway Board—that is the real principle we are asked to accept—where shall we draw the line? Already my Honourable friend Mr. Cocke has sounded the note that ports may come into the hands of the railways and a separate Member may be necessary. I know, as the Chairman of the Roads Development Committee which sat last year, that a proposal may eventually materialize that certain all-India roads may be separated from provincial control and given into the hands of the Railway Board. A year or two hence, if we accept the principle now, another Member may be asked for for new needs. So, we have a Member for ports, another for roads, and so on; and so in the evolutionary period of Indian national life, I can quite conceive, in a few years' time, six new Members may be added to the Railway Board. The departmental work must naturally increase in course of time, but that does not mean that the Members of the Railway Board should also increase in proportion. If we want to retain the original conception of the Railway Board, as I have stated it before, *viz.*, a group of a few select men who sit, like the General

behind the warfare in their room, and lay down policies, then the fewer Members we add to the existing number of Members of this Railway Board, the better will it be for efficiency. That is, Sir, my strongest objection to the granting of this particular Demand.

I am aware, Sir, that, as my Honourable friend Mr. Neogy said, the Honourable the Commerce Member is killing three birds with one stone. It is said that he is, by the addition of this new Member, meeting our claim for Indianization. Sir, this is the most objectionable part of the proposal which we on this side of the House feel as an insult to public feeling. It is this, that we are now being given an Indian on the Board by an expensive door by which we do not want him to enter at all. No public man ever suggested that the Indian Member of the Railway Board should come in by the creation of a new and expensive door. What public opinion has wanted is that, out of the existing four Members, one should be an Indian when the occasion arises. (Hear, hear.) It is not meeting the public demand for Government to say:

“We won't give up what we have got of the British element on the Board, *i.e.*, the four European Members that are already there; but if Indians want the luxury of an Indian Member, they must pay for it by the creation of an expensive new post.”

I know the Honourable the Commerce Member is always fair to this House, and probably this aspect of the question did not strike him. Therefore, it is my duty to point out as a non-official Member that the principle is wrong that Indianization can only proceed with the creation of new expensive posts. Government are here putting public opinion at a great disadvantage. Public opinion did want a new post for an Indian Member. It did not want an Indian Member by having another expensive post created for the first time under a pretentious name, for which the public will have to pay an extra Rs. 64,000. The public demand is—and let Government deal with it fairly—that out of the four seats which Government have reserved for the British element, on the Railway Board, let them give one to an Indian. Government are not meeting the public demand fairly by saying: “Well, if you want to have the luxury of an Indian Member, you must pay for it”.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Why not criticise that and give this up?

Mr. M. R. Jayakar: Therefore, Sir, what I want to say is that this is wrong in principle, and we object to such a principle, which will, if accepted, be a mischievous precedent. Some Members made a suggestion, Sir, in the Railway Standing Finance Committee, that if it was merely a question of some one person attending to the growing problems of labour, that could as well be done by having a Deputy Director. Personally, I was even prepared to go further and have a Director. But to have another Member for the plain ground that the general work of the Board has grown, sounds to me, Sir, like departing entirely from the original conception of the Railway Board. A better plan would be, Sir, to have a re-inquiry as to whether it would not be possible to readjust the portfolios, as Mr. Sesha Ayyangar said in his speech. If the work of the Railway Board has grown immensely and if the circumstances require readjustment, certainly this House would be quite willing to have an inquiry made whether, having regard to the changed conditions, the ways of doing work cannot be once more so adjusted as to secure efficiency without departing from the original conception of the Railway Board. That would be the easiest and

[Mr. M. R. Jayakar.]

fairest way of dealing with this problem. But if Government want to have this question discussed within the narrow purview of a demand for a grant, I think the non-official Members in this House would be compelled to oppose it on the grounds I have indicated.

Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, in regard to the statement made by the Railway Member in answer to my inquiry, I find that strong criticism has been evoked from some Members of this House. I have also listened, with very great attention, to the criticism of my Honourable friend Mr. Jayakar on this subject. Now, Sir, my point was that the Railway Member had come forward with a proposal, without taking into consideration the claims for the appointment of an Indian, which we have been pressing on him, out of the four existing Members of the Railway Board. That was my point, and to that point the Railway Member replied that he did not want to put it in the statement which he had presented to this House by way of a speech on the presentation of the budget, but that if Members wanted to know whether there was a desire on the part of the Government of India to have an Indian, they would be prepared to consider the question of an Indian regarding the fifth post. I must say, Sir, it is unfortunate that a frank statement like that from the Railway Member should have been criticised in the way my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta thought fit to do. Sir, the Railway Member only wanted to make a perfectly frank statement, namely, that he is not only considering the question of appointing an Indian, but that he is going to appoint Mr. So-and-So to that post. This side of the House, he knows perfectly well, has got a strong feeling in regard to the difference between a real Indian and a half Indian or Anglo-Indian, and the Honourable Member was good enough to tell the House that his intention was, if the post is created that it should go to Mr. Hayman, whom we all know, and with whom it has been a matter of great pleasure to me to have worked when I was a member of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways.

Sir, as regards the question raised by my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta, I have possibly failed to understand it, because, in the whole of his speech he has been arguing regarding a policy of retrenchment, namely, he told us that the figure of expenditure has gone up from Rs. 8,20,000 to Rs. 15 lakhs, and now it is Rs. 17,50,000. If he talks of retrenchment and comes forward with a proposal to appoint a retrenchment committee or a retrenchment officer to look into the extravagant expenditure of the Railway Board or the Railway administration, I am always with him. Now, Sir, as regards this post there are two distinct things to be kept in mind. One is the creation of a post, and another is the additional expenditure that will be involved in creating the post. I could quite understand if my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta had said:

"You can certainly create this post if the Standing Finance Committee or the Legislative Assembly are in favour of the creation of such a post, but as far as the money is concerned, you will have to find the expenditure in the budget that we sanction for this year, because the Rs. 64,000 additional amount we think is not justifiable. You will have to retrench to the extent of Rs. 64,000 from the present budget, even if you prove the necessity for creating this post."

My Honourable friend Mr. Jayakar has pointed out, Sir, that the Railway Board should consist only of experts, and that they should lay down the

policy for the railway administrations to follow. He knows perfectly well what the labour point of view is. He knows also perfectly well the manner in which the labour problems are being faced from time to time, and if there is a Member who can look after and dictate the policy as regards labour questions, I do not see what possible objection he can have to the creation of a post of a Labour Member. The point, Sir, as I understand it, is whether it should be an Indian or a non-Indian. I entirely agree with my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta that, as far as this question is concerned, it should not be mixed up with anything else, such as that we are going to give this appointment to an Indian, or are creating it because there is an offer that this appointment is to go to an Indian. We want to debate it on its own merits. But I remember, Sir, that, whenever the creation of posts comes up in the Standing Finance Committee, we have invariably asked this question, and my Honourable friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta will bear me out, that there is no position or post which an Indian cannot fill with credit, and if there is a proposal that an Indian is not to be appointed, my friend Mr. Jamnadas has gone to the length of saying that it is financially unsound. The simple reason is that we have felt a just grievance against the Railway Board who have deliberately ignored the claims of Indians on the most flimsy grounds. If you were, Sir, to inquire into today's answer of Mr. Parsons to my Honourable friend over here, you would see that he told us that qualified Indians were not available, and therefore they are being trained, and as time goes on, he will be able to reach the figure of 75 per cent. Now, Sir, this side of the House is prepared—I say on the floor of this House with a full responsibility for the statement—that we will be able to give him a large number of qualified Indians, provided he is prepared to appoint them. Our difficulty, Sir, is that we have got highly technically trained Indians, specially for the engineering department, coming with full diplomas from Europe, which more than satisfy the requirements of the Railway Board, and when they come here, the question which Mr. Parsons or his Board has to decide is, the question of colour. If he looks into his department, he will bear me out, that there are hundreds of Europeans who are appointed on a thousand and over irrespective of any other consideration except colour. May I ask him what are the qualifications of these gentlemen? It was, Sir, with this apprehension, that I raised this question at the very first moment, because after we create an office or a post, Honourable Members of this House are perfectly aware that, as far as the actual appointment is concerned, we have no say in the matter. There are at present four Railway Board Members, and my Honourable friend Mr. Aney said that this House, by a majority, declared that one of them should be an Indian. We have seen that our claims have been ignored, when an Indian might have been put in place of Sir Austen Hadow, who went on leave, or in place of Sir Clement Hindley, who retired. Therefore, Sir, while the creation of a post is in the hands of this House, the actual appointment is with the Railway Board; and that is why I said that, when we debate the merits of the appointment, we want to know what the policy of the Government of India will be with regard to it, if the appointment is created. Now, Sir, I personally, and some of us here, are well acquainted with the work and worth of Mr. Hayman. We can testify to the sincere desire he has for the aspirations of India, and he has recently also, as I know perfectly well, taken a keen interest on the question of labour and has sent up several proposals for the attention of the Railway Board as far as labour problems are concerned. Nevertheless, I think that the House ought to consider the

[Mr. Fazal Ibrahim Rahimtulla.]

question of the necessity of creation of the appointment apart from the expenditure involved thereby. The extravagant expenditure, or waste of public money is a question which should be decided on its own merits.

My friend, Mr. Jayakar, has pointed out from the memorandum which he read, and which is now before the House in the shape of the Committee's Report, one paragraph in which it is mentioned why this labour Member was necessary. I shall quote another paragraph from the speech of the Honourable the Commerce Member, which was delivered when he presented the budget, in which he made out a case. He says:

"It may suffice to give only one or two illustrations of the kind of question which, under our existing organisation, it is almost impossible to handle adequately or expeditiously. One is the organisation of the method by which labour disputes on the railways should be handled, and the relations of the railway management with the trades unions. From the nature of the case, these are matters which must frequently engage the attention of this House, and in which the Railway Member will frequently be called on to explain and justify the attitude of Government."

Sir, I was one of those who, with my friend Mr. Joshi, on a certain railway labour strike, wired to the Railway Board to intervene immediately and do the needful; and we have seen that the Railway Board has not been a very alert body as far as labour questions are concerned. My friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta has rightly pointed out that the Railway Board have not done their duty; and to-day, if they want to do their duty, they should do it without the creation of a new post. But if the Government of India tell us that, with the staff they have at present they are not able to do that duty, which we expect from them, or to our satisfaction, I do not think it is wrong for them to ask for the creation of an appointment and justify it on the ground that it was badly needed in order to satisfy the just claims and aspirations of people on this side of the House.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I am not quite sure whether the Honourable Members who have preceded me are really so serious about their opposition to this grant of Rs. 64,000. I do not mean, serious about their opposition, but about the necessity of adducing arguments when the Government has made up its mind. I thought they might have profitably remembered the saying of Mr. Cobden who with respect to a particular newspaper, said "Whenever I saw that this newspaper approved of a certain conduct of mine, I had a suspicion that probably I was wrong." I think Indian Members who have really any patriotism in them must know, whatever proposal comes from the opposite side, the same is not for their benefit but for their exploitation. I also know

Mr. K. Ahmed: But some of them are Indians.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: There are Indian Members and Indian Members. I know there are Indian Members in this Assembly who would sell their birthright for a mess of pottage. I know that there are people who, for a jewelled sash or a ribbon to stick to their coat or a title to cover their base birth, would sell their birthright, which an honest Indian would not. Sir, I do not know whether my estimate about the attitude of the Members who have preceded me is correct or not, because the Honourable President will kindly excuse me if I submit to him that I have been

dragged from my sick bed and I think my temperature is still more than 100.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Then why do you trouble?

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: I do not think I should sit down at the dictate of any man here save and except the one man whom we have raised to that position there.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Your medical adviser will be dissatisfied.

Mr. Amar Nath Dutt: Sir, I think this is not the place for buffoonery always, and I think we may expect some amount of protection from buffoons. Sir, I was very sorry that Mr. Neogy was so hard upon the Anglo-Indian community, as also upon our rulers, the Englishmen. Of course I have never been able to differentiate between an Englishman and an Anglo-Indian save and except that certain services had to be given to men of lower position in society under the name of statutory Indians. I never made any distinction, because our spleens were ruptured both by real Englishmen and also by Anglo-Indians, because we were turned out from compartments reserved for Europeans, both by real Englishmen as also by men who now style themselves Anglo-Indians. There is a proverb in Bengali which says, that you can bear the heat of the sun, but you cannot bear the heat of the sand which becomes warm by the heat of the sun. It is so with us. But my friend, Mr. Neogy, forgot one thing and that is this: that these Englishmen must have a soft corner in their hearts for these men for obvious reasons; and that is a thing which ought to have silenced my friend, Mr. Neogy, when commenting upon Mr. Hayman's appointment. As for the charges brought against the proposed incumbent, who is to come in for this Rs. 64,000 a year, by which some votes are to be captured by saying, "We are going to appoint an Indian", I beg to submit that those who swallow such pills, would swallow any other pill also. So it was not necessary for the Government to say, "We are going to appoint an Indian."

Now, Sir, about this Railway Board, I think very few here are more conversant about the affairs of this Railway Board from its very inception, than myself; and I can say, with an amount of certainty which no body can claim here, because when this Board came into existence in the early part of the 20th century, Sir Frederic Upcott who was an Executive Engineer at one time, came out as the first Chairman of the Railway Board. And I was told by an Honourable Member of the Governor General's Executive Council, whom I do not see here at the present moment, that Sir Frederic expressed himself, in the words that formerly there were three *lats* in Simla, but now there are four *lats*: one was the *Jungi Lat*, another was the *Chota Lat*, another was the *Burra Lat*, and the fourth was himself. I have known Sir Frederic Upcott ever since I was a boy and he was one of the finest of men. But such men were also not above a little vanity. If my friend had remembered all these things, he would not have objected to the creation of these posts. Sir, before the creation of the Railway Board, there was only one Member in the Governor General's Council and under him a Secretary, who used to manage the affairs of the Public Works Department, which consisted not only of railways but also of irrigation, provincial works, and

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

military works. It was never explained how suddenly their duties became so onerous, necessitating the creation of the Railway Board, with highly paid officers; but probably I forget that this is a stage in our constitutional exploitation by the foreigner, and so they must have increased the number of Members of the Board. Sir, some of my friends behind me do not wish that I should speak any more in my present state of health, and so I shall conclude with opposing this demand.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, to-day we are discussing principles and policies. So far, the principles of the Honourable the Railway Member and of the Honourable Mr. Parsons have been questioned as far as this appointment of a fifth Member is concerned, as they have not cared to abide by the decision of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways. We have all along been told on the floor of this House and elsewhere in committee meetings that we should always abide by the decisions of the Standing Finance Committee,—their decisions had been treated as sacrosanct—and we have been told on numerous occasions not to say anything against the decision of that Committee. Here we find that the Standing Finance Committee for Railways has decided, by a majority, not to have a fifth Member, but the Government have not cared to abide by their decision and have rebelled against the very principle which they had advocated on previous occasions. Again, Sir, Indianization had been the one principle on which great emphasis was always laid by this side of the House, and although a colleague of the Honourable the Railway Member—the former finance member—once assured us that an Indian would occupy a place on the hierarchy of the Railway Board, that definite pledge was broken by the Government of India a few months thereafter. Thereafter, when we pressed that at least one or two Members of the Railway Board should be Indians, they trotted out the idea that no Indian is technically fit to be the technical expert on the Railway Board. That Honourable gentleman, Sir Clement Hindley, is not any more in the Government of India. He started a small school at Chandausi to train up the boys of our subordinate staff in the Railway Department. When these boys are trained up, it is said that they will rise to be Members of the Railway Board after 30 or 40 years. So it is impossible, if the principle which at times my Honourable friend Mr. Parsons and the Honourable the Railway Member advocate is true, that any Indian will ever get the chance to be a Technical Member of the Railway Board or the General Member for Railways. And to-day, under the guise of Indianization you throw just a few crumbs at us. You dangle Mr. Hayman as the fifth Member! Why then adopt this device? Mr. P. R. Rau becomes the Financial Commissioner for six months, and we are asked why we should not be satisfied. Sir, We are not going to be treated like children. We are not going to be satisfied with this toy train—like the one exhibited at the publicity exhibition—where guard Hayman and driver Rau pretend to play with the railways. That toy train gives us no responsibility. We want complete control. We want to administer the Indian Railways, and the Railway Board therefore should be controlled by Indians. If you want to satisfy the principle that the Railway Board and the Indian railway system belong to India and Indians, there should be Indians to manage it. My friend Mr. Cocke laughed at Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas when he said that principles had changed, and asked, "Where will you

find Indians to sit on the Railway Board? Where will you find them?" Why should my friend Mr. Cocke go so far in search of men to sit on the Railway Board? We have here men like Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas and Sir Victor Sassoon, who manage large industrial concerns worth many crores of capital. . . .

Sir Victor Sassoon (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): We only travel in railway carriages.

Mr. B. Das: Where technical work is concerned, they as directors are quite capable of guiding the technical advisers under them. Why should not Indian Members be on the Railway Board to direct the policy of the technical assistants who will be confined to the position of Directors? But, Sir, that is not the policy of the Government of India. It is a vicious principle that actuates always the policy of the Government of India and that is working behind it. Well, we wanted provincial autonomy—and we got diarchy. They gave us an Indian Governor, and Lord Sinha was appointed for a few months as the only Indian Governor of a province. We wanted Indian Executive Councillors, and the Government doubled, and in some cases trebled the existing number of Executive Councillors in the provinces and they have been administering in some places one part of a minor subject, and that's how Indians have been given a so-called share in the administration of the country. Well, that is not the thing, Sir, that we want. We want real responsibility. We want to control the Railway Board. What is the use of saying that the Assembly control the railway management, when they defy the Indian public opinion and day by day Europeanise the Department, and when the Indian does not get a chance to control the activities of the Board?

Sir, I once said on the floor of this House, and I again repeat it, that it was the famous cut of Rs. 77,000 that gave the chance to Board to do away with a number of Indians who were working as engineers and traffic officers. Today if one looks at the number of staff in the Railway Board, one finds very few Indians, and I am sorry my friend Mr. Kaul, a capable Indian Officer, passed away, and I understand an European takes his place. I hear that another European is going to occupy the post of Mr. Hayman when he vacates it. We are also told that a Traffic official of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway will come and take the place of Mr. P. R. Rau. Why this policy of distrust? Mr. Parsons has told us on numerous occasions on the floor of this House that he has got the highest respect for Indians in the Finance Department, to which service he once belonged though not at present. Well, can't you find another Indian to replace Mr. P. R. Rau or Mr. Hayman? But then there is the policy of distrust everywhere. You want to balance the power, as my friend Mr. Neogy says. It is the balance of power that you want to maintain. We want Indian Executive Councillors—all right you say you will add a few more; for instance, in the Bombay Government you have two Europeans and two Indians. So if Mr. Rau becomes the Financial Commissioner, you want to bring in an European, who is a Traffic official, who does not know the "F" of Finance. That is not the right thing. If we are the owners of the Indian railways, then we ought to have full control over our railway administration. I am not talking here politics. I am talking business. In our business management we exercise full control, but so far as the policy of railway administration is concerned, it has all gone the wrong way. If my friend Mr. Parsons, who had the privilege

[Mr. B. Das.]

to work with Sir Clement Hindley, is working out the theory that on various occasions was trotted out that *mistries'* sons should be trained in the school at Chandausi and then they will be fit to occupy the superior technical posts in the engineering department and other branches, then, I say, unless there is some kind of a revolution that will do away entirely with the European element, there is no chance whatever for any Indian to occupy the position as a Member of the Railway Board.

Sir, I do not want to countenance the creation of this new post. The time has not come for it. There is the Royal Commission on Labour which will be coming out shortly; and let that body decide on your acts of commissions and omissions on labour problems.

My Honourable friend Sir George Rainy, for whom I have the highest respect, and who, I know, has a detached mind and keeps himself aloof from all political intrigues and scandals, and who always brings in a freshness of mind to all problems—my Honourable friend, Sir George Rainy, has been persuaded, I think, to adopt this course in order that, when the Royal Commission on Labour arrives in this country, it may be shown that there is a Labour Member on the Railway Board doing one-tenth of the work of examining questions of labour! May I ask Government, what they have done to organise trade unions among the labour population in the different railways? Have you encouraged it? I do not know if you have encouraged it. You have not instructed the Agents of the various railways to organise labour into proper trade unions so that they can deal with labour problems in a proper manner. You have not given any help, any assistance to the labour, to organise. You want probably to throw dust into the eyes of the Labour Commission to show that you are doing something.

Mr. K. Ahmed: The argument seems to be very dusty.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, I will be no party to the creation of this new post until I find that Government is loyal to India, and until the Government have two Indian Members out of the four Members on the Railway Board. Until that time I will be no party to any such proposal as is before the House. With regard to what has fallen from most of my Honourable friends, I agree that one of the four Members, whether he is a European or an Indian, can look into the labour questions, but he should have to possess a large and humane mind. I am not going to criticise the functions of Mr. Hayman, but it is problematic, how far as financier, who has all his life been dealing with financial problems, will look into labour questions, and, in the absence of any expression of the labour view point on the floor of the House, how far he will be successful we do not know. But I am glad to find one thing. Last year in the debate on the Railway Budget, when we brought the problems of *social welfare* to the attention of the Honourable the Railway Member, he thought that they were not within the compass of his purview at the time, but I am glad that, within a year, he has changed his view and he wants to have a Labour Member who will look into the social welfare of the labour population. There also without being charged by the Honourable the Railway Member that we are very suspicious, I will say this, that when we ask Government to Indianise the Railways, they try to Indianise from the bottom. They appoint a few more coolies and a few more clerks. But when you want

to look after the problems of labour they suddenly spring forth upon us a Labour Member on a high salary, with the proviso that nine-tenths of his time will be devoted to establishment problems, namely, those relating to superior services, and that he will do very little work on the labour side. Strange, indeed! Sir, with these few observations, I strongly oppose the creation of this new post in the Railway Board.

Mr. President: I do not know if Honourable Members desire that this debate should be carried over to Monday.

Several Honourable Members: No. Let the question be now put.

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

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Sometimes, in this House, when speakers from the Opposition Benches are levelling an attack upon the Government I feel a certain difficulty in living up to the character that is attributed to me. For instance, when I hear the Government referred to as a Satanic Government, I never feel that I quite look the part. My Honourable friend, Mr. Das, today has put me in a new difficulty by drawing a picture of a Sir Galahad of such complete purity that probably he would not even venture into the Lobby. There, again, I have a certain difficulty in accepting the compliment at its face value.

Before I deal with the more important points which have been raised in the course of this debate, there are two small points which I should like to get out of the way at the outset. They are not, I think, very material to the main issue, but they were points about which there seemed to be some little difference of opinion, and out of courtesy to the Members who mentioned them it is perhaps as well that I should refer to them. One of them was raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jayakar. His statement was that the Standing Finance Committee had received a statement from a Member of the Railway Board that nine-tenths of his time was taken up by establishment questions leaving only one-tenth for labour work. That I think was the impression left upon my Honourable friend's mind. I am informed that what he certainly meant to say, and what he believes he did say, was that nine-tenths were taken up by establishment questions, leaving only one-tenth for transportation, and that he regarded the establishment questions as including and covering labour questions. I should like to add from my own knowledge, and here I can speak positively, that one-tenth of his time would be wholly insufficient for dealing with the questions which come under the head of Labour. I have the best reasons for knowing that, when there is labour unrest in any railway workshop or on any railway system, much of the time of the General Member of the Railway Board is taken up in discussions of the matters in dispute, in endeavours to obtain further information from the Agents of the Railways, and I am afraid, to a large extent in trying to help the Railway Member of Council and explaining to him what the situation really means. The other point was raised by my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. He said that he was unable to understand how increased work fell on the Railway Board, when a company-managed Railway was taken over, on account of the work that had to be done in connection with the higher officers of the Company who became officers of the State Railways. I think it arises mainly in this way.

[Sir George Rainy.]

When we take over the Railway, the officers of the Company become the officers of Government and the higher officers acquire the status of officers appointed by the Secretary of State in Council. The result is they come under certain rules which give them considerable rights of appeal, in the first place, to the Government of India, and in the second place, to the Secretary of State. Not only may they appeal if they are brought under discipline in any way, but it is open to them to appeal if they consider that particular appointments should have been offered to them and they desire to make representations on the subject. I see a fair number of these cases myself not only when they have to be referred to the Secretary of State, but also when there is an appeal to the Government of India against the decision of the Railway Board. These, however, are comparatively small points and I should like to devote the greater part of what I have to say to the main points which have been raised in the course of the discussion.

I think, on the whole, the argument that has been most freely used against the proposals which I have put forward, is that the case for additional expenditure in order to create a new appointment of a Member of the Railway Board has not been fully made out. I have no right to complain of arguments of this character. It is the peculiar function of this House to challenge all proposals for new expenditure put forward by Government and to insist that Government should justify them fully, and when objections of that kind are raised, clearly no member of the Government has any right to complain. It is incumbent upon me therefore to satisfy Honourable Members opposite, so far as I can, that there is a good deal more to be said for this proposal than they are at present prepared to admit. I have no great hope, it is true, of convincing my friend Mr. Jamnadas Mehta. I fear that in this matter his ignorance is invincible, and that no persuasive powers of mine will succeed in satisfying him on the point. I was, however, deeply touched by the almost lyrical enthusiasm with which he spoke of the Railway Board as at present organised, and it seemed to me that even the smallest change in its constitution would have caused him real pain. I have no doubt that the Members of the Railway Board will fully appreciate the compliment he has paid them. Mr. Mehta apparently regards Sir Clement Hindley's memorandum of 1922 or 1923 (I forget which year it belongs to) as the last word in railway administration, and thinks that we ought still to be guided by it to-day. I do not think there is anybody in this House who has a higher opinion of Sir Clement Hindley than I have, and that for very good reasons, but in the first place I do not admit that this is a question to be settled finally by any authority, however high, and in the second place I do not admit that the Honourable Member is entitled to assume that Sir Clement Hindley would regard the organisation which he recommended in 1922-23 as sufficient to meet present-day requirements.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: That is what he said.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: That does not in the least follow. Now, my friend asked in what respect conditions have changed since 1922-23? Well, we have taken over the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, the East Indian Railway and the Burma Railways. That in itself must mean an inevitable addition of work at headquarters. Then again, there

have been very distinct changes as regards labour since 1922-23. As I tried to point out in my budget speech all these labour questions are being forced upon us with growing insistence. It is becoming more and more necessary that they should be studied. We must be ready to deal with the new situations which we cannot avoid, do what we will, and I cannot admit the validity of the argument that, because Sir Clement Hindley did not propose in 1922-23 the employment of a Labour Member in the Railway Board, therefore the House are justified in assuming that a Labour Member is not required now.

More than one Honourable Member but particularly my friend Mr. Aney—and I think my Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas—said, "If the work at headquarters is becoming too heavy, why don't you decentralise, and get rid of the difficulty that way?" Now, the two big branches of work with which we are concerned in this discussion are rates and fares, that is the first, and establishment and labour questions—that is the second. Now, is the House quite sure that it wants decentralisation as regards rates and fares? As I pointed out recently—I forget on what occasion—when I go round and interview commercial bodies in various parts of India I have again and again been asked to see whether something cannot be done to promote the extension of through rates, which means that instead of each of the railway systems treating itself as a separate entity, we should have through booking from station to station, just as if all the railways constituted one system. We apply that system at present to coal but we do not apply it to other commodities. If that system is a good thing—and I think some extension of it is probably desirable—to this extent you cannot have decentralisation because you are treating the whole of the railways of India as a single system. Then again I have frequently heard proposals that there should be greater uniformity in rates and fares, and we know it is frequently argued that if one railway reduces its rates and fares, then it is reasonable and fair that other railways should follow suit and do the same. If so, that again is a conception of the railway system of India which is not consistent with decentralisation, because it means that the Agents are not to have a free hand to carry out the policy that they think best for their own lines, but to a large extent they must be governed by the policy which commends itself to the Railway Board and to the Government of India. Turning now to the labour question. I would ask there also to what extent at present decentralisation is possible. We have to remember that in a movement which is fairly new, we cannot yet see our way fully and it might be a little dangerous to give a free hand to all Agents to do exactly what they choose in the matter. Apart from that, I have very good reason to know that, if on any particular railway, some concession is given; some increase of pay to a particular class of establishment, it is very apt to lead to demands for similar increases of pay in the same classes of staff and for other classes of staff on the other railways. There again, when you come up against it, the question of decentralisation becomes extraordinarily difficult, and I have never been able to feel myself that as regards this particular matter we can look forward to much relief through the avenue of decentralisation.

My Honourable friend Mr. Aney said this:

"Why do you want a new Member for the Railway Board? The responsibility for labour policy rests with the Department of Industries and Labour of the Government of India. Why then do you want to duplicate that machinery in another department?"

[Sir George Rainy.]

I fully agree that the general direction of policy as regards labour must rest with the Department of Industries and Labour, and it is precisely because I want to get into closer communication with them, to keep pace with them, that it seems to me desirable that we should have our own officials for dealing with the subject. It is precisely for that reason that I want the creation of the new appointment. The moment we have a separate member in the Railway Board to deal with labour and establishment questions, it will be possible to keep in closer touch with the Industries and Labour Department and I have every hope that things will develop on satisfactory lines. If we don't get the new appointment, I am afraid that difficulties may arise owing to insufficient touch.

One more remark of my Honourable friend I should like to refer to. He had not much use for what I said about "the human factor", which he seemed to regard as bit of sob-stuff inserted to enlist a little support from his side of the House. What was really in my mind was this. If an officer has from the nature of his work constantly to consider all the questions that come before him from a strictly commercial point of view, counting up the Pounds, Shillings and Pence, and making cheapness the primary virtue, then from the nature of the case he will be apt to regard all questions from exactly the same point of view. In dealing with labour problems, it is not a safe attitude to adopt exclusively. That is all I need say on that particular point.

I listened with great interest to the speech made by my Honourable friend, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. No one in this House has a better right to speak on railway questions than he, and there is no one, I am sure, to whom the House will more readily listen. He was good enough to say that it was with reluctance, and only after full consideration, that he found himself unable to agree with me. I should like to return the compliment and say that it was only with reluctance and after the very best consideration I could give to the question, that I found it necessary to disagree with him. (Cheers from Opposition Benches.) I think that the organisation which was in his mind, and which he would like to see in the Railway Department, differs rather substantially from the organisation which we have at present. I admit that all the quotations which he read from the Inchcape Committee's Report and the Acworth Committee's Report do give a good deal of support to an organisation in which the men at the top would not be experts, would only deal with the general direction of policy, and would leave the detailed execution of policy to the people below them. I can conceive that the railways of India might be administered on such lines, but the point I should like to bring out is that that is not the form of the organisation which we have at present. As things stand at present, the Members of the Railway Board and the Chief Commissioner, are experts in railway work, and the Financial Commissioner is an expert in finance. Together they constitute the Board. It is of the nature of an executive committee rather than a committee directing policy. We none of us know what the future may have in store for us as regards constitutional reform or changes in organisation. But what I had to deal with was the organisation that exists at present, and it seemed to me that the proper remedy for our difficulties was the addition of one more Member, so that labour and establishment questions might receive their full share of attention on the one side, and traffic and

commercial problems might receive their full share on the other side. I was not contemplating any radical departure from the existing scheme, and if I thought that my proposal did involve any radical departure from the present scheme I should not have put it forward.

My Honourable friend Mr. Jayakar realised clearly what the present organisation means—I am quoting his own words which I took down at the time—"The Board should be", he said, "a small expert group of a few men and the smaller the better." If I thought that the creation of the new appointment—the addition of one Member to the Board—was going to turn the Board into a collection of departmental heads, instead of being a body which tried to deal with the questions that came before them from the point of view of efficient commercial administration of the railways, I should withdraw my proposal. But I do not think that there is real danger of that, and I do not think there is a real danger of this new appointment becoming a precedent for the creation of many other new appointments.

My Honourable friend referred to one possibility that we might take over the administration of roads. I can only say that I hope we shall not do so in my time, because I have quite enough on my hands with the railways. But supposing it happened, and supposing on that ground it was suggested that there should be another Member of the Railway Board, is that really an analogy? In this case we are not taking over anything new, but are merely proposing a new appointment to deal with the work already there, which has developed out of what has always been there. Therefore I cannot say I am much impressed by the fear expressed, that we might begin to multiply appointment on appointment and gradually increase the size of the Railway Board beyond all measure.

My Honourable friend said that the true ideal of the way the Railway Board should carry on its work was that they should take a bird's eye view of important problems and not allow themselves to become immersed in detail. I entirely agree. It is precisely because they are too much immersed in detail at the present moment that I am proposing to provide a scheme which will prevent that result. And while I am on this subject I should like very briefly to refer to the suggestion that the Chief Commissioner should have a portfolio of his own, perhaps taking over the labour work. In the first place I should regard that as a very serious departure from the scheme adopted in 1922-23 after the Acworth Committee had reported, because one of the main points in that scheme was that the Chief Commissioner should be regarded as the expert adviser of the Government of India on all questions connected with railways, and that he should have power to overrule his colleagues. If he is to have that power, and if his advice is always to be the advice, by which in the last resort the Government of India is to be guided, it is most important that he should not have a portfolio of his own and become immersed in the details of that portfolio, but should be free to review the whole of the work of the Board and advise accordingly.

There were several points which were raised, Mr. President, by other Members who spoke, but I do not wish to go deeply into them today. There is, however, one remark which was made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Sesha Ayyangar, who asked whether the creation of a rates tribunal

[Sir George Rainy.]

might not to some extent diminish the need for this new Member. I am afraid the only answer I can give is very emphatically in the negative. It seems to me that, if you create a rates tribunal, the immediate result would be a very great increase of the work in the traffic department of the Railway Board Office; for this reason, that it would be necessary for all the railway administrations in India to prepare their cases, to be laid before the rates tribunal and a large number of general questions would emerge, upon which it would be necessary for the Railway Board to instruct the railway administrations as to the lines they were to follow. What the ultimate result might be I do not know, but the immediate result would be an increase of work. If the Honourable Member contemplates that the rates tribunal should revise the whole of the rates throughout India, it would take a long time, probably not less than five years and during these five years the traffic department of the Railway Board office would be worked much harder than now.

I shall not delay the House, Mr. President, much longer. Honourable Members have as usual been extraordinarily kind in their references to myself, although my Honourable friend Mr. Jannadas Mehta thinks that I slipped up a bit when I announced what the intentions of the Government of India would be, supposing the new appointment comes into existence. I do not complain of his criticism at all, but I think that most Members of this House recognise that I acted with no sinister motive, but under the impression that, while it was not for me to volunteer the announcement, it was almost impossible for me to refuse one when it was definitely asked for on the floor of the House. That is all I wish to say on that particular point. I do not wish to speak at any length on the question of Indianisation, because it has not played a large part in most of the speeches delivered. But, may I say this, that I fully understand the view expressed not only by my Honourable friend Mr. Jayakar but by other Members, and of the ardent desire which Honourable Members opposite have to see their own countrymen appointed to the existing Memberships of the Railway Board. I respect that desire, but at the same time I want to see them appointed on their merits. I expect to see them appointed on their merits. After all, in spite of what was said by my Honourable friend Mr. Das, it is not quite true that you can pick up anyone at random and say: "Will you kindly administer the traffic department, or will you take on the Engineering Department?" As we all recognise, we must have expert knowledge and great experience in our railway administrators. There are difficulties at present, as the House quite well knows, about meeting the wishes of the House, in that respect.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Will the Honourable Member tell us what the tests are? Will he agree to a Committee of officials and non-officials of this House to judge whether there are Indians who fully satisfy the tests that may be imposed upon them? I make this offer, that I will give the names of several gentlemen, and I will challenge anybody to say that they do not fully satisfy the requirements of the Railway Board, either for technical knowledge or financial knowledge. (Hear, hear.)

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: Sir, I regret that I cannot give an undertaking to devolve upon a Committee of this House a function which quite definitely is the function of the Government of India.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: That is what we all complain of. It is a despotic system which does not take into account the feelings of the people.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Or their merits.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I will now try to resume the thread of what I said. Not having the same practice in speaking as my Honourable friend, I am a little bit lost. I do not in the least complain of his interruption, but it is a little embarrassing for those of us who have not had so much of practice in speaking in public.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member was not bound to give way if he thought so.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I entirely recognise that, and I merely desired to apologise for my own unreadiness to take up the thread of my speech; I am not in the least complaining of the Honourable Member's interruption. What I wish to say is this. Assuming that we find ourselves unable to meet the wishes of Members on the other side completely, we do make every effort to meet them as far as we can. I do hope that Honourable Members on the other side will not accuse us of trying, by a subterfuge, to give them something less and something different from what they asked for. We are at least doing our best to comply with the wishes of this House, and I do not in any way admit that we need be at all ashamed of the action that we propose to take from the point of view of Indianisation. It is a matter in which I personally take a great interest and I should be very sorry if Honourable Members opposite should attribute to me an unfair motive of which I am not conscious. Now Sir, the House will have to decide this important question as to whether the proposal of the Government of India is to be accepted or not. I would only very briefly in conclusion ask the House to weigh well before they commit this House to a vote which by many would be regarded, and by a great many would certainly be represented as adverse to labour.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Not a bit.

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: I know that is not what is in the mind of the Honourable Members opposite, but quite clearly they will have to keep in view what people in India and outside India will be inclined to say with regard to it. Almost the only words which I regret in the speech of my Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas were those in which he referred to the Geneva Convention, mentioning that, there are other countries which had failed to satisfy their obligations under the convention, and saying that, if we had to wait for another two years before we carried out our obligations, it did not very much matter. I think it would be very regrettable if that were to be taken to be the general feeling of the House, because India has an excellent record as regards the carrying out of its international obligations. I feel it almost with a sense of shame that, in this particular matter in the Railway Department, I cannot claim that we have fully satisfied our obligations. For this reason, I trust that no consideration of that kind will influence Honourable Members of this House to vote against the Government proposal. That, Sir, I think really concludes what I have to say. Before sitting down, I desire once more to thank Honourable Members for their kindly references to myself, and also to express the hope that nothing that I have said has wounded Honourable Members opposite.

Mr. President: The question is :

“That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 64,000.”

The Assembly divided :

AYES—43.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Maulvi.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswamy.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. S. Sessa.
Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das.
Birla, Mr. Ghanshyam Das.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Haji, Mr. Sarabhai Nemchand.
Hans Raj, Lala.
Iswar Saran, Munshi.
Jayakar, Mr. M. R.
Jogiah, Mr. V. V.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kunzru, Pandit Hirday Nath.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.

Misra, Mr. Dwarka Prasad.
Mitra, Mr. S. O.
Moonje, Dr. B. S.
Mukhtar Singh, Mr.
Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayyid.
Naidu, Mr. B. P.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Neogy, Mr. K. O.
Pandya, Mr. Vidya Sagar.
Phookun, Srijut T. R.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Rang Behari Lal, Lala.
Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
Shervani, Mr. T. A. K.
Siddiqi, Mr. Abdul Qadir.
Singh, Kumar Rananjaya.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Narayan Prasad.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Sinha, Mr. Siddheshwar Prasad.

NOES—53.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
Abdullah Haji Kasim, Khan Bahadur
Haji.
Ahmed, Mr. K.
Alexander, Mr. William.
Aillison, Mr. F. W.
Ashrafuddin Ahmed, Khan Bahadur
Nawabzada Sayid.
Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
Bower, Mr. E. H. M.
Bray, Sir Denys.
Chalmers, Mr. T. A.
Chatterjee, the Revd. J. C.
Coatman, Mr. J.
Cocke, Mr. H. G.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.
Crerar, The Honourable Mr. J.
Dakhan, Mr. W. M. P. Ghulam Kadir
Khan.
Dalal, Sardar Sir Bomanji.
French, Mr. J. O.
Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Mr.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Graham, Mr. L.
Hira Singh, Brar, Sardar Bahadur,
Honorary Captain.
Hussain Shah, Sayyid.
Ismail Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Keane, Mr. M.

Lall, Mr. S.
Lamb, Mr. W. S.
Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
Nath.
Moore, Mr. Arthur.
Muhammad Nawaz Khan, Sardar.
Mukharji, Rai Bahadur A. K.
Mukherjee, Mr. S. C.
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Rahimtulla, Mr. Fasal Ibrahim.
Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
Makhdum Syed.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. O. S.
Rao, Mr. V. Panduranga.
Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Roy, Rai Bahadur Tarit Bhusan.
Sams, Mr. H. A.
Sassoon, Sir Victor.
Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
Shah Nawaz, Mian Mohammad.
Shillidy, Mr. J. A.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Stevenson, Mr. H. L.
Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Webb, Mr. M.
Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 25th February, 1929.