

25th February 1935

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume II, 1935

(20th February to 8th March, 1935)



FIRST SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1935



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1935.

Legislative Assembly.

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., KT.

Deputy President :

MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

SIR MUHAMMAD YAKUB, KT., M.L.A.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

LIEUT.-COLONEL SIR HENRY GIDNEY, KT., M.L.A.

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

CAPTAIN HAJI SARDAR NUR AHMAD KHAN, M.C., I.O.M., I.A.

Committee on Petitions :

MR. AKHIL CHANDRA DATTA, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

MR. S. SATYAMURTI, M.L.A.

DR. ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

RAJA SIR VASUDEVA RAJAH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—20th February to 8th March, 1935.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
WEDNESDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY, 1935—		SATURDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Member Sworn	971	Questions and Answers	1257—1301
Questions and Answers	971—1008	Election of Members to the Governing Body of the Indian Research Fund Association	1301
Statements laid on the Table	1008—12	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Commerce	1012	Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department—Grievances of third class passengers	1303—32
Message from the Council of State	1012	Demand No. 3—Miscellaneous Expenditure—Rational and economic administration of Railways	1332—42
Bill passed by the Council of State	1012		
The Railway Budget—General Discussion	1013—56	MONDAY, 25TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
THURSDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1935—		Member Sworn	1343
Questions and Answers	1057—96	Questions and Answers	1343—76
Short Notice Question and Answer	1096—98	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
Election of the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	1098	Demand No. 6A—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works—Indianisation of railway services	1377—1407
The Payment of Wages Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1099—1107	Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department—Manipulation of railway freight rates without due regard to all the interests involved	1408—25
The Code of Civil Procedure (Second Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1107—13		
Resolution <i>re</i> Draft Convention of the International Labour Conference concerning unemployment insurance and other forms of relief—As amended, negatived	1118—41		
FRIDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1935—			
Questions and Answers	1143—79		
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1179—1222		
The Railway Budget—List of Demands—Demand No. 1—Railway Board—Railway administration in India	1222—56		

TUESDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Questions and Answers	1427—45
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 6E—Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department—	
Labour grievances	1445—79
Excessive rates and insufficient facilities for transport of agricultural produce and live stock	1490—95
Demand No. 6G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses—Wagon policy of Government	1496—98
Demand No. 2—Audit	1499
Demand No. 4—Revenue funds	1499
Demand No. 5—Payments to Indian States and companies	1499
Demand No. 6B—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power	1500
Demand No. 6C.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock	1500
Demand No. 6D—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours	1500
Demand No. 6F—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments	1500
Demand No. 6G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses	1500
Demand No. 6H—Working Expenses—Electric Service Department	1501
Demand No. 7—Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund	1501
Demand No. 8—Interest Charges	1501
Demand No. 9—Temporary Withdrawals from Depreciation Fund	1501

TUESDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY, 1935— <i>cont'd.</i>	
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Demand No. 11—New Construction	1501
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works	1502
WEDNESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Members Sworn	1503
Questions and Answers	1503—42
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1542—46
Constitution of the House Committee	1546
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 406—Referred to Select Committee	1547—86
The Indian Coastal Traffic (Reservation) Bill—Introduced	1586
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1587
The Repressive Laws Repealing and Amending Bill—Introduced	1587
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 167—Introduced	1587
The Specific Relief (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1588
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 205—Introduced	1588
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Amendment of section 386—Introduced	1588—89
THURSDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1935—	
Presentation of the Budget for 1935-36	1591—1605
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced	1605
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Introduced	1605
TUESDAY, 5TH MARCH, 1935—	
Members Sworn	1607
Questions and Answers	1607—54
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1654—63
Short Notice Questions and Answers	1663—69

	PAGES.		PAGES.
TUESDAY, 5TH MARCH,		THURSDAY, 7TH MARCH,	
1935— <i>contd.</i>		1935—	
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i>		Member Sworn	1781
Impending execution of		Incorrect Report of the	
one Abdul Quaiyum		proceedings of the Legis-	
for murder in Sind—		lative Assembly by the	
Disallowed by His Ex-		Press	1781—82
cellency the Governor		Questions and Answers . .	1782—1813
General	1669—70	The General Budget—List	
Statements laid on the		of Demands—	
Table	1670—79	Demand No. 28—Exe-	
Message from the Council		cutive Council—	
of State	1679	General policy of the	
The Indian Mines (Amend-		Executive Council	
ment) Bill—Presentation		in the administra-	
of the Report of the		tion of the country	1814—67
Select Committee	1679		
General Discussion of		FRIDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1935—	
the General Budget . . .	1680—1725	Questions and Answers . .	1869—1904
		Short Notice Questions and	
		Answers	1904—08
WEDNESDAY, 6TH MARCH,		The General Budget—List	
1935—		of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
General Discussion of the		Demand No. 32—Home	
General Budget	1727—80	Department—	
		Repressive policy	1908—56

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 25th February, 1935.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

MEMBER SWORN:

Mr. Frank D'Souza, M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official):

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

REVISION OF PAY FOR FUTURE ENTRANTS TO THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE AND THE INDIAN POLICE SERVICE.

516. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: (a) With reference to the answer to starred question No. 10, dated the 24th January, 1934, will Government be pleased to state if any recommendations have been made to the Secretary of State regarding the revision of pay for future recruits to the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service? If so, in what directions and when are the new scales of pay expected to be introduced in their case?

(b) Are Government aware of the great discontent among the subordinate ranks of the services and among the members of other all-India services, such as the Indian Audit and Accounts Service, owing to the discriminatory treatment meted out to them in the matter of reduction of their salaries?

(c) Was it not one of the recommendations of the General Purposes Retrenchment Committee that the reduction in the scale of salaries of all Government servants should take place all round and simultaneously and not piecemeal just as Government have done at present?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I am unable, in accordance with the existing practice, to disclose the nature of the recommendations made. The Secretary of State has decided to postpone further consideration of this question until after the passing of the Constitution Act.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by my predecessor in this House to part (1) of question No. 1191 on the 28th November, 1933.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: On a point of order, Sir, I should like to submit to you, Mr. President, that this habit of referring to answers that were given some years back is really a handicap to us, and I would

submit, Sir, that answers should be referred to only if they were given within the Session, or else the very purpose of answering questions would be nullified. I would like you, Mr. President, to give us a ruling.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable the Home Member proposes to do so, he may read out the answer that has been referred to.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I shall be glad to do so, Sir. The answer dealt with two parts of the question and it was as follows:

"The officer on Special Duty took up the case of the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police at an early stage of his enquiry. The problems arising in these two services are more complicated than in the services recruited solely in India, and as they are All-India Services, it has also been necessary to consult all local Governments. This has naturally caused some delay in the consideration of the case."

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is it not true, Sir, that the pay of the services recruited by the Government of India was reduced as far back as 1933?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not sure of the exact date. Pay for new entrants? As long back as when?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: 1933.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am not sure of the exact date.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to part (a) of the question, may I know the reasons why the Government of India decline to state what their recommendations to the Secretary of State are?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Because it is not usual, or in accordance with constitutional practice, to disclose recommendations made to the Secretary of State.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, the Government of India usually decline to answer "on the ground of public interest"—that is the Standing Order—but they should at least say that "we consider it to be not in the public interest to give an answer". I am asking the Honourable the Home Member whether he considers that it is against the public interest to give an answer to this question of a very important character concerning the pay of our future recruits to the I. C. S. and the Indian Police Service.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, Sir, it is contrary to the public interest. The matter is still under correspondence with the Secretary of State, and, until a decision is arrived at, I cannot disclose the recommendations made.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know how many years ago the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee regarding the rates of pay for the services recruited by the Government of India were made and when the reductions in pay were made? I refer to the recommendations made by the Retrenchment Committee presided over by the Honourable the President. I ask, when were they accepted as regards the services recruited by the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Well, the recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee will be found in their Report.

Mr. T. S. Avinashlingam Chettiar: The recommendations were given effect to as regards the services recruited by the Government of India in 1933, is it not so?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: As I have already said, Sir, I do not know the exact date, but I believe that is approximately correct.

ARREST OF KHAN ABDUL SAMAD KHAN.

517. *Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: (a) Will Government be pleased to state what the main reason was for the arrest of Khan Abdul Samad?

(b) What are the proceedings of his trial?

(c) Did he stand his trial by the local *jirga* or any other court of law? If the answer be in the negative, why was his case entrusted to a *jirga*?

(d) Was he sentenced as a political prisoner? If so, is he being accorded equal treatment as is being done in the case of other political prisoners in British India?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: With your permission, Sir, I will answer parts (a) to (d) of the Honourable Member's question together. The information asked for will be found in the following replies already given to which the Honourable Member's attention is invited:

(1) the reply given to his question No. 264 which was laid on the table of the House on the 14th March, 1934;

(2) the reply given to his questions Nos. 250 and 253 which was laid on the table of the House on the 16th August, 1934;

(3) the reply to question No. 581 asked by Maulvi Shafi Daudi which was laid on the table of the House on the 21st January, 1935.

ARREST OF ABDUL SALAM AND HAKIM ABDUL REHMAN.

518. *Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: (a) Is it a fact that the main cause of the recent alleged arrest of Abdul Salam and Hakim Abdul Rehman is due to their making criticisms on the present *jirga* system as published in a booklet which was distributed?

(b) Are Government prepared to modify the present *jirga* system and adopt therein the system of franchise and nominations as is prevalent in other provinces? If not, why not?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) No. These two men were arrested for the purposes of an enquiry in regard to the publication of a book containing seditious poems intended to bring the Government into hatred and contempt. They were, however, released on the undertaking of the Maliks of their tribe that they would be responsible for their future good behaviour.

(b) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to part (d) of the reply to question No. 255 given to the House on the 30th July, 1934.

PREFERENCE TO EDUCATED BALUCHIS AND BALUCHISTANIES FOR POSTS IN BRITISH BALUCHISTAN SERVICE.

519. *Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: (a) Are Government prepared to give preference to educated Baluchis and Baluchistanies for posts in British Baluchistan services?

(b) Are Government prepared to make direct appointment of suitable Baluchis and Baluchistanies for high posts in British Baluchistan?

(c) In order to safeguard the interests of educated Baluchis, are Government prepared to reserve a certain percentage of posts in Baluchistan services only for Baluchis?

(d) Are Government prepared to enlist and take up Baluchis for high posts in British Baluchistan Levy Corps?

(e) Are Government prepared to give first preference to Baluchis (forming a most backward Muslim community) in Government services in India?

(f) Are Government prepared to give first preference to those Baluchis who so desire, in regard to high ranks in British Indian Army?

(g) Are Government aware that enlistment of Baluchis is slow in British Army and particularly in Baluchis Regiments in British Indian Army? If so, why?

(h) Are Government prepared to enlist first Baluchis as officers and in other ranks in Indian Police, and Baluchistan Police services?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: (a) The Local Administration does recruit suitable educated youths of the indigenous tribes of Baluchistan for all services in the Province.

(b) "High posts" in Baluchistan are usually filled by promotion; but, should occasion arise for direct recruitment to such a post, a qualified local man would certainly be preferred to an outsider.

(c) Government cannot give any such undertaking nor do they consider it desirable to discriminate in the matter of appointments between the three main tribal divisions in the Province, i.e., Pathan, Brahui and Baluch.

(d) There is no Levy Corps in British Baluchistan. The composition of the Mekran and Chagai Levy Corps is almost exclusively Baluch and Brahui, and this is true also of their Indian Officers.

(e) Government regret that they are unable to treat the Baluchis as a separate entity in regard to representation of minority communities in public services, but otherwise the field is open to them to the same extent as to other communities.

(f) No. Government are not prepared to give preference to any one class over another in this respect.

(g) No Baluchis are enlisted in the British Army. Baluchis from Baluchistan proper were formerly enlisted in the Indian Army, but they were found to be unsuitable: the desertion rate among them was abnormally high, and it was found very difficult to obtain suitable recruits. Their recruitment was, therefore, discontinued in 1925.

Baluchis settled in the Punjab are enlisted as Punjabi Mussalmans on exactly the same conditions and terms as other Punjabi Mussalmans. There were 441 such Baluchis serving in the Indian Army on the 1st January, 1934.

(h) Direct appointments to the Indian Police in British India, including Sind, are ordinarily made by competitive examinations held on a provincial basis, and appointments to other ranks, i.e., Provincial and Subordinate Services, are made under rules and regulations framed by the Local Governments. As regards appointments to such services in Baluchistan, the position is as stated in (a) above.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Is it a fact that there are three Baluchi regiments at present in India and the recruitment of sepoy to these regiments is not made from the Baluchi tribes?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I am afraid that I can give no detailed information on that point. The question should probably be rather addressed to the Army Department. But I have explained as far as I know what the position as regards the recruitment of Baluchis is, namely, those who live in Sind are recruited.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: My question is not for the Sind Baluchis: my question is for the Baluchistan itself. How is it that previously the Government used to recruit from Baluchistan sepoy for these Baluchi regiments, but they are not so recruiting now?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: That information I have already given in reply to the original question. I have also explained the reasons why Government have ceased recruiting Baluchis actually from Baluchistan itself.

Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer: May I ask the Honourable the Foreign Secretary whether the recent Resolution of the Home Department giving 25 per cent. of services to the Muhammadans will also apply to Baluchis in Baluchistan?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that question. It is much too complicated for me to answer straightaway.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Is it a fact that the Baluchi tribes have always been regarded as brave and faithful and yet the Government say that they are not suitable? May I know the reasons of their unsuitability for recruitment to these Baluchi regiments?

Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe: The only reason that I am aware of is that there was a high rate of desertion. But there may have been other reasons. If the Honourable Member wants more reasons, I think it would be better for him to put down a question on the paper.

DIESEL ELECTRIC LOCOMOTIVES.

520. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether Diesel electric locomotive is a patent one? If so, to whom does the patent belong, and which is the manufacturing firm?

(b) How are purchases made of these locomotives? Are they purchased by arrangement or by tender system?

(c) How many electric locomotives have been purchased up to date, and how many Diesel locomotives, giving their price and description?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) It is a long time since the Diesel engine was invented and the original patents have expired many years ago. I understand Diesel electric locomotives are now being manufactured by a large number of firms. The locomotives manufactured by each firm incorporate special features some of which may be patented.

(b) The recent purchase of two Diesel electric locomotives for the North Western Railway was made through the Indian Stores Department and after calling for world wide tenders.

(c) The total number of electric locomotives used on Indian Railways is 75. Details of prices paid are not readily available. Two Diesel electric locomotives of the 0-4-4-0 type of 350 horse power costing approximately Rs. 1,41,000 each were purchased in 1930 for the North Western Railway. Two more of 1,300 horse power, costing approximately 3½ lakhs each, are expected to be delivered during the course of the year.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: I heard the Honourable Member say that parts of this Diesel engine are patented. Is it so?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I understand that some parts of the locomotives manufactured by any firm may be patented.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it impossible to manufacture these locomotives in this country?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No, it is not impossible. Nothing is impossible.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government try to manufacture them?

Pandit Nilakantha Das: If some parts of the locomotive are patented, may I know how tenders are invited from all over the world?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The tenders are invited according to the specification, and the actual locomotives tendered may be in accordance with this specification.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: May I ask how many firms have supplied these Diesel engines in the past? One or more than one?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I should like to have notice of that question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are any attempts being made to investigate the possibility of manufacturing locomotives in this country?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Yes, Sir. I think I have explained to this House more than once that the question is under investigation.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: At what stage is the investigation standing now?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid I cannot say.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will it ever be completed?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I hope so; certainly.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Is it not a fact that this investigation began some time in 1927-28?

Mr. P. B. Rau: No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then, when did it begin?

Mr. P. B. Rau: Some time last year.

Mr. V. V. Giri: May I ask, Sir, who are the members of that Committee?

Mr. P. B. Rau: There is no Committee.

TRADE COMMISSIONERS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

521. ***Pandit Nilakantha Das:** (a) How many Trade Commissioners have been appointed by Government in foreign countries? Will Government please state their names, qualifications, headquarters and nature of work in each case?

(b) How many of them, if any, have been recruited from the Indian Civil Service, and if any, why?

(c) Under whose direct supervision do they work, and what have they done in pushing Indian products in the foreign markets?

(d) What is the total expenditure, and the expenditure in each case?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) There are three Indian Trade Commissioners at present, one each in London, Hamburg and Milan. Dr. D. B. Meek, lately Director General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics, is the Indian Trade Commissioner in London, Mr. S. N. Gupta, I.C.S., Indian Trade Commission, Hamburg, and Mr. M. R. Ahuja, Indian Trade Commissioner, Milan. The last named was selected in 1931 on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission and received training in the Commercial Intelligence and Statistics Department, Calcutta, and lately also in the Trade Department of the office of the High Commissioner for India in London. The nature of work done by these officers relates mainly to the development of markets for Indian goods in the areas for which they are responsible.

(b) Only one, namely, the Indian Trade Commissioner, Hamburg. This officer was selected for the post in view of his experience as Deputy Trade Commissioner, London, for more than two years.

(c) For administrative purposes these Trade Commissioners are under the control of the High Commissioner for India in London. As regards the results achieved by them in pushing Indian products in foreign markets, the Honourable Member is referred to the quarterly and annual reports on the work of Indian Trade Commissioners. The quarterly reports are published in the *Indian Trade Journal*, copies of which are in the Library of the House. Copies of the annual reports are also to be found in the Library.

(d) The latest budget estimate for 1935-36 is £25,170 made up as follows:

			£
Indian Trade Commissioner, London.	12,900
" " " Hamburg	5,960
" " " Milan	6,310

Mr. B. Das: Have Government considered the representations of the Indian Federation of Chambers of Commerce and various other Chambers of Commerce?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am afraid I should require notice of that question. I would not be able to answer it straight off.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Are Government aware that at least one of the Trade Commissioners is ignorant of the tariff duties on Indian articles which are sent to the country in which he is a Trade Commissioner?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I have no reason to believe that, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask, Sir, what are the criteria which the Government follow in deciding the places in which they appoint Trade Commissioners for India?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The criteria are what the Government consider are the places where openings for Indian trade offer the best chances.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government considered the claims of any places other than these three?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I believe so

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How many more Trade Commissioners do the Government of India propose to appoint in the next year?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: We do not propose to appoint any during the coming year as far as I recollect. There is no budget provision.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the qualifications for the selection of these Trade Commissioners?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The qualifications are a good knowledge of trade and commerce and a general acquaintance with the commerce of the country.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I ask, Sir, why is no Indian sent to London? Why is only a European sent to London?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Is my Honourable friend referring to the Trade Commissioner in London?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: I am sure that if my Honourable friend had come in contact with Dr. Meek, he would have realised that he was one of the outstanding figures here so far as knowledge of Indian trade and commerce is concerned.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there no Indian anywhere near him?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: Not that I am aware of.

Pandit Nilkantha Das: Is there a proposal to make all Trade Commissioners Indians in the future?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Next question.

CONNECTION OF THE INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT IN INDIA WITH THE INDIA STORE DEPARTMENT, LONDON.

522. *Pandit Nilkantha Das: (a) Has the Indian Stores Department in India any connection with the India Store Department, London, under the High Commissioner?

(b) Does the Indian Stores Department in India supply orders for foreign materials to Railways, Army and other Government and semi-Government Departments?

(c) Are such orders also placed separately with the India Store Department, London? If so, is there any division of articles of purchase in each case, i.e., orders for such foreign articles to be placed in India and such and such articles to be placed in England?

(d) Is there any arrangement for centralising State purchases in the Indian Stores Department? If not is there any centralised arrangement for State purchases? If not, in what way and through what agency are State purchases made and supervised?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Indian Stores Department utilises the services of the India Store Department, London, for:

- (i) the inspection of stores ordered and manufactured abroad (i.e., outside India);
- (ii) the distribution of invitations to tender;
- (iii) obtaining advice of experts on tenders for technical stores; and
- (iv) collecting information regarding the capacity, etc., of manufacturing concerns abroad, and in regard to prices and other trade intelligence.

(b) Yes.

(c) I would request the Honourable Member to see the Rules for the supply of articles required to be purchased for the Public Service, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

(d) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the Final Report of the Stores, Printing and Stationery Sub-Committee of the Re-franchisement Advisory Committee, and the annual Administration Reports of the Indian Stores Department, copies of which are available in the Library of the House.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: There have often been proposals to centralise the stores purchased under the Government of India. Has that been made? I know there is some recommendation for purchasing as much as possible through the Stores Department and there are also some rules to that effect. I want to know if any attempt has been made to centralise under the Government of India the stores purchased?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I am not quite clear to what my Honourable friend refers. I take it that he is referring to the purchases for the Railway and the Army Departments which have not been centralised in the Indian Stores Department.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Yes, I am referring to that.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There are special reasons why these two Departments have their own purchasing agency, but the amount of work done by the Indian Stores Department on their behalf is growing.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the special reasons why the Army and the Railways have got their own separate buying agency?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think it would be better if my Honourable friend would put down a question on the paper.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Is it a fact that the Indian Stores Department insists upon contractors to railways buying articles from that Department, though the price of such articles is higher than the market rate?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There, again, I should like to have notice. It seems to me that this question should more properly be addressed to the Railway Department.

Mr. B. Das: With reference to part (d) of the question, was it not one of the recommendations of the Stores Retrenchment Committee to reduce the personnel of the London Store Department and to make it subordinate to the Indian Stores Department in India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would refer my Honourable friend to the debate on this subject on Thursday, the 30th August, 1934, in which I explained to the best of my ability the exact relationship between the Indian Stores Department and the Store Department in London.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: Was it not one of the instructions to the London Store Department some time ago that they should buy in the best market and not necessarily in the cheapest market? Does that instruction still hold good?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I think my Honourable friend is referring to the operations of the India Store Department in London. In cases in which they do not accept the cheapest tender, a statement is placed on the table of the House with the reasons why the cheapest tender was not accepted. However, cases in which the cheapest tender is not accepted are few and far between. I shall be placing on the table of the House a statement on that subject in a few days and I think during the period it covered there were only two small cases.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to part (c) of the second part, may I ask for a categorical answer whether there is such a division or not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I would refer my Honourable friend to the stores purchase rules. He will find in rules 7 and 8, the rules governing purchases outside India. They show the cases in which orders can be placed for stores with the Store Department in London. There are the only cases and there are no others.

Pandit Nilakantha Das: The rules 7 and 8 refer to stores supplied in India on rupee tender? Are these articles purchased from abroad supplied in India on rupee tender?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Rules 7 and 8 refer to cases in which it is not necessary to call for rupee tenders. These two rules govern the special cases in which it is not necessary to call for rupee tenders.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it a fact that the Stores Department strain every nerve to purchase as far as possible only British goods?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir. Emphatically not. My Honourable friend will find that the purchases through the India Store Department, London, show a very great decrease in recent years.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: They do it without straining.

EXTENSION OF THE LARKANA-DODAPUR BRANCH LINE OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BEYOND DODAPUR UP TO JACOBABAD.

523. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (on behalf of Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto): (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state whether it is intended to extend the Larkana-Dodapur Branch Line of the North Western Railway beyond Dodapur up to Jacobabad?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state when the extension would take place?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The question is under investigation by the Agent, North Western Railway, and his report is awaited.

(b) I regret I am not in a position to say when a conclusion will be reached.

TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS IN THE KARACHI DIVISION OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

524. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (on behalf of Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto): Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of Travelling Ticket Examiners in the Karachi Division of the North Western Railway, as it stood on the 1st of January, 1925;

(b) whether their number was increased afterwards; if so, to what extent, and since when;

- (c) what the additional expenditure incurred on account of the appointment of a larger number of Travelling Ticket Examiners than before is;
- (d) the reasons for appointing more Travelling Ticket Examiners;
- (e) the figure of the average income to the railways, as a result of the activities of the Travelling Ticket Examiners, per year, before their number was increased;
- (f) whether the income from that source has now increased owing to the appointment of more Travelling Ticket Examiners; if so, the average additional income per year now; and
- (g) whether Government are aware that some of the newly appointed Travelling Ticket Examiners are alleged to be in the habit of harassing passengers in order to increase income and thereby justify their appointment?

Mr. P. B. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 524 and 525 together. The information is not readily available and Government consider that its collection will involve an amount of labour and expense which is not likely to be justified by the results.

***TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS IN THE KARACHI DIVISION OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

†525. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (on behalf of Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto): Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Mussalman and non-Muslim Travelling Ticket Examiners respectively in the Karachi Division of the North Western Railway, as it stood on the 1st of January, 1925;
- (b) how many new appointments of Travelling Ticket Examiners have been made after that and what the percentage of Mussalmans promoted to or appointed in that grade was;
- (c) what the present number of Mussalman and non-Muslim Travelling Ticket Examiners, respectively is; and
- (d) whether the Travelling Ticket Examiners get travelling allowance in addition to their pay? If so, how much per day?

***QUALITY OF FOOD, FRUIT AND ARTICLES KEPT FOR SALE AT RAILWAY STATIONS IN THE KARACHI DIVISION OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

526. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (on behalf of Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto): Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government are aware that food, fruit and articles kept for sale at Railway stations in the Karachi Division on the North Western Railway are generally old, stale and unfit for human consumption;

- (b) whether Government are aware that whenever any complaint is made by public on this score, the station staff show a partial attitude towards the vendors; and
- (c) whether Government are prepared to issue fresh orders, enjoining upon the Railway staff to take a serious view of the matter whenever any complaint of this nature is made and ask the higher authorities of the division to inspect stalls on all stations by paying surprise visits till, at least, the present state of affairs improves?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) The Agent, North Western Railway, states that while there may be isolated complaints from time to time, the conditions mentioned are definitely not general.

(b) This is possible only on the assumption that the station staff are negligent or culpable, but disciplinary measures would be taken against them if any connivance is noticed by inspecting officers, or is brought to light by complaints from the public which can be substantiated.

(c) The necessity for the supply of good food and for complaints to be investigated is kept before the staff by notifications issued periodically. The last such notification was issued on the 25th January, 1935. Surprise checks on vendor stalls are made by supervising officers.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if there are Sanitary Inspectors on the North Western Railway and why are they not engaged for the purpose of inspecting the foodstuffs?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have just informed the House that surprise checks on these lines are made by supervising officers.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Are these supervising officers Sanitary Inspectors or somebody else?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I do not know who it is that makes these surprise visits.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I, therefore, request the Honourable Member if he will be prepared.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is not a question.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member see his way to instruct the Agent to give this duty to the Sanitary Inspectors?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I do not see any necessity to give instructions to the Agent as to the agency by which these surprise checks should be made.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware that even in the Madras and Southern Mahratta and South Indian Railways, the food supplied is generally stale, old and unfit for human consumption?

Mr. P. E. Rau: It is a far cry from Karachi to Madras.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that the food supplied at railway refreshment rooms and at the railway carriages that carry refreshments is so wretched and so bad in quality, will the Honourable Member consider the advisability. . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the question refer to Karachi Division on the North Western Railway?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Yes, Sir. Is the Honourable Member prepared to consider the advisability of arranging for the supply of food directly by the railway companies and not through private agencies?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Over the North Western Railway?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Yes, Sir.

Mr. P. E. Rau: I do not think that railways should be expected necessarily to embark upon such a costly venture.

ALLEGED PARTIALITY SHOWN TO NON-MUSLIMS IN THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY WORKSHOP OFFICES, SUKKUR.

527. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (on behalf of Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto): Will the Honourable Member for Railways be pleased to state:

- (a) the number, community-wise, of clerks working in the offices connected with the North Western Railway Workshop at Sukkur;
- (b) the number, community-wise, of journeymen connected with the North Western Railway Workshops at Sukkur;
- (c) whether it is a fact that three men working in the above Workshop, named Kartarchand, Amarsingh and Lachhman, have been given promotions in preference to Mussalman employees who are said to be senior to them and more worthy of promotion;
- (d) whether it is a fact that the Head Clerk in that office is a Hindu of the same place; if so, how long he has been in that office;
- (e) the number of Mussalman aspirants for these appointments;
- (f) whether it is a fact that there is a general complaint of partiality being shown to non-Muslims, at the expense of Mussalmans, in the matter of appointments, promotions, etc., so far as the above workshop is concerned; and
- (g) if so, what steps Government propose to take to redress the grievances of Mussalmans?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Government have no information. These matters of detail have been left to the Agent, North Western Railway, to whom I am sending a copy of the question.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know what has been left to the Railway Board if everything has been left to the Agent to attend to?

Mr. P. E. Rau: One rupee. (Laughter.)

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS IN THE CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT, KARACHI.

528. ***Mr. Muhammad Nauman** (on behalf of Mr. Nabi Baksh Illahi Baksh Bhutto): (a) Will Government be pleased to state, community-wise, the total number of appointments, permanent, temporary and provisional, made since 1925 in the cadre of:

- (i) Appraisers,
- (ii) Examining Officers,
- (iii) Preventive Officers,
- (iv) Assistant Preventive Officers,
- (v) Clerks (Upper and Lower Divisions),

in the Customs Department at Karachi?

(b) Is it a fact that the orders of the Government of India regarding the recruitment on communal basis were not followed, and will Government be pleased to state whether steps are being taken to rectify the past deficiencies by proportionately increasing the number of new recruits from the communities affected?

Mr. A. J. Raisman: (a) A statement regarding permanent appointments is laid on the table of the House. Information regarding temporary and provisional appointments is not readily available.

(b) It is not a fact that the orders of the Government of India have not been observed in the past.

Statement showing community-wise the number of permanent appointments made since 1925 in the Karachi Custom House.

	Europeans and Anglo-Indians.	Hindus.	Muslims	Sikhs.	Indian Christians.	Others.	Total.
Appraisers	2	4	3	2	11
Examining Officers	..	5	2		2	1	10
Preventive Officers	3	3	4	10
Assistant Preventive Officers	1	..	1
Clerks (Upper Division and Lower Division)	2	41	12	1	9	3	68
Total	7	53	21	1	12	6	100

SCHEME FOR OPENING TWO NEW BRANCH LINES OF THE ASSAM BENGAL RAILWAY.

529. ***Mr. Basanta Kumar Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if there was any scheme prepared for opening two branch lines of the Assam Bengal Railway, one connecting the Sub-Divisional headquarters of South Sylhet with the Kulaura station, and the other for connecting the Sub-Divisional headquarters of Sunamganj with the District headquarters of Sylhet? If so, will Government be pleased to state the full particulars of the two projects as far as possible and to state when the projects are going to materialise?

(b) Are Government aware that for want of suitable means of communication with the headquarters of the district of Sylhet the people of the two sub-divisions are suffering great inconvenience?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) A survey was made in 1929 of a line from Kulaura to Maulvie Bazaar. This scheme which was combined with another to form the Srimangal—Maulvie Bazaar—(Kulaura) project with branch to Manumukh, was not considered as likely to be remunerative. A survey of a line from Sylhet to Chataak was made as a part of the Sylhet-Chataak-Therriaghat project; the report on the Sylhet-Chataak portion is now being brought up to date.

(b) I am willing to take it from my Honourable friend that the facts are approximately as stated by him.

Mr. Basanta Kumar Das: Do Government contemplate to open this line in the near future?

Mr. P. B. Rau: That depends on the results of the investigation that is being made at present.

Mr. Basanta Kumar Das: Are Government aware that the Sylhet-Chataak line would open up a part of the country which produces the celebrated Sylhet lime and oranges?

Mr. P. B. Rau: That, Sir, will no doubt be brought out by the investigation.

BRANCH LINES OPENED BY THE ASSAM BENGAL RAILWAY.

530. ***Mr. Basanta Kumar Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many lines of branch lines of Railway were opened by the Assam Bengal Railway within the last ten years?

(b) Are Government aware that the Assam Bengal Railway Company has not put any fencings as required by law on either side of its branch lines in the districts of Sylhet and Cachar? If not, are Government prepared to make an enquiry about this and insist on the Railway to put up fencings at an early date?

(c) Are Government aware that accidents on these lines are very frequent? If not, are Government prepared to make an enquiry to ascertain the number of casualties due to such accidents?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Nine.

(b) and (c). There is no legal obligation for a railway to fence every line. The views of the Government are embodied in a statement laid on the table of the House on the 2nd September, 1929.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What was that statement placed on the table in 1929?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The statement covers about four or five pages of typed matter, and I do not think it is necessary to read it at present.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do Government accept the obligation to fence these lines at least when they pass through crowded villages or towns and through crowded localities generally?

Mr. P. B. Rau: Yes, Sir. I suppose so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is not a question of supposition; I want to know what the policy of Government is.

Mr. P. B. Rau: I would invite my Honourable friend to read that statement.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I make an appeal to you. We are given a statement which is five years old, and we are asked to look into it, although it is not laid on the table. How can we ask supplementary questions?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's answer is that the information is given in that statement which is a lengthy one.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But it should be placed on the table. Otherwise, how can we ask supplementary questions?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If any question arises upon that statement, the Honourable Member is at liberty to put down a question on it.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Has the Inspector of Safety ever reported against or in favour of these fences?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I should like to have notice of that question.

COVERED AND RAISED PLATFORMS FOR IMPORTANT STATIONS ON THE ASSAM BENGAL RAILWAY.

531. ***Mr. Basanta Kumar Das:** (a) Are Government aware that the Assam Bengal Railway Company has not provided many of its important stations with covered and raised platforms? If not, are Government prepared to make an enquiry into this and ascertain how many stations have got raised and covered platforms and how many have not?

(b) Are Government aware that on account of the fact that the Assam Bengal Railway lines pass through districts in which there are excessive rainfalls, the passengers suffer great inconvenience on account of the absence of covered platforms?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) and (b). It is left to the discretion of the Railway Administrations to provide high level platforms and covering for them at stations where the traffic offering justifies their provision. I would, therefore, suggest that this matter be brought to the notice of the Agent, Assam Bengal Railway, through his Local Advisory Committee.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is the Honourable Member aware that the Local Advisory Committee has recommended the raising of these platforms?

Mr. P. B. Rau: On the Assam Bengal Railway?

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Yes, Sir.

Mr. P. B. Rau: I am not aware of that, and if my Honourable friend will kindly show me the proceedings of the Committee in which that recommendation was made, I will consider it.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: May I ask the Honourable Member to take the trouble of consulting that report of the Local Advisory Committee?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I thought my Honourable friend had seen the report and I hoped he would be willing to spare me the trouble of going through it myself. It will save me a certain amount of time which I can usefully employ in other directions.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government made any inquiries after receiving this question whether the passengers do or do not suffer great inconvenience?

Mr. P. B. Rau: No, Sir; because Government consider that these matters of local importance are best dealt with by the Local Advisory Committees who will bring specific inconveniences to the notice of the Administrations in their lines.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Do Government refuse to take any action on questions tabled by Honourable Members in this House pointing out these inconveniences?

Mr. P. B. Rau: No, Sir. I am quite prepared to send a copy of this question to the Agent of the Assam Bengal Railway.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government make inquiries and take action if the Honourable Member is found to be correct?

Mr. P. B. Rau: No inquiry is necessary to prove that if there is no covered platform, and there is heavy rain, passengers are likely to suffer inconvenience.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: In view of the categorical statement that, if there are uncovered platforms, the passengers will suffer inconvenience in the rain, will the Railway Board or Government take steps to mitigate the inconvenience?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The question is whether the inconvenience is so great that it must be remedied at once; and that, I submit, is for the Local Advisory Committee to consider.

THROUGH CARRIAGES BETWEEN CHANDPUR AND SYLHET ON THE ASSAM-BENGAL RAILWAY.

532. *Mr. Basanta Kumar Das: Are Government aware that on account of the opening of direct communication between Shillong and Sylhet by the new Shillong-Sylhet motor road, there has been an increase of through passengers between the main line of the Assam Bengal Railway and the Sylhet Kulaura line? If so, are Government prepared to ask the Assam Bengal Railway to make provision for through carriages between Chandpur and Sylhet to be attached to No. 2 Down Surma Mail and No. 1 Up Surma Mail?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The reply to the first part is in the negative. As regards the second part, I shall convey the Honourable Member's suggestion to the Agent, Assam Bengal Railway, for consideration.

PERSONS DETAINED WITHOUT TRIAL UNDER REGULATION III, POLITICAL PRISONERS, DETENUS AND INTERNEES.

533. *Dr. P. N. Banerjee: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the total number of persons detained without trial under Regulation III in Bengal and in other provinces, together with the dates of commencement of their detention and the periods of such detention;
- (b) how many of these political prisoners have not been given any allowance for their dependants and why;
- (c) how many detenus and internees have been permitted to appear at the University examinations, and how many of them have been successful; and
- (d) what facilities Government are ready to give to the successful candidates at examinations for prosecuting further studies?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) I invite attention to the reply I gave on the 6th February, 1935, to question No. 86.

(b) No family allowance has been sanctioned in the case of twelve State Prisoners detained under Regulation III of 1818 either because they have no dependants or because their detention did not affect the circumstances of their relatives.

(c) Only two State Prisoners now detained under Regulation III of 1818 have applied for permission to appear at University examinations. Arrangements are being made for them to study for the examinations and to appear in due course.

(d) Does not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What does the Honourable Member mean by stating that the circumstances of the dependents were not affected by the detention of these persons?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said no family allowance has been sanctioned in the case of twelve State Prisoners either because they have no dependents or because their detention did not affect the circumstances of their relatives. The second case is very much the same as the first.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee: Were these persons earning any incomes at the time they were detained?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot say, but nobody except themselves was dependent on that income.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am asking about those who have dependents. How many of them had dependents?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: None of them had any dependent at all.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: How do Government find out that the detention of these persons does not affect the other members of their families?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: By making local inquiries

Mr. Sri Prakasa: What is the nature of those inquiries?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Has there been any protest from these twelve people or from any of them?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot say without notice.

POLITICAL PRISONERS DETAINED WITHOUT TRIAL.

534. ***Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a full list of the political prisoners detained without trial, stating at the same time their places of detention?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I invite the Honourable Member's attention to my replies to question No. 96 on the 6th February and question No. 223 on the 14th February, 1935.

ALTERNATE ROUTE BETWEEN BENARES CANTONMENT AND STATIONS ABOVE ALLAHABAD TOWARDS DELHI.

535. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Are Government aware that though the routes *via* Janghai and *via* Moghalsarai are alternate routes between Benares Cantonment and Allahabad, they are not regarded as such between Benares Cantonment and stations above Allahabad?

(b) Are Government aware that this causes much confusion and results in conflicting interpretations being put by the different Railway officials dealing with passengers holding such tickets, and much unnecessary harassment is caused to passengers travelling between these stations?

(c) Are Government prepared to instruct the authorities concerned to make suitable changes in the byelaws, so as to make that route alternate not only between Allahabad and Benares Cantonment, but also between Benares Cantonment and stations above Allahabad towards Delhi?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) Yes.

(b) No. The rules in the East Indian Railway's time-table clearly permit passengers holding tickets from Benares Cantonment to Allahabad or *vice versa* to travel by either route. There is no rule permitting this between Benares Cantonment and stations above Allahabad.

(c) I am conveying my Honourable friend's suggestion to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for consideration.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: My question is whether Government are aware that, by limiting this alternative route to Allahabad and Benares, they are causing a lot of confusion in the minds of passengers as well as the minds of the ticket collectors?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The answer to that question is that the rules are clear on the subject and there cannot be any confusion: but, at the same time, I have forwarded my Honourable friend's suggestion to the Agent of the East Indian Railway for consideration.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member kindly accept my statement that travelling by this route I had to pay four annas when I had a second class return ticket, six annas when I had an intermediate class ticket, and one rupee and eleven annas when I had a third class return ticket, and it is possible that, if I had a first class ticket, they would have made a refund to me? (Laughter.) Does not that show confusion? May I also inform the Honourable Member that I have written to the authorities and have had no reply?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is the time for questions, not to supply information.

USE OF THE WORD "PORTER" OR "MAZDUR" INSTEAD OF "COOLIE" BY RAILWAY OFFICIALS.

536. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** Are Government prepared to instruct all Railway authorities to desist from the use of the word 'Coolie' and to use the word 'porter' or 'mazdur' instead?

Mr. P. B. Rau: In the absence of any reasons in support of the suggestion made, the only reply I can give to the question is in the interrogative. The only difference between these words, so far as I can see, is that both the words the Honourable Member prefers have a foreign origin while the word in use at present is, according to the Oxford Dictionary, probably of Indian origin, and is derived either from Tamil or Guzerati.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is the Honourable Member aware that the word "cooly" implies a certain amount of contempt?

Mr. P. R. Rau: No.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is he aware that the Maharaja of Burdwan got into trouble when he referred to the late Mr. Keir Hardie as the leader of white coolies? Is he further aware that Mr. Balfour once referring to British workmen told clearly in the House of Commons that they were not Indian or Chinese coolies?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If my Honourable friend is referring to the associations which the word "cooly" has gathered round it, I am afraid it will not be long before the other words he suggests will have the same associations.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Is not the Honourable Member prepared to abolish this word just as the railways have abolished the words "native" and "Eurasian"?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I cannot really understand why the word "cooly" is objected to.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Because the word is offensive.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already answered that he does not see any objection to the word "cooly", and, therefore, he is not prepared to direct the disuse of this word.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will he dare to call the porters at Charing Cross, when he next visits England, as coolies?

PERSONS DETAINED WITHOUT TRIAL UNDER REGULATION III OF 1818.

537. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a list of persons detained in different jails, all over India and in detention camps set up for their detention without any sort of trial either in ordinary law courts or in special tribunals under Regulation III of 1818 as State Prisoners, with the dates of their arrest and period of their detention and their present place of detention?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if any such person with family and dependants or with dependants only has been deprived of the allowance for dependants, and if so, will Government be pleased to state why?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). I invite attention to the reply I gave on the 6th February, 1935, to question No. 86, and to the reply I have just given to part (b) of question No. 533.

RAILWAY COURTS AT DIFFERENT RAILWAY STATIONS.

538. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is the Honourable Member for Railways aware of the creation of Railway Courts at different Railway stations, presided over by honorary magistrates, far away from the ordinary district courts and sub-divisional courts of law? If so, where are such courts held and at what time of the day?

(b) Are Government aware that it is not a very inconvenient arrangement for parties who have to attend such courts to answer charges, get justice and have redress, from a financial point of view as well as on account of waste of time?

(c) Are Government aware that the public as plaintiff or defendant have to requisition lawyers from a distance and that this entails expense and inconvenience?

(d) Are they prepared to abolish Railway Courts and to resort to ordinary courts of law for Railway cases?

Mr. P. R. Rau: In some provinces the Local Governments have, at the request of a railway administration, agreed to magistrates dealing at certain railway stations with the cases of persons travelling without tickets. I have no information in regard to the places in the stations or the times at which these magistrates hold their courts. As these arrangements have been made at the request of the railway administrations concerned I have no reason to suppose that they are inconvenient to these administrations. As the object of the arrangements is to dispose of petty cases on the spot and without delay I have also no reason to suppose that the arrangements are inconvenient to the public but any representations on this point should be made to the Local Governments concerned.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

539. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state:

(i) the number of Railway accidents during the year 1933-34 and 1934-35, showing increase or decrease;

(ii) the nature of accidents—simple hurt, grievous hurt, loss of life, loss of property, etc.; and

(iii) the number of persons claiming compensation for such accidents on account of such injury?

(b) How many such claims for compensation had been settled through courts of law, through mutual agreement or arbitration, and what was the total amount of compensation paid in each year?

(c) Was every case of accident duly reported to the Magistrate of the district in which such accident occurred, and to the officer in charge of the Police station within the local limits in which it occurred or to the proper authority as the Governor General in Council appointed in this behalf?

(d) Did the Railway administration send a return of all such accidents during the aforesaid period to the Governor General in Council and will the Honourable Member place that return on the table of this House?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) (i) and (ii). I regret figures for 1934-35 are not available: but a comparison of the figures for 1933-34, with previous years, will be found in paragraph 87 of Volume I and pages 287-289 of Volume II of the Report by the Railway Board on Indian Railways for 1933-34. The statistics compiled do not differentiate between 'simple hurt' and 'grievous hurt'.

(a) (iii) and (b). The total amount of compensation paid by Class I Railways during 1933-34 was Rs. 1,78,408. While this amount covers all payments for loss of life and injury to persons, it may include compensation paid for other reasons, but does not include compensation for goods lost or damaged. Figures for 1934-35 are not yet available. Particulars with regard to the other points referred to are not available, and their compilation will involve considerable labour.

(c) No. Only such accidents are reported to the persons referred to as are covered by section 83 of the Indian Railways Act.

(d) An annual return of accidents is received from every Railway, and the particulars given therein are embodied in Appendix D of Volume II of the Railway Board's Annual Report.

CERTAIN PARTICULARS REGARDING EAST INDIAN RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

540. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will the Honourable Member for Railways lay on the table.

(i) a list of men of the East Indian Railway, in all the departments, who had been thrown out of employment on account of economic necessity, and

(ii) a list of those who have been reinstated or reappointed, and state by which time do Government expect to reinstate the rest?

(b) What is the total number of men working on the East Indian Railway getting salary (i) above Rs. 100, (ii) above Rs. 500, (iii) above Rs. 1,000 and (iv) maximum, both as officials and clerks and assistants?

(c) How many of them under each head are Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Hindus, Muhammadans, Christians and what is the percentage of Bengalees, Biharis, U. P. men, Hindusthanis, Punjabis and Sikhs?

(d) What is the number of engine-drivers and guards?

(e) Have Government considered the necessity of now admitting Indian engine-drivers and guards in larger proportion than what had been the custom so long?

(f) How many engineers are working on the East Indian Railway, and what is the percentage of Europeans, Anglo-Indians, Bengalees, U. P. men, Punjabis and Sikhs?

(g) What is the total number of coolies (labourers) and menials throughout the East Indian Railway, and what is their average monthly income?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) (i) The information available with Government in this connection will be found on pages 73 and 74 of Volume I of the Council of State Debates, 1933.

(ii) I have called for information regarding the number of retrenched staff re-employed and will lay it on the table of the House in due course.

(b) and (c). The latest information available with Government is given on pages 58 and 59 of Volume I of the Report by the Railway Board on Indian Railways for 1933-34.

(d) and (g). The information is not readily available and its compilation will involve an amount of labour, which, in the opinion of Government, is not likely to be justified by results.

(e) Indians are eligible for appointment to all the posts for which they are qualified.

(f) I would refer the Honourable Member to pages 7, 8 and 13—16 of the Classified List of State Railway Establishment corrected upto 31st December, 1933, which gives the names of the engineers employed on the East Indian Railway. Accurate information regarding the points referred to in the second part of the question is not readily available, but to a certain extent can be guessed from the names.

Mr. V. V. Giri: With reference to part (a) (i), will the Honourable Member request the Agent to supply the information immediately—a list of men who have been thrown out of employment on account of economic necessity in all departments of the East Indian Railway?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have already informed the House that the information available with the Government in this connection will be found on pages 73 and 74 of Volume I of the Council of State Debates, 1933.

Mr. V. V. Giri: I mean as regards (ii).

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for the information.

Srijut N. O. Bardaloi: With reference to parts (c) and (f), is it a fact that my Honourable friend has referred to all nationalities in India except the Assamese, because there are no Assamese in that portion of the railway which runs through Assam?

Mr. P. R. Rau: My Honourable friend must ask that question of the questioner.

Srijut N. O. Bardaloi: Is he aware that Assamese are not employed in that portion of the East Indian Railway which passes through Assam?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am sure, there are some.

Srijut N. O. Bardaloi: Is the Government Member quite sure about it?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am not sure of it from personal knowledge: I have not travelled over that line there.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I ask whether the persons who will be reinstated will have to join at the bottom of the service, or on their old salary?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I think I replied to that question a few days ago and I laid a statement on the table with reference to that.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Will the Honourable Member repeat the reply that was given?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am sorry I have not got it here, nor can I carry it in my mind.

Mr. M. S. Aney: He does not know what the reply was?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The reply was that certain staff who were retrenched and re-employed and who were originally employed before a certain date would be on the old scales of pay.

COMPLAINT OF CERTAIN STATE PRISONERS.

541. ***Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state when the State Prisoners are generally locked up (i) during summer, and (ii) during different seasons of the year?

(b) Did Government get any complaint regarding the lock-up time from the State Prisoners in the Rajahmundry Central jail?

(c) Did Government get any complaint from the aforesaid prisoners in Rajahmundry jail in regard to the withdrawal of the privileges of exercise and diet? If so, what were the complaints and what steps have been taken to redress them?

(d) Is it a fact that the monthly allowances of the aforesaid prisoners have been curtailed? If so, why?

(e) Will Government please state what allowances they used to get and what they are receiving at present, and when the previous allowances will be restored?

(f) Is it a fact that Pratul Chandra Bhattacharya, a State Prisoner in the Rajahmundry Central Jail, has been asked to bear the cost of his medical treatment—purchase of a nasal douche and medicine for himself—out of the scanty allowance he receives? If so, why?

(g) Is it a fact that a political prisoner, Suresh Chandra Das, got his eyes examined in November, 1934 and still he has not been supplied with glasses? If so, are Government prepared to see that he gets his glasses without delay and enquire the cause of this delay?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer given by me to Mr. Satyamurti's starred question No. 213 on the 13th February, 1935.

(c) The Government of India have received no such complaints and have no information that any privileges have been withdrawn. The second part of this question does not arise.

(d) and (e). The allowances have not been curtailed, but, owing to the two State Prisoners having at one time overdrawn their allowances, the amount is being recovered by deduction of Rs. 12 a month from the monthly allowances.

(f) No. The State Prisoner was asked under a misapprehension to pay for a nasal douche but the cost has since been met by Government.

(g) Sanction has been conveyed to the supply of spectacles to the State Prisoner Suresh Chandra Das. I will draw the Local Government's attention to this question in case the spectacles have not yet been supplied.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In view of the fact that the Honourable Member has stated that he has no information in regard to part (g) of the question, will he be good enough to call for information from the Superintendent of the Rajahmundry Jail after making proper inquiries from the prisoners concerned?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have said, Sir, that we have received no complaints and have received no information that their privileges have been withdrawn. If any complaints had been submitted and if any privileges had been withdrawn, the fact would have been reported to us.

Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: Will the Honourable the Home Member please state if the time for locking State Prisoners is different in different jails?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already answered that question in reply to Mr. Satyamurti's question No. 213 on the 13th February.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I put this question, Sir, for Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon? I have written authority from him.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Yes.

INTEREST CHARGED ON THE SUKKUR BARRAGE DEBTS.

542. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (on behalf of Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon):
(a) With reference to my question No. 76, will Government be pleased to state the rate or rates of interest now being charged on the Sukkur Barrage Debt incurred prior to 1932-33?

(b) If the rate or rates are above three and a half per cent., have Government considered the question of reducing the rate on the whole debt to three and a half per cent., by redemption and re-issue of the loans, involved, or otherwise? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) A statement is laid on the table.

(b) The Honourable Member will observe from the statement that the full benefit of the conversion operations of the Government of India have already been passed on to the Provincial Government. Any further benefit which the Government of India may derive from future conversion operations will similarly be passed on to the Provincial Government.

Statement.

(a) The rate of interest on loans made from the Provincial Loans Fund to the Government of Bombay for the Sukkur Barrage Project are as follows:

1921-22	6½ per cent. reduced to 4½ per cent. from 1st April 1927.
1922-23	6½ per cent. reduced to 5½ per cent. from 1st April 1929.
1923-24	6 per cent. reduced to 5½ per cent. from 1st October 1933.
1924-25	5½ per cent. reduced to 5 per cent. from 1st October 1933.
1925-26	5½ per cent.
1926-27	5 per cent.
1927-28	5 per cent.
1928-29	5 per cent. reduced to 4½ per cent. from 1st October 1933.
1929-30	5½ per cent.
1930-31	6½ per cent. reduced to 5 per cent. from 1st October 1933.
1931-32	6½ per cent. reduced to 6 per cent. from 1st October 1933.

Prof. H. G. Banga: Can this question be left over for tomorrow? The Honourable Member is not here.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): All right.

+543.*

†This question will be answered on the 26th February, 1935.

**CASE OF STATE PRISONER VIDYA BHUSHAN AZAD CONFINED IN THE
MUZAFFARGARH JAIL.**

544. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) Are Government aware that Mr. Vidyabhushan Azad, a State Prisoner under Regulation III of 1818, now confined in the Muzaffargarh sub-jail in the Punjab has developed serious trouble in the nose, leading to other complications, such as, amongst others, colic, and frequency of urination with an abundance of mucous and phosphates?

(b) Are Government aware that the jail authorities are of opinion that an operation is necessary and that the local Civil Surgeon has more than once advised such an operation in the Mayo Hospital at Lahore where the necessary apparatus and equipments are available?

(c) Have Government received any recommendation from the Superintendent of Jail, as also from the local Civil Surgeon as to the urgency of the operation at Lahore?

(d) Do Government propose to order the immediate transfer of Mr. Vidyabhushan to Lahore to enable the operation to be performed there?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (d). The State Prisoner has had some nasal trouble which gives him an occasional headache. No suggestion has been made by the Medical Officers that he should undergo an operation but arrangements are being made for his examination by the Civil Surgeon of Multan. The other symptoms mentioned in the question appear to be due to indigestion. The State Prisoner has gained ten lbs. in weight during the last five months.

INDIAN OFFICER CADETS TURNED OUT BY THE TRAINING SHIP "DUFFERIN".

545. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of Indian officer cadets turned out by the Training ship "Dufferin" since it was started in 1927?

(b) How many of them have been able so far to secure admission in the commissioned ranks of the Royal Indian Marine or the Indian Navy?

(c) How many of them have been taken in as apprentices in the service of shipping companies operating in Indian waters, and of the latter how many are British and how many are Indian concerns?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) 149.

(b) Six *ex*-cadets of the "Dufferin" have so far been selected for employment in the Royal Indian Navy. Of these, two have got their Commissions and are serving as Sub-Lieutenants, while the remaining four are still under training in the United Kingdom.

(c) 116; 74 by British Companies and 42 by Indian Companies.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are there any candidates who have been trained and have not secured appointments?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am afraid I could not tell you off-hand.

INDIANS HOLDING A MASTER'S CERTIFICATE ON AN OCEAN-GOING STEAMER.

546. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): Will Government be pleased to state the number of Indians holding a Master's (i.e., Captain's) Certificate of an ocean-going steamer, and the nature of their employment?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Government have no precise information as to the number of Indians holding a Master's certificate, but the following are the numbers of candidates born in India who have qualified as Masters of Foreign-going and Home Trade Steamships, since 1929, when such certificates were first issued by the Government of India.

1930	9
1931	5
1932	7
1933	8
1934	6

In addition to these, Government are aware that some Indians hold the corresponding certificates issued by the Board of Trade in England. Government are not aware of the nature of the present employment of these gentlemen.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Will the Honourable Member kindly try to get the necessary information and supply it?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I am afraid it would be almost impossible, otherwise I should have been only too glad to try and get the information.

ENGINEER CADETS TURNED OUT BY THE TRAINING SHIP "DUFFERIN" OR AS A RESULT OF TRAINING AS MARINE ENGINEERS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

547. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Engineer cadets turned out so far either by the training ship "Dufferin" or as a result of training as Marine Engineers in the United Kingdom; and
- (b) the number of such Engineers who are employed (i) by British shipping agencies and (ii) by Indian shipping companies?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: (a) None from the "Dufferin", but two of the nine scholars, who were sent to the United Kingdom for training, have returned to India after completing their workshop training while a third scholar is expected to reach India this month. They have to put in 18 months training at sea before they can sit for the examination for the second class Engineer's Certificate.

(b) One of the above three scholars has already been employed by a British Company (the British India Steam Navigation Company) and is now undergoing his sea training. The second one was, on examination,

found to be temporarily medically unfit for employment as a Marine Engineer. An assurance has been received from a British Company that he will be employed by them for his sea training when he becomes fit again. Arrangements have also been made for the employment by an Indian Company (the Scindia Steam Navigation Company) of the third scholar for his sea training as soon as he reaches India.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Was he declared unfit for work in the Docks also?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am afraid, Sir, that I do not remember the details of the case, but if my Honourable friend will put down a question, I shall supply him with the information.

EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN MARINE ENGINEERS BY THE PORT TRUSTS AND SHIPPING COMPANIES.

548. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) What steps, if any, have Government taken so far to impress on Port Trusts and shipping companies engaged in the coastal trade of India the desirability of their engaging Indian Marine Engineers to the extent they are available?

(b) Do Government propose to insist on an undertaking being given by such shipping companies regarding employment of Indian cadets and apprentices both in navigation and engineering lines and the Indianisation of their marine services?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) Government have received assurances from the principal shipping companies in India as to their willingness to employ properly trained and qualified engineer officers on their ships. Government have also brought to the notice of Port Trusts the desirability of Indianizing their superior services generally, and have particularly asked them to give preference to candidates who have passed through the "Dufferin" training ship.

(b) In view of the readiness of shipping companies to employ such suitable and qualified Indians as are available, Government do not consider it necessary to take any such action even if they had power to do so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: After the assurance has been received by Government, how many Indians have been employed by the Shipping Companies?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Actually employed?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I am afraid I could not tell how many were actually employed.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am asking, Sir, whether the assurance given by the Shipping Companies has been translated into practice?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think so, Sir.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact that every cadet who has come out of the "Dufferin" has got an appointment?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I think my friend is quite correct so far.

WIRELESS OPERATORS TRAINED AT ALIPORE AND ENGAGED BY THE INDIAN AND BRITISH SHIPPING COMPANIES.

549. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): Will Government be pleased to state the number of wireless operators trained since the opening of training class at Alipore in 1928 and the number of such operators as have been able to secure employment in (i) Indian shipping companies and (ii) British shipping companies engaged in India's coastal trade?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The Wireless Training School maintained by the Posts and Telegraphs Department at Alipore was instituted a long time before 1928 for the purpose of training personnel of the Posts and Telegraphs Department in wireless and is not intended for the training of other persons. As a special case at the request of an Indian Steamship Company the training of 17 men as wireless operators for ships was undertaken in 1928. Sixteen completed the full course and were granted certificates of competency as wireless operators. So far as Government are aware, these operators were employed by the Company at whose request they were trained.

CONFIDENTIAL ENQUIRY MADE IN BIHAR AND ORISSA FROM PRIVATE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ABOUT THEIR WILLINGNESS TO VOLUNTEER FOR WAR SERVICE OR IN ANY NATIONAL EMERGENCY.

550. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they are aware that in the Province of Bihar and Orissa, a confidential enquiry is being made from private medical practitioners as to whether they would be willing to volunteer for service either in case of war or in any national emergency arising?

(b) Is the enquiry being made under Government instructions, and is such enquiry proceeding in other Provinces also?

(c) If the enquiry is proceeding at Government instance, will they be pleased to explain the meaning and significance of it?

(d) Is the enquiry in question a mere precautionary measure, or have Government any reason to anticipate in the near future either a war, or what is described as "national emergency"? If not, what is the idea behind the enquiry?

(e) Has the enquiry anything to do with the question of the retention of the civil branch of the Indian Medical Service on the grounds of a war reserve?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: (a), (b), (c) and (e). No such enquiry is being made under the orders of the Government of India. I have asked the local authorities for information on the subject and will lay a further reply on the table in due course.

(d) Government have no reason to anticipate a war in the near future.

REALISATION OF FINES BY ATTACHING JOINT-FAMILY PROPERTY IMPOSED IN CONNECTION WITH THE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE MOVEMENT.

551. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they have issued instructions to the Local Governments to realise fines, by attaching joint-family property, if need be, imposed in connection with the civil disobedience movement, even though the sentence of imprisonment awarded in default of fine has been fully undergone, in addition to the substantive sentence, of imprisonment?

(b) Are Government aware that according to judicial decisions, joint-family property cannot be attached in realisation of a fine imposed on an individual member of a family? If not, are they prepared to consult legal opinion on the subject?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) No such instructions have been issued.

(b) Government are aware that there have been judicial decisions to the effect mentioned by the Honourable Member.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Is it a fact, Sir, that attempts are still being made to realise these fines which were imposed at the time of the civil disobedience campaign, although this campaign has been stopped?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: My information is quite the contrary and no such attempts have been made since this decision.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Are not Government aware that by following these oppressive methods they are creating more enemies of the British rule in this country?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a question.

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Is there no answer, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a proper question; it is not in order.

VENDING CONTRACTS OF FOODSTUFFS AT THE GAYA RAILWAY STATION.

552. ***Mr. Ram Narayan Singh** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) Is it a fact that Messrs. Baliabhdas Ishwardas of Bombay have been given contract of selling foodstuffs at the Gaya Railway Station? If so, will Government be pleased to state since when this arrangement has come into force and for how long it is to operate and on what terms?

(b) Is it a fact that foodstuffs exposed for sale at the Gaya Railway Station by the vendors of Messrs. Ballabhdas Ishwardas on examination by the district medical officer on the 7th August, 1934 and 25th August, 1934 were found to be unfit for human consumption?

(c) Are Government aware of the growing complaints of the travelling public against the leasing out of the vending contracts of foodstuffs to one person on the ground of dearness of price and bad quality of foodstuffs at the Gaya Railway Station?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Messrs. Ballabhdas Ishwardas were given the contract sometime about the end of March or the beginning of April, 1934. The contract is for a period of one year and is thereafter subject to cancellation on six months' notice.

(b) Government have no information, but I am bringing the allegation to the notice of the Agent, East Indian Railway, for investigation if the matter has not already been taken up.

(c) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that complaints against vending arrangements have always received serious attention, but most of the recent complaints on investigation proved to be unfounded and to have been engineered by interested parties, principally the vendors who had been displaced by the new contractor.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Is it not a fact, Sir, that these contracts were terminable on one month's notice, and in this particular case the period has been extended from one to six months?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am aware of the terms of this contract, but not of previous contracts.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: From where did the District Medical Officer examine the foodstuffs in this particular shop? Did he examine them from his bogey carriage or from his trolley?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Sir, I have no information whether it was a fact that the District Medical Officer did make such remarks on the foodstuffs exposed?

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: What was the procedure adopted?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I believe the Agent called for the Report and sent an inspecting officer.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: Is it not desirable that some independent inquiry should be made into such matters instead of the railway authorities themselves making an inquiry?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Surely, Sir, the Agent who is responsible for the management of the Railway can be trusted to hold an inquiry into matters of this sort.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi: But when Government receive so many complaints from Honourable Members, don't they think it desirable to adopt some other means of making an inquiry into such complaints?

Mr. P. E. Rau: This complaint is a specific complaint that certain foodstuffs were declared to be unsuitable for consumption by a District Medical Officer. That is a question of fact, and there cannot be any difficulty about getting at the facts.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Are Government aware that prices at this particular station (Gaya) are about 25 to 30 per cent. higher than the market rates?

Mr. P. E. Rau: No.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: That is a fact: take it from me.

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS—*contd.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now 12 noon. resume discussion of the Demands for Grants for Railways. The Chair understands the Nationalist Party want to move a motion for reduction in respect of Indianisation.

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): I will have to request the Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore to move his Demand No. 2.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Commerce and Railways): Is the Honourable Member quite sure that his cut motion is under Demand No. 2 and not No. 8?

Mr. M. S. Aney: It is under No. 2. Audit is No. 2.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Might I suggest that the question of Indianisation may perhaps be taken up under Demand No. 6-A? It does not make any difference.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I have no objection. I have given notice of a cut under that demand also.

DEMAND NO. 6A—WORKING EXPENSES—MAINTENANCE OF STRUCTURAL WORKS.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,65,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,65,25,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1936, in respect of 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works'."

Indianisation of Railway Services.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I beg to move :

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works.' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The cut is with a view to raising a discussion on the Indianisation of Railway Services. Sir, the subject which I am, by means of this cut, bringing prominently to the notice of the House and of the Government of India is almost a hardy annual. It has been discussed practically every year, and it is really painful that an Indian Member should be compelled to bring this grievance to the notice of the so-called Government of India in the Indian Legislature and that the process should go on from year to year without the non-official side being satisfied that there was no need for it left. The very question of Indianisation of the Indian Railway Services implies that some wrong principle is being adopted in the recruitment of the services, and Indian Members find it necessary to remind the Government of India, almost every year, that they are neglecting Indianisation. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition said the other day, the question of Frenchisation, or Anglicisation or Germanisation of the services can never be raised in France, England or Germany. It is the misfortune of this country only that the question of Indianisation has to be raised, has to be discussed and has to be urged on the Government which reluctantly accede to it at times in principle only without perhaps meaning to scrupulously observe it in practice. That is our misfortune. The story of the Indian railways, which begins with the year 1853, to this date, so far as Indianisation is concerned, is a miserable one. I will not speak of the earlier years. It was in 1869, if I mistake not, that Government practically entered upon the policy of owning the railways. It went on doing this work through its own Public Works Department, and under a Directorate for a number of years. Then, that policy was changed in the year 1905 when the Railway Board came into existence. It was in March 1905. Now, it is 30 years that the Railway Board has come into existence and taken charge of the Indian railways. One object in establishing the Railway Board and taking away the control from the former authority and vesting it in this body was to run the Indian railways principally in the interests of the Indian people and the Government of India in a more profitable, commercial and economic manner. So, it would not be improper to examine the Railway Board's administration from the year 1905 to 1935, a period of 30 years, from the point of view of what progress the Railway Board has been able to achieve in the Indianisation of the services.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division : Non-Muhammadan) : On the other hand, it is retrograde.

Mr. M. S. Aney: My Honourable friend, who is thoroughly conversant with the statistical knowledge of the railways, informs me that it is retrograde. If it is so, it is certainly discreditable to the Railway Board, and I have no doubt if judged properly, the verdict of the House also will be that the word progress is a misnomer in that case. If we give up the year 1905, the other important year in the history of the railway administration in India is 1924 when the railway finances were separated from the general finances and the Railway Board also was constituted

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

on a more constitutional and a more efficient basis. At the time of this separation, a convention was accepted, and as a part of that convention a condition was laid down that the Board should be more careful and vigilant in Indianising the services rapidly. That condition was so skillfully introduced into the convention that it might be read as a part of the convention or it might be treated as not being a part of the convention also. But the understanding when that convention was entered into was that the Railway Board, in discharging its duty of administering the railways, was expected to give its prominent attention to the rapid Indianisation of the Indian Railway Services. From 1924 to 1935 is a period of 11 years. The Railway Board has been in existence for 30 years, and with a specific solemn condition attached to its duties and obligations in respect of Indianisation it has been in existence for the last 11 years. The Board was given, by this House, all the facilities it wanted by allowing the railway finances to be separated from the general finances. We know how far, during the last 11 years, the Railway Board has succeeded in observing the conditions on which the separation convention was made. Of course it would be out of place for me to deal with other points which do not directly have a bearing upon the question of Indianisation, but, by the way, I may mention that some of the most important conditions of that convention during the last five years the Railway Board has not at all been able to fulfil. The Railway Board has not been able to give to the Central Revenues even that little contribution which was fixed as the minimum that was due from the Indian Railways to the Indian taxpayers who have incurred the burden of something like 800 crores of rupees of debt for the capital expenditure of the railways. The annual contribution which only amounted to six crores a year could not be paid off by them. The depreciation fund has been practically exhausted. The reserve fund has been entirely swallowed. That is the way in which the Railway Board has been managing the railway affairs during the last eleven years. It will not be proper for me now to enter upon an examination of these points. I will only try to examine the particular point, *viz.*, Indianisation of services, and I hope to show that, even on this point on which this House has been very keen and on which several recommendations have been made by Commissions which have come into existence for the purpose of examining the question of Indianisation and other railway matters, the Railway Board has not yet been able to come up not only to our expectations but they have not even made any appreciable progress in that direction. The position of Indianisation when the Acworth Committee reported was this.

An Honourable Member: Awkward Committee.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I see an Honourable Member calls it the "Awkward Committee". (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: We heard you like that.

Mr. M. S. Aney: It was due either to a mispronunciation by me or it was misheard by my friends. This is what the Acworth Committee said on page 58, paragraph 182 of their report:

"At the date of the last report, there were employed on the railways of India about 710,000 persons; of these roughly 700,000 were Indians and only 7,000 Europeans, a proportion of just one per cent. But the 7,000 were like a thin film of oil on the

top of a glass of water, resting upon but hardly mixing with the 700,000 below. None of the highest posts are occupied by Indians. very few even of the higher. The position of a District Engineer, District Traffic Superintendent, or of an Assistant Auditor is, with one or two exceptions, the highest to which Indians have hitherto attained."

The detailed figures are given elsewhere. This was the position when the Committee made its report. Sir, after that, we had also this subject discussed to some extent by the Lee Commission. The Lee Commission report was made after the Montford Reforms came into existence. The policy of those reforms as regards services was that there should be a greater association of Indians in every branch of the administration. After that the Lee Commission had made its report and the Lee Commission distinctly laid down that the proportion of Indianisation must be more rapid than what it was and it also suggested that the recruitment should come up at least to 75 per cent. A report to that effect was made by the Lee Commission.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): That result was to be achieved after a certain number of years.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I am coming to that. I am not unaware of what has been done and I am fully conscious of what my Honourable friend is going to say in reply also. My object in referring to this is this—that this is a question on which it has been found necessary, both by this House as well as by the various committees and commissions that have been appointed, to bring this matter repeatedly to the notice of the Government of India—that the progress of Indianisation is not at all deemed satisfactory by them and it is really so. If you take the classified list and the distribution return of establishments of all railways for 1933-34, and if you go on reading the names under the various departments of the Railway Board and the different State Railways, so far as the superior services are concerned, it is difficult for you to find out in the thick jungle of foreign names any Indian name there. The Indians are so meagrely represented there that if you want to find an Indian name there you must make a serious study of the lists.

An Honourable Member: Microscopic minority!

Mr. M. S. Aney: My Honourable friend opposite will tell me that from the year 1925 to the year 1933 or 1934, from 28 point something, Indians have progressed and risen to 38 point something in the superior services. I will read to you the figures from the Railway report relating to the progress made in Indianisation. In 1931-32, Europeans 22 per cent.; Indians 25, of whom 16 were Anglo-Indians, 78 per cent. In 1932-33 Europeans 36.4 per cent.; Indians 63.6. These are the figures which my Honourable friend might quote. In the first place, with regard to these figures, I have got one particular point to bring to his notice. In the year 1931-32, I find that including the Anglo-Indians the rate of progress is 78 per cent, but in the year 1932-33, it has come down to 63.6 and the reasons given for this reduction are very astounding. That is also a point which I want to emphasise in connection with this subject.

It is stated that the reduced percentage was on account of the appointment of three Europeans on the Burma Railways. And why were the Europeans instead of Indians appointed there? We are told seriously and gravely—as if it was an axiomatic truth which did not require any demonstration at all, that in accordance with an understanding between the Government of Burma and the Government of India, Indians were

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

not to be appointed but only Burmans and if Burmans were not available then Europeans were to be appointed. That is the sort of understanding between the Government of Burma and the Government of India. Whenever there is a vacancy, it is to be filled either by a Burman or by an European but not at all by an Indian. In what year did the Honourable Member or the Government of India come to an understanding like that with the Government of Burma? Is the Government of Burma an independent Government with which the Government of India have to make a treaty like the so-called Indo-Burman treaty which is to come and of which we are hearing so much here. When the Indo-Burman Railway treaty was made, was it brought to the notice of this House, or of the Central Advisory Council? Was this fact ever brought to the notice of the Standing Finance Committee when they considered proposals for new construction in Burma? Did that committee approve of that policy? If the Government of India are prepared to make agreements with the Government of Burma, which was undoubtedly a Provincial Government, subordinate to them, can the Government of India say why they did not make similar agreements with other Provincial Governments? On what principle do the Government of India justify the policy of treating Indians as aliens in Burma when Burma is still being recognised as part of British India? When Burma will be separated from British India, that will be a different proposition, but so long as Burma forms part of British India, what is the principle and what is the ground on which the Government of India are prepared to justify the isolation of Indians and treating them as aliens in Burma and giving preference to Europeans as being more akin and nearer to the Burmans? (Laughter.) Sir, they are establishing a new relationship of blood between the Burmans and the British (Laughter) and trying to teach them, as it were, secretly to treat Indians as aliens and foreigners! (Laughter.) It was the result of this teaching, this mischievous teaching, I say, secretly carried on by very responsible officers that they have now succeeded in manipulating the Burma-separation problem today and it is thus that we and the Burman brethren find ourselves now in this very difficult and unenviable position. (Hear, hear.)

My point, Sir, is that even in carrying out the niggardly policy of 75 per cent. they are not consistent. On one excuse or another they are getting over it, and I have pointedly brought this policy to the notice of the Assembly, this point to which reference was made by the Government of India in their Railway Report of 1932-33. I find it there and I have noted this fact. With regard to this principle of recruitment, *vis.*, the recruitment of Indians to the extent of 75 per cent. what I find is that in the recruitment of the superior services and in the recruitment of the subordinate services they are not uniformly following the principle of 75 per cent. It is no use giving a smaller percentage of increase in the case of the superior services and with a higher in the case of the subordinate services and then trying to arrive at an average by dividing it by two and say that it comes to somewhere near 75 or 76 per cent, and so on. My main complaint about this matter is that the superior posts are kept up in the hands of Europeans and the lower services are mainly recruited in Indians and the Indians are appointed there. In that way the thing is going on, and today the result is that the top is white and the bottom is black. (Laughter.) That is the position of the Indian railway services.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): They are growing old!

Mr. M. S. Aney: But not wise.

Now, Sir, in connection with this question of Indiansation, I also want the Government of India to bear in mind one thing. After thirty years we find the percentage of Indians in the superior services to be 88 now. At this rate, I want to know, after how many centuries are we likely to have our Indian railway services completely Indianised? How many centuries will we have to wait for at least the substantial Indianisation of the railway services? And when we look into the distant long period for which we shall have to wait for that consummation, I am completely dismayed and disheartened by the dismal prospects of the wholesale or complete Indianisation of the Indian railway services. I then say to myself that I do not know how many centuries, and what geological ages it is going to take for us to have our Army completely Indianised. Sir, the process, the principle, on which the Government of India are at present proceeding is, in my opinion, not merely slow, but essentially wrong. This is not the way to nationalise the services. If you want to do that, you will have to change your method radically. My protest is not that the principles on which the Lee Commission wanted the Government to go and which the Government reluctantly accepted in 1925 are altogether and entirely neglected by the Government of India. They are trying to follow those principles in some niggardly way. I am aware that on account of the fact that they have had to practise considerable retrenchment during the last five years that there is no doubt that there is not much tangible advance in the Indianisation of the services. My real complaint is that if the Indian railways are to be Indianised, then they cannot say that they will only direct their attention to the problem by simply fixing percentages of recruitment for the Europeans and for the Indians both. Let them say, Sir, that till the services are completely Indianised, they will stop recruiting any European at all. (Hear, hear.) Unless they take some such step and adopt some such method,— and let me assure the House that I do not want to do any injustice to those who are already employed and who are serving under covenants—no appreciable progress can take place within any reasonable time. Sir, if they really want to stand purely for the interests of the people of India, the first thing, I say, for them to do is to stop the recruitment of Europeans in England

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: And have it in India

Mr. M. S. Aney: and have it in India. Unless they take to a policy like that, they will never succeed in Indianizing the Indian railways within a reasonable time. Sir, it was stated that competent Indians were not found, and for the purpose of training Indians and giving them the necessary facilities for becoming competent, a college was started at Dehra Dun. I do not know what happened, but that college was closed in the year 1932. Now on the one hand, they assert that we are incompetent and hence our men cannot go to the top and cannot be appointed to the superior services. Then, when protests have been recorded on the floor of this House, they make a grand show of starting a college. But they immediately get some excuse for stopping that college, and the process of training Indians comes to a sorry end. I am told that that college has been turned into the Indian Military Academy.

Dr. Maaddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): That was on the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee.

Mr. M. S. Aney: So I do not know what other method they have got to train Indians in order to make them competent officers now. So long as there was no college, the ground taken was, 'we do not get competent men'. Then the college was started, but it was abolished on account of retrenchment shortly afterwards, and now I do not know how they are proceeding. But they are appointing a few men here and there. It all seems to me, Sir, that to regard a man as competent or incompetent is more or less the discretion of the Railway Board or those persons who are entrusted with the duty of making these appointments. Now, firstly, I have suggested that in the matter of recruitment, the Board must stop the recruitment in England altogether, and they must recruit Indians here in this country (Hear, hear.) Secondly, if they consider that higher technical training is necessary for qualifying men for the higher services, then for the purpose of such recruitment they must grant or create all the facilities on a sufficiently large scale so that large numbers of people can come and take advantage of them and offer themselves for the higher posts. It is undesirable to close such institutions as they did, and then to point out to the paucity of competent men and to close the doors. Then, secondly, one of the other things which was insisted upon before the separation was ratified that the Indian Railway Board also should have Indian members. So far as the Railway Board is concerned, that Board has shrunk into a smaller number of Members than when I left the Assembly in 1980; it is now a Board of three persons—the Chief Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner and there is one other Member only. Of course there is a large staff under the Railway Board. There are five Directors and some Secretaries and so on. That is the staff. Then we come to the Agents. We have got some six or seven Agents. For all these posts, excepting one or two here and there, we are told that they do not find competent Indians.

Dr. P. N. Banerjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): There is no Indian Member on the Railway Board.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): What is Mr. P. R. Rau?

Mr. M. S. Aney: I must say there is no Indian non-official member on the Board. I know that immediately an Indian is appointed, he will become an official Indian. The danger is there. However, we want an Indian to be there who can look at the question from a non-official point of view and not from the point of view of a Civilian who has been brought up in the service traditions for all these years. There is a good deal of advantage which even my Honourable friends on the Treasury Benches will not be able to deny in having a non-official Indian to work as their colleague. He will be able to present to them certain points of view which will never occur to the Centralised bureaucrat or those who are brought up in that system. From that point of view the complaint of this House has been from the very beginning to have a competent and qualified Indian public man who is intimately conversant with the business affairs and commercial and other activities of this country to be on the Board as

a colleague of the other Members; and it frequently urged that they should carry on the administration of the Railways in this country with the help of such an Indian colleague. If they had the benefit of a man like that, many of the grievances with regard to freight and rates and other matters would have possibly disappeared or been solved in a more satisfactory manner. The absence of a member like that makes it difficult even for those who are there and think otherwise to place their points of view properly at the proper time. That is what I feel. If the Honourable the Commerce Member would have the advantage of having on the Railway Board a non-official Indian of independent views, I really think

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): The Railway Board is going.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): And what is coming is still worse.

An Honourable Member: Make a passing reference to it.

Mr. M. S. Anay: This would be a funeral oration for the Railway Board. The point is this. So far as the Indian services are concerned from the very beginning to this day I find that there has been no genuine attempt to bring in Indians and to train them for managing the responsible work, so that one day they should be in a position to take charge of the whole machine. That ideal is not present before their mind. The ideal is to silence the protest or to hush up the cry that is raised in the country. If somebody makes a complaint, they tentatively look into the matter and try to do something by way of a sop a tentative palliative. But there is no consistent policy before the Railway Board or those who are in charge of the Railway administration that this is the machine which is to be handed over to the whole charge of Indians and that cannot be done in one night or in one day. For that purpose they will have to see that from top to bottom competent Indians are being duly recruited so that they should be in a position to assume, in the near future, the charge of the entire machine without creating any dislocation. That ideal is not kept by the Railway Board. My main grievance is that it is only by doing these tentative things that they want to say that the policy of Indianisation is being followed and not altogether neglected by them. Sir, Indianisation is not demanded by the people in order to secure a few jobs for their sons and brothers. Indianisation is demanded by the people for the sake of making the Railways a truly national asset. We have been clamouring here for the sake of asking the Government to nationalise the Indian railways, asking them to make them a State industry and a State business. We had been urging that point here on the Government and ultimately we prevailed upon them to assume the charge of the direct managements of the State Railways. Now, what was the object of doing that? If even after the assumption of the direct management of Railways, Government is going to run them in the same way in which they were being run when they were the Company-managed Railways and not as the concern of the State, the Indian Nation, then the object for which the people have been struggling and labouring during all these long years is altogether defeated in my opinion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has already spoken for half an hour.

Mr. M. S. Aney: I will soon finish my speech, Sir. My point is this. In view of all these things, my main complaint against the Government of India is that the present system of Indianisation is in itself not being scrupulously and honestly carried out. That is one thing. And if they go by that system, it will be centuries before the Indian Railways can be Indianised. Therefore, a radical change in the system and a steady adherence to the policy of completely Indianising the services within a definite period must be steadily kept in view by those who are responsible for the management of the Indian Railways. That is a grievance which we on this side of the House have against the Government. My Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, in the touching peroration of his speech on the Railway Budget said that the proper ideal which should be observed by the railway authorities is economy and efficiency combined. Now, from the point of view of economy, if you really want these railways to stand on their own legs even in lean years and if you want these railways to be a business proposition even in the midst of times of depression, that can be helped, considerably only if the railways are completely Indianised and not otherwise. It is certainly not possible when there are more than three-fourths Europeans in the higher services and only a fraction of it goes to the Indians. It is economic to employ Indians and, therefore, I say that even from the point of view of economy for which my Honourable friend, the Member for Railways, has entered such an eloquent plea, we urge that the process of Indianisation should have been more rapid particularly during the last few years when he found himself face to face with a situation of deficit budgets. The one thing that should have suggested itself to him was this that these foreign servants who have to be given such fat salaries should be dispensed with as far and as quickly as possible and persons who are Indians and equally competent and who can be had at a lower pay should have been employed by him. If the Government had taken that step, the period of the depression would have been tided over by them more comfortably than they actually found it to be. Let us hope that at least the lessons of this difficult situation would not be lost upon the Government of India in the future. In this hope, Sir, I move.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved :

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. A. K. Fuzul Huq (Bakargunj cum Faridpur: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, on a motion urging Indianisation of services, no Indian can possibly withhold his whole-hearted support to the principle involved. But I wish to emphasise that this Indianisation should ensure to the benefit of all. It will not be enough if non-Indians are merely replaced by Indians. Care must be taken that in the process of this replacement, extraneous forces do not come into play to interfere with the free flow of recruitment to services or the operation of the rules according to which the recruitments are made. Sir, if, in the past, Indians have suffered from inadequacy of representation in the services, particularly the railway services, I think I may fairly claim that Muslims have suffered the most. Sir, before I proceed further, I wish to make one point clear. I do not wish to raise any discordant note or to emphasise anything like

communalism, but I am taking up this position simply because I am convinced that the gravest possible injustice has been done to my community, injustice which should be redressed as soon as an opportunity presents itself. Only the other day, the Leader of the Opposition said that Indians are between the devil and the deep sea. I entirely agree with him, and I go further and say that Indian Muslims have been between many devils and many deep seas. Sir, the reports published, from year to year, of the working of the various departments, show very clearly how Muhammadans have been dealt with unjustly in the matter of recruitment to the public services. In the railway services the report of the Railway Board shows that the Muslim representation is only something like four per cent. I do not believe for a moment that it can be honestly urged that suitable Muslims have not been forthcoming. I am convinced that injustice has been done under various pretexts and the result is that Muhammadans are not getting a fair and proper treatment. Because I am convinced of the injustice done to my community, I am here to urge the claims of my community and I would equally urge the claims of the Parsi, the Sikh or the Hindu community or the Christian community or of any other community if I were convinced that their case also is one of injustice. I plead for fair play and equality for all, no undue preference to anybody. I have got certain figures with me, but I do not wish to go in great detail over them. I find in one of the Departments of the Railways, namely, the Accounts Department, the Muslims are most poorly represented. I am singling out the case of this department, because I find from the enquiries that I have been able to make, within the limited time at my disposal, that many of the employees in this Accounts Department have passed only the matriculation examination, while there are several Muhammadan graduates out of employ and who are willing to take an appointment at the lowest rung of the ladder and work their way up by sheer merit and by a proper discharge of the duties that may be entrusted to them. There is another office, called the Central Standardisation Office. I do not know if I have got the name correctly, but it is something of that kind which is soon going to be made permanent, and I am informed that in this Department over 50 appointments have been made, but there is not a single Muslim . . .

Bhai Parma Nand (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): May I have your ruling whether the motion is for Indianisation or for Muslimisation? I want your ruling on this point of order.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. There is no point of order.

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Hug: I want by Indianisation that all communities should have a fair share. If the result of Indianisation is to be that only Brahmans will get in, then I will say that it is Brahminisation and not Indianisation. I am pleading for equality of treatment, and I hope my Honourable friends will bear with me when I say that injustice in any share or form must be put down. I am pleading for my community, not because they are Muslims, but because they are Indians. I submit that Indians should be provided for in railway services consistently with the question that efficiency of service is not impaired, and if qualified Muslims are forthcoming, I do not see any reason why they should not be given

[Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq.]

a fair chance. Does not my Honourable friend know that although rules regarding recruitment to services are in force, various influences come into play in the way of a fair application of the rules? There is indirect pressure, there is favouritism and many other forces that come into play which keep out really qualified Muhammadans from entering into railway services. I am not at all surprised that if a man at the top has got some near relations he has a natural feeling that his dependants relations, his *jathbhais* and his kith and kin should be provided first, and that is the reason why the Muhammadans are kept out and that is why members of various other communities are kept out, except the community to which the top-man belongs. I want to see all jobbery, favouritism and nepotism of all kinds that work to the prejudice of the really qualified entirely wiped out from the services, so that we may get the best value for the money we spend.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind. Non-Muhammadan Rural): Is there favouritism in the Public Services Commission also?

Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq: I have had no information on that subject. I have never been acquainted with the doings of the Public Services Commission, because I have no relation of mine depending for selection by the Public Services Commission. I will soon find out, in course of time, how the Public Services Commission is doing its work. I do not wish to take up any more time of the House. I submit that while care should be taken that the services are Indianised, equal care should be taken that no injustice is caused to the members of any particular community, because it is Indianisation we want and not favouritism for anybody, whether Hindus, Sikhs or Muslims or Buddhists, or anybody else.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I enter this debate not with the desire of defending the Railway Board, because they can well do that themselves, but to support the Mover very largely in certain things that he stated. The Honourable the Mover of this motion has charged the Railway Board with insufficient Indianisation or a slow-movie Indianisation instead of the pace he wants. With my knowledge of the subject, I do not think that this charge can be honestly levelled against the Railway Board as far as State Railways are concerned. But, I do submit, it can be levelled with every justification against the operation of Indianisation as far as Company-managed railways are concerned. (Hear, hear.) One has only to scan the statistics that are supplied to us yearly to see that the Railway Board, as far as the State Railways are concerned, have not only satisfied the Lee Commission demand, but in certain cases have exceeded the percentages

Mr. B. Das: You are wrong there.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I will not say that my friend is an ass, but sometimes he makes interruptions like one.

Mr. M. S. Aney: Is it parliamentary to use the word "ass" with respect to an Honourable Member of this House?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think the Honourable Member meant any sort of reflection. As the expression has been objected to, he must withdraw.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: He is a very wise man who, at times, maketh himself an ass. I did not mean that Mr. Das was an ass. I did not mean that, Sir. I am sorry if he has misunderstood me, but he sometimes makes interruptions . . .

Mr. B. Das: Do not make yourself an ass by your explanation.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: If one really looks at the statistics of Company-managed railways, one will find that not only is Indianisation more or less at a stand still in the official grades, but also in the upper subordinate grades. For instance, take the railway workshops of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway. That Company has made a habit, or a fetish, of bringing covenanted men into the upper subordinate ranks of the workshops at Ajmer as foremen and assistant foremen, men who are Europeans, covenanted or domiciled, and cunningly wangling their promotions to the prejudice of senior Anglo-Indians, and Indians. The Railway Board, I am aware, has frequently insisted on the policy of Indianisation being rigidly adhered to by Agents of Company-managed railways. I make a charge here on the floor of the House and I challenge contradiction from the Government that most of the Company-managed railway Agents have flouted their orders and have not carried them out. I go further and say that the Railway Board have warned Company-managed railways against their non-observance of the policy of Indianisation and that these Agents have taken very little notice of it. I sit down and await a contradiction of my statement. (After a pause.) There is no contradiction. If my Honourable friend, the Mover, had confined his charges to the Company-managed railways, I would have supported him whole-heartedly. I do think he was a little bit too hard on the Railway Board so far as the State Railways are concerned.

Sir, the superior services of the railways are today recruited very largely in India and partly in England. In England, the procedure of recruitment today is divided between the Secretary of State in Council and the High Commissioner for India in London. Certain appointments are made by these two high officials and the other appointments, which are today called Indian services,—specially the Indian Service of Engineers and Transportation and Power,—are made by the Public Services Commission. The Honourable the Mover of this Motion in commenting on this point in anticipating greater fear for the future made, what I consider, rather a *faux pas*. He said it is bad today, and what is about to be given in the new Railways Statutory Board will make bad. I am afraid I cannot agree with him, because, if he studies the Statutory Railway Board Report, he will find that the position, so far as recruitment of officials is concerned, will be infinitely better in the future, because it distinctly lays down in that Report that all superior appointments to the railways will, when that Board becomes operative, be the duty of the Federal Government, which means that India will then really have the sole power and authority in the selection of its superior railway services. I do think there is much in favour of what the Honourable Member

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

said that all railway recruitment should be stopped in England. But there are certain railway appointments that demand certain highly skilled qualifications and experience and we must insist on these since India cannot give us such men; the fault is,—may be our own, may be the result of the Government policy which the severe critic would say has been a "studied policy",—in that India has not been given facilities to train her sons in these higher skilled technical and manufacturing works, and so we are unable to provide our own men who can fill these highly technical appointments, and, therefore, they must continue to be recruited from England. Until this state is remedied, it is, I submit, necessary for us to indent on foreign countries for such experts. I do think, Sir, that the railways being so highly technical and scientific in certain of its branches, we must continue to recruit people in England for some time to come. But I do hope the day is not far distant when we shall be able to recruit all our railway servants in India. My Honourable friend showed a great desire to get at the bottom of things. Well, Sir, he would have more quickly got at the bottom of the thing had he confined himself to the pace in which Indianisation is going on, not as a whole, but in certain Departments and communities.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Fuzlul Huq, with whom I am not very often in agreement, referred to the paucity of Muslim recruitment and he was interrupted by my friend, Bhai Parma Nand, who asked whether he wanted Indianisation or Muslimisation. I do think that Mr. Fuzlul Huq brought before the House a very serious position. I remember about eight years ago, on the floor of this House, I pointed out this very fact to my Muhammadan brothers, and it was then that they, for the very first time, interested themselves in their representation on railways. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, will remember the occasion when they came to me and together we collected certain information which was used in a demand before this House. Sir, there is no doubt in my mind, that if any community has suffered from non-employment on the railways, it has been the Muslim community.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: So you are the culprit!

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, if my friend from Sind would only place a barrage around his voice, I would be saved his barrage of interruptions.

Sir, I would draw the Honourable the Railway Member's attention to the flagrant violation of the policy of Indianisation indulged in by Company-managed railways, specially so far as their workshops are concerned, and, in this connection, I wish to make special reference to the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway where, as I have said, covenanted men and Europeanisation is the established order of the day and the appointments of foremen and assistant foremen are so manipulated as to be a preserve for them and them only, and what is worse is, the Railway Board cannot interfere and stop this malpractice.

My Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, made a complaint about the closure of the college at Dehra Dun for the training of officers in the superior railway services. But, I ask, who closed that college? I think it was the Retrenchment Committee that was appointed by this House. I believe it was they who suggested it; but why, when you have the opportunity, do you, in your lustful quest for economy, try to operate

reprisals on the Government by closing an institution which was doing good work, that is, harming ourselves and India? But apart from that, I think myself that if we mean to push this demand, it is no use doing it by words in this House and by moving a cut of Rs. 100. The Railway Board can easily afford a cut of one hundred lakhs and yet function; a cut of one hundred rupees can do no harm to them. Why not let us be more practical? Let us insist that we must be trained in our own country for all branches on our railways. That is what we must have, and a beginning must be made now.

My Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, labours under a very wrong idea when he points out that there are very few Indians in the official and upper subordinate classified lists. Sir, last year, I made an appeal to Government that an Indian should be appointed on the Railway Board for the vacancy that was about to exist and I mentioned the name of a very distinguished officer, Rai Bahadur B. R. Singh of the Eastern Bengal Railway. I very much regret that no notice was taken of that, because that was an opportunity for the Government of India to make a gesture to this House. But, apart from that, there is no Indian in the Railway Board today.

Mr. R. S. Sarma (Nominated Non-Official): There are.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I am glad you interrupted me, but I shall be very glad if you can show me that there is an Indian on the Railway Board. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, brilliant as he is in the profession, is not a member of the railway service. He is the watchdog of the Finance Member to control the financial expenditure of the railways. But he is not a Member of the Railway Board, so far as the railway service is concerned. I repeat, there is no Indian on the Railway Board. Our worthy friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, has certainly a controlling effect on that Board, but he is not a member of the railway service. The actual working Railway Board consists entirely of Agents of the railway service. They represent their own interests. I know they are honest enough to look after the administration and welfare of railway administration as a whole; but behind their heads there is that one paramount point, *viz.*, they must look after their own railway interests first, especially in so far as their European officials are concerned, for blood is thicker than water.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Thank you, Sir; I have very little more to add. Sir, I provisionally support this motion. (Laughter, and cries of "You will vote with Government".) Would you mind keeping quiet until I finish? If in interrupting me you want to make use of your 12-bore guns, I'll use my cannon. When I said I provisionally accept this motion, I meant that my acceptance depended on the reply Government give. If Government prove to my satisfaction that they have carried out their policy of Indianisation on the State Railways, and if Government admit that the Company-managed railways have not carried out their policy and they will insist on this being remedied, I shall not walk into the lobby with the Mover of the motion. If they do not, then I shall vote with the Mover of the motion.

Dr. N. B. Khare (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Mr. President I rise to support the cut moved by my friend, Mr. Aney. Sir, I am a new arrival in this House and it is possible that I may commit some mistakes, but I hope you will bear with me for some time. Being a new arrival, I am not conversant with any Ackworth or awkward commissions or Lee loots. I will look upon this question from a different point of view, from the Congress point of view. Sir, this complaint about Indianisation is not only a hardy annual, it is a perennial one, a perpetual one, and so long as we are what we are, it is going to remain so. There is provision made in the Act itself, under which the government of this country is carried on, for this complaint. If I am right, I remember that there is some phrase in the Act somewhere to this effect: gradually increasing association of Indians with the task of the governance of the country. The phrase is clear enough: the increasing association of Indians must be gradual; and for it to be gradually increasing it must never be complete: otherwise it will cease to be gradually increasing. (Laughter.) So, in this phrase itself, you can find grounds for the complaint. There are several phrases on a par with this. There is one more phrase of which some people of a particular political persuasion are very much enamoured, which runs thus: gradual realisation of responsible government by successive stages. Here again the realisation of responsible government must be gradual . . .

An Honourable Member: Progressive.

Dr. N. B. Khare: Progressive: it does not matter—it makes no difference. If the realisation ever comes at all, it will never be progressive: it must be progressive, therefore, it must never be complete. We are in this situation, and, therefore, it is no wonder that such perennial complaints arise in this House, and we have to come to this House and cry ourselves hoarse for the redress of these complaints. If I may say so, this complaint is as old as Johnnie Walker 120 years old and still going strong. This complaint is very kindly nurtured and watered by our benign Government so that we might come here every year and please our palate by chewing this complaint with our sweet tongues. If really the Government is serious in giving heed to our complaint they must do something substantial towards the removal of that grievance; but are they doing it? They cannot, because, although the Government consist of foreigners, and we are under foreign domination, that is not the only worst thing about it. The domination is not only foreign, but is meant to be for exploitation; and so long as the exploitation is there, of course I do not expect that this Government will do anything in the matter of removing our complaints. The whole fabric of this administration is really based on two simple small Anglo-Saxon words: what are those words? Grab, and Brag. When we place our grievances that a certain pledge is not kept, that a promise is not kept, we get some sort of yarn from those Benches and we are asked to be quiet and behave like good children. That is brag: and when they plot and scheme to keep us away still further from our desired objects, that is grabbing: these two things go on merrily together hand in hand . . .

An Honourable Member: Permutation and combination!

Dr. N. B. Khare: Yes: really speaking, if this Government had honoured their pledges given in the past, we would have had no occasion to come to this House and make these complaints. But even a pledge of that august Queen Victoria, which was given in 1858 after the mutiny, was and is being honoured in its breach: and a Viceroy had the effrontery to say that it was an impossible character. What value can you attach to promises given on the floor of this House or any where else when such pledges given by august personages like the Sovereign himself are trampled upon in this manner? They say that something is being done: I am sure they will continue saying so, repeating this pledge to Indianise the railway services: let alone big jobs: even when they do something to Indianise the smaller jobs, they act in a niggardly and miserable manner. Really speaking this cry should not be raised: or rather we are helpless in this matter: Why? Because the Government are the worst communalist in this matter: they have reserved everything worth having, so far as they can help it, for the Europeans. If we cry for Indianisation, they must thank themselves for it: we cannot help it; but so far as I am concerned I do not care what community there is, so long as it is Indian: it should be Indians alone, whether they are Anglo-Indians or Muhammadans, or Hindus or Parsis—I care a tuppence for it; but it should not be Europeans. But I do not blame the communalists among us because naturally they take their cue from the paternal Government which is communalistic in this matter

An Honourable Member: Paternal or maternal?

Dr. N. B. Khare: It is *Ma Bap*—combined both. As an example of how the Government carried out the policy of Indianisation even in small jobs in the most niggardly and fraudulent manner, I will quote one instance. Let alone the big and soft jobs: this is with regard to a small job of an Assistant Station Master at Itarsi on the Great Indian Peninsula which is a State-managed railway so far as I understand: my friend, Colonel Gidney, will note—he made a great excuse for the Railway Board: and it is in this railway that these things happen. This Assistant Station Master's appointment was "A" grade—it is not for Indians; and when the administration wanted to Indianise it, they sent a man there an Indian—on Rs. 75: the pay of the job up to that time was Rs. 345. This is Indianisation. Not only that: there are some bigger posts there carrying Rs. 345 and held by non-Indians if I may say so: they are not very big jobs, but still they are held by non-Indians, and if Indians are appointed, what pay was given to them? Rs. 80 per month.

An Honourable Member: Economy!

Dr. N. B. Khare: Why do not they have this economy all round? Why do they have this particular kind? There is a still more funny instance,—again at Itarsi; and this time it is the Station Master's job. When it was in the hands of a non-Indian person—whether he was 16 annas European or not, I do not know—he was getting Rs. 395 and the station was classed as first class. When it was Indianised the Indian was given Rs. 225 and it was classed as a second class station. Subsequently, when the Indian was removed and another non-Indian was again brought there, he was given again Rs. 395 and the station was again classed as "A". This is how they are carrying out Indianisation with a vengeance Sir, this is

[Dr. N. B. Khare.]

the niggardly and fraudulent manner in which things are managed by the Railway Administration,—let my friend, Colonel Gidney, please note. Now, if this is the way, if this is the fashion in which Indianisation is carried on, I will say, Sir, God save us from Indianisation. Really speaking, I am not at all for any kind of "Isations". I want power to appoint people, to carry out my policy in the interest of my country, dictated by my Government, and if that policy is carried on by any kind of people, whether Europeans, Hindus, Muslims, Christians or Parsis, I do not care so far as I am concerned. (Cheers from Congress Party Benches.) I am perfectly certain about one thing; we may cry from year's end to year's end, but we will not gain our object, because, as I said before, the whole administration is unrighteous. They will benefit themselves, their own pockets, and so long as we do not create sanctions behind our demand, I do not think that we shall gain anything in making these demands; but still we have to carry on things like this as sometimes we carry on our religious functions . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: Without believing in God?

Dr. N. B. Khare: Yes, in the same way we have to carry on these things, until we are in better times from our point of view. Sir, it is our birthright to have our administration in our own hands, to run it by our own personnel, for our own benefit, and this birthright cannot be obtained by making grievances in this House, especially when the people in whose hands lies the remedy for setting right our grievances have interests diametrically opposed to ours. So in coming here this is what we find. And when we go back we will be in a mood like this. It is a common couplet which says:

*"Sangdil ko sang leke sangdil ke sang gaye,
Jinka dil tha sang marmar unke sang mar mar gaye".*

"Of course, they are white no doubt, and they have got a heart, but it is not only as hard but as cold as *Sanga Marmar* or marble rocks". So, we have, after all, to dash our heads against that marble and return from this House and see what we can do outside and come in again to see if that stone will melt at all. With these words, I support the cut.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at a Quarter Past Two of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) in the Chair.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair desires to remind Honourable Members that the European Group would move their cut motion at 3 o'clock according to the arrangement arrived at between the Parties, and the Chair would ask them to bear that in mind.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): Sir, the very fact, that year after year a cut motion on this subject is tabled worded as "Indianisation of Railway Services", goes to show that there is something wrong in the whole system of administration in India. We, Indians, who should be the only claimants to the posts in our own country, really feel humiliated when we find that we have to fight for our rights even in our own country. As a matter of fact, we should have expected that the motion should be worded in some such language as this, "a few Europeans to be recruited for certain technical subjects". But, on the contrary, we are told that in this country of 350 millions of people they have not yet been able to find Indians who can know something of railway technique or are expert in various branches of the railway administration. May one ask a simple question from the power that be, that how is it that when a small country like England could furnish experts in all branches, in all services and in the various activities of the State, a country of 350 millions cannot produce those experts? If they have not been able to produce these experts in the last 150 years of British rule here, may I know when we are going to have those experts? Or are we not going to have them at all? Are Indians intellectually inferior to such a degree that even with the best of masters Indians have not been able to come up to the level which fits them to fill up the jobs in their own country? This is a monstrous proposition to which no Indian with any self-respect can subscribe. We have not been able to understand the position taken up by the bureaucracy in India that Indians are not able to fill any job which requires technical knowledge. Why introduce any service if Indians cannot be trained as experts to handle that service? Why not begin with a planned scheme by which the technical branches of the Indian railways may be classified and the qualifications necessary to fill up the appointments noted,—open training institutions where that technical knowledge may be imparted; fix up a time limit within which the whole of the technical branches should be replaced by Indians after due training. Why has it not been done so far? Every year we are told that technical men must be imported from abroad. May I know why? What is this logic, what is this reasoning? There is no sense in it. I can understand if technical men are imported for a year, for six months or some time, for even a couple of years, but not for all time to come. The want of a planned scheme of some sort is adding to the unemployment that we find today amongst our own educated classes. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, has told us that, so far as the State-managed railways are concerned, Indianisation is going on with a rapid pace, but so far as the Company-managed railways are concerned, the need for hastening the pace is greater.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca cum Mymensingh: Muhammadan Rural): Not in the Bengal Nagpur Railway.

Sardar Sant Singh: I do not know much about that railway, and, therefore, I cannot say one way or the other.

Pandit Nilakantha Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Did the Honourable Member say that the Bengal Nagpur Railway has been Indianised?

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I said it is going on with Indianisation rapidly.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. No conversation across the floor of the House is allowed.

Sardar Sant Singh: My point is that State-managed railways are as badly off in this respect as the Company-managed railways. I do not think any gentleman can safely challenge me when I say that if we are serious in bringing about Indianisation in services generally and in the railways particularly, it should not take more than five years to do so if a proper will is behind it.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: How in five years?

Sardar Sant Singh: My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, asks me how it can be done.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: In five years I said.

Sardar Sant Singh: I say it can be done in a lesser period than five years if we put our shoulders to the wheel. How is it that, when a new service comes into existence in foreign countries, those experts come into existence simultaneously, while, in India, it requires the importation of foreigners each time new services are introduced? I refuse to believe in the supposition that we are inferior to any race in intellect, physique or mind. Those who want us to remain suppressed say that this cannot be done within this period or that cannot be done within that period. Coming to another question which was raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Fuzlul Huq,—I do not find him in his seat

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: I am here.

Sardar Sant Singh: I am glad that there is a substitute sitting in this House. Mr. Fuzlul Huq said that there was a paucity of Muslims in the railway services and he wanted that, if Indianisation was to come at all, it should come at all, it should come through the Muslimisation of the services, and not otherwise.

An Honourable Member: There is no doubt about it.

Sardar Sant Singh: Of course, there is no doubt about it. I quite agree with this, but in a different sense. Such a claim reminds me of a story. A beggar saw a very pretty lady riding a camel, adorned with very valuable jewellery on her person, and her very handsome husband going along with her. The beggar asked for some alms from the lady who gave some alms and she asked the beggar to pray to God that she may get something more. He was surprised at such a request and said: "My dear Lady, you have got a pretty face, a very handsome husband and lot of jewellery and you are riding a camel. What more do you need? If you want something more, I will advise you to put up a pole on the back of the camel and ride higher". The Muslims, after getting all they wanted, cry for still something more. That inequitable and most abominable circular that has recently been issued by the Railway Board for the employment of Muslims in the various departments of the railways has practically Muslimised the services. Yet, Muslims want something more. I am thankful to my friend, the new Honourable Member, who spoke last,—for the two very happy expressions.

"grab and brag" which exactly apply to the case of Muslims. The Muslims act on the motto. "Take all you get and then go on bragging. We have got nothing" This is the way in which our Muslim friends are proceeding in this matter. However, I am not dealing with this subject. If I get a chance to move my out, I will show from facts and figures how my community has been ignored in the railway services. I will only say this now, and then finish. I expect the gentlemen belonging to all the communities in this House to put their shoulders together and vote in order to make it clear to the Government that we are rather serious in making the pace of Indianisation speedier and more rapid than it is at present.

U Thein Maung (Burma: Non-European): We shall vote for the motion as we understand that Indianisation means Burmanisation so far as Burma is concerned. At the same time, we wish to protest very strongly against the suggestion that qualified Burmans might not be available. Our University has been turning out a large number of graduates every year, and we maintain that they can hold their own against graduates of other Universities. We also have others who have had their education in English Universities. As a matter of fact, some Burmans have been tried in the superior services of the Burma Railways, and they have been found to be quite capable.

Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Reral): Sir, in the convention of 1924, the Government gave a solemn undertaking that they would expedite the Indianisation of services in the Railway Department. Indianisation does not mean the recruitment of one particular community, but Indianisation really means fair and equitable treatment of all. It is not fair for the majority community to deprive the minorities by catchwords of nationalism, efficiency or acquisition and distribution. The majority community who are advantageously placed cannot press the minorities not to bring forward their claims

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholder): Even the majority community has not got adequate representation in the Railway Service.

Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer: That is not my lookout. You see the Railway Authorities. No nationalism can be formed until and unless the majority community comes forward and safeguards the interests of the minorities. The story of the Mussalmans in the railway services is woeful.

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I inquire if the Honourable Member is supporting my cut?

Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer: If the Honourable Member will hear me with some patience, he will know. Year after year, the Muslim representatives press the claims of the Mussalmans. Year after year, undertakings are given by the Railway Board, and year after year we find them in the same position. Out of all the minorities, the Mussalmans suffer the most. They form about 25 per cent. of the population of this country, but their representation in the higher services is only 4.41, in the upper subordinate services 4.7, and, in the lower grade services, it is in the neighbourhood of 12. The percentage is made up by peons and chhaprasia.

[Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer.]

The Government of India, by a recent Resolution, has fixed 25 per cent. for the Mussalmans, but it is extremely unfortunate that the share of the Mussalmans has been whittled down from 38½ to a meagre figure of 25 per cent. The Railway Board, without consulting the Mussalmans and against the statistical calculations of their own Department, has issued a circular reserving a certain proportion in various lines. The proportions fixed are 60 per cent. for the North Western Railway, 45 per cent. for the Eastern Bengal Railway, 35 per cent. for the Assam Bengal Railway, and other railways have been asked to maintain the existing low proportions of Mussalmans on those lines. This order about this new proportion is exceedingly unfair. No mention is made for the deficiency in the present deplorable proportion. Before these orders were issued, the Government of India satisfied themselves that the present paucity of Mussalmans in railway services was not due to their own fault. It was proved to the satisfaction of the Government of India that even one division of the North Western Railway can produce a sufficiently large number of qualified Mussalman candidates for all the available posts on the whole of that railway. It is a matter of common knowledge that the railway accounts offices, in which the proportion of Muslims is the smallest, are manned mostly by non-matric Hindus. Muslims with better qualifications are available and have always been available.

There are certain defects in the orders recently issued by the Government of India for the recruitment of minorities to which the attention of the Government has already been drawn by some Members of this Legislature, but no action has been taken on them.

During these days of retrenchment and economy, the proportions of certain other minority communities who were already over represented in the Railway Department have actually been increased, e.g., the proportion of Sikhs, Indian Christians and other classes taken together was 4.58 per cent. in 1931. It went up to 4.74 per cent. in 1932, and, in 1934, it stands at 5.06 per cent. In particular, the total number of Indian Christians has increased from 14,398 to 16,167 from 1932 to 1934, although during this period the total number of the entire staff on railways fell from 7,31,979 to 7,01,862. In other words, whereas there was a total reduction of more than 30,000 during these two years, the number of Indian Christians was in fact increased by about 2,000. The only minority community which is not adequately represented in the railways is the Muslim community. Its share should not have been further reduced.

I appreciate the efforts of my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, for Indianisation of services, and I hope that my Honourable friend will equally appreciate our desire which is equally sincere that the minorities should be treated in a fair manner and fair justice and an equitable share should be reserved for the Mussalmans in every grade of service for the same reason which my friend has advanced for the Indianisation of services.

Sir, I support the motion.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, there is just one important point that I would like to bring to the notice of this Honourable House and specially to the notice of the Honourable Member in charge. Mr. Aney complained, and rightly complained, about training for Indians to qualify them for railway service.

I think he stated that Government may be able to say that there are not sufficient qualified Indians to fill the higher grades. I think that is wrong. There are Indians, and what I desire to point out to the Honourable Member is that the number of qualified Indians that have been retrenched from the department lately is pathetic. There have been many Indians, educated in England, with degrees and qualifications equal to any held by Englishmen or Europeans, who after having served in the department for eight to ten years have been ruthlessly retrenched. Well, Sir, that does not appear to be a sound way of Indianising the services. I am not communally minded, but I am quite prepared to see the minorities properly represented in all our services, and I trust that my small community will not be forgotten (Laughter) (Hear, hear), because we happen to be merely concentrated in one part of India. I am not making any complaint about it but I do say that if we are to get on peacefully in this country, we must see that the minorities are satisfied, and I do not think, Mr. President, there is anybody in this House who really desires to deliberately neglect any minority. (Hear, hear.) Sir, it is rather pathetic to see qualified men, who come from these minority communities, so ruthlessly retrenched, and, having examined several of the cases of retrenchment that have been brought to my notice, I will repeat, of men educated in England, some of them recruited on a temporary basis by the Secretary of State. I must say I feel doubtful about the principle of Indianisation. And perhaps these men will not be employed again by the Railway Companies, but recruitment will take place afresh from England, and these men's lives will be ruined.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: They will have the first preference.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: My friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, says that these men will have the first preference. I can only hope and trust that that will be so, but I have my doubts. (Hear, hear.) Once a man has left the service for two or three years, he is likely to be forgotten

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Quite right, quite right.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: regardless of his qualifications, regardless of the number of years he has put in, regardless of the sacrifices he has made. Some of these men, Mr. President, who were recruited in England on a temporary basis, were given hopes of permanent appointments. They got married, they had families, and after eight or ten years' service they were thrown on to the streets. Is that a fair way of treating your services, and is that the best way to Indianisation? I should have thought that when your principle was Indianisation, you would not have retrenched a single Indian qualified to serve you, who had spent his own money to go to Europe, to get educated, you would not have retrenched those men at all, and that you would have seen that you nursed them until better time came. I think, Mr. President, these criticisms of mine are founded on facts; and, notwithstanding the attention of Government being drawn to this state of affairs, I still regret to find that nothing has been done as a remedy. Another fact, Mr. President, I would like to bring the attention of this House to. I am not on such solid ground here as I was on the other point. There is a complaint amongst Indians, qualified Indians, in the railways, that very often their services are dispensed with without legitimate grounds.

Mr. A. H. Ghumanavi: Before their time?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I have got one or two cases before me now. I am not going into details, but, on the face of it, it does seem to me that it is curious that when this House has been urging for years that the services should be Indianized, we should find men, well-qualified, and most of them that I have in mind, educated in England, suddenly turned away from service on one pretext or another. The allegation is—I am not inclined to believe it—but the allegation is that their places are taken by some below them who do not happen to be Indians. Well, Mr. President, I was one of those who did not pay attention to these complaints when I first heard them. I thought there was a certain amount of exaggeration, that I had only heard one side of the question. But when such cases begin to multiply, I must say I begin to feel rather suspicious. I begin to feel that there is something wrong about this principle of Indianisation, that some at least of those who have instructions given them to carry out this policy of Indianisation do not mean to do so, but mean to take every advantage of their position and their authority, to see that that policy is not carried out (Hear, hear); and when such cases are brought to our attention, we find a fairly good case put on paper before us for justifying the dismissal. But when these cases begin to multiply, I will repeat, I begin to get a little doubtful. Mr. President, I trust that this policy of Indianisation will now become a serious problem with the Railway Board, and that they will see to it that no Indian is replaced unless they are dead certain themselves that he deserves to leave the service, and that they will not depend upon reports from howsoever high an officer who may have in his hands the destinies of many a young Indian. (Applause.)

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I thank you for the opportunity you have so kindly given to me to take part in the discussion on the subject of the "Indianisation of the railway services". But, Sir, I do not understand the subject itself. Sir, I hear the cry of Indianisation every now and then. Some say: "Indianise the railway services". My friend, Mr. Aney, for instance, says that. Others say, for instance, my friend, Sardar Mangal Singh, may come forward and say, "Indianise the Army of India". Then, a friend from the Independent Party may say, "Indianise all the public services of the country". Now, may I ask, Sir, what then will the British do? (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Go home. (Laughter.)

Mr. Ram Narayan Singh: Sir, the Government is foreign, and all the Departments of that Government are meant for particular purposes of their own, and in every Department there is the question of the ruler and the ruled. The rulers will frame the policy, will hold all key positions, and do all the brain work, and the ruled are meant only to do according to the orders they receive. In riding men do the riding and enjoy it and horses are used for the purpose. If the horses come forward and claim the responsibility of doing the action of riding, is not the claim impossible? I take it for granted that all the services of the country have been Indianised, of what good will it be to the country? I see some Indians

occupying the Treasury Benches. I hear that they form the Government of the country. But what is the good of it? Are they doing any good to the country? I say they are more dangerous. Sir, the Honourable the Leader of the House is craning so that he may hear me clearly. I, therefore, say more loudly that Indians in the services are more dangerous than the Government themselves to the cause of the liberty of the country. Sir, the thing is this. The monopoly of the railway services by the British people will continue till the Government will continue. That is a foregone conclusion. If we are men of action and if we are men at all, we should get rid of the Government first and then the Government officials will go away automatically. Sir, I do not study and quote figures because I consider it perfectly useless. What is the use of making a learned speech in this House when I see defeat after defeat is being inflicted upon this Government and yet they are going on as merrily as before. Sir, does it not amount to this that the constitutional methods of this country are a total failure? If the Government are not going to listen to the opinions, votes and judgment of the representatives of the people of the country, let them know that they are encouraging those who advocate the use of physical force and violence in this country who, if this policy fails, will come forward. We know the Government and we know the several departments. The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhowe, before he concluded his speech, said :

"I would ask the public sometimes to glance at the other side of the picture, at the organisation, the forethought, the unremitting care, the technical skill and the devotion to duty on the part of the lowest to the highest official which are essential if the railways of India are to meet effectively and efficiently the administrative and economic needs of the country."

Sir, I do not understand whether my Honourable friend is himself misled or was trying to mislead others. I think he was misled only to mislead others. Sir, do the railways of India provide for the administrative and economic needs of the country? To say yes is to talk nonsense. Sir, the railways of India are meant for the speedy transport of British troops from one place to another throughout the country, to force the people of this country into abject slavery and subjection and also for the discovery into the interior of the country of markets for British goods. These, in fact, are the aims and the objects of the Railway Department, and, these being the aims and objects of the Railway Department, the question of Indianisation does not arise. With these words, Sir, I do not like to support the motion, but I shall vote for it, because it is a pleasure to vote against this Satanic Government.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman (Patna and Chota Nagpur *cum* Orissa : Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion of my Honourable colleague, Mr. Aney, for Indianisation, but, before I do so, I would like to understand the significance of the word "Indianisation". This word has been very much misused by certain communities who are advantageously placed. The claims for Indianisation of services are certainly not based on grounds of efficiency, but on grounds of patriotism and with a desire to find living for the sons of the soil of this country. Had efficiency been the objective, the distinction between Indians and Englishmen and even between Englishmen and Continentals would not have been in question. We see that an Englishman is preferred to a German or American in spite of inadequate qualifications. Under the conditions prevailing in this country, I think I am perfectly consistent in pressing for an adequate share of

[Mr. Muhammad Nauman.]

minorities on the same ground of patriotism as any other and I must be sure of the position of the Muslims before Indianisation on the present basis is actually given effect to. The majority community, to whom Mr. Aney belongs, sometimes most unfortunately change their vision in making distinctions between one Indian and the other and do begin to talk of efficiency, experience, this and that, to keep away the minority communities from their adequate and legitimate shares. This has been the position in many departments if I am only allowed to say so without interruption of the Opposition Benches. Last year, while discussing the question of the paucity of Mussalmans in services, in the Assembly, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar explained the attitude of the majority community by introducing a story by way of an example. He said:

"There is a saying in the South that two people went out and one of them suggested to the other; 'You bring the rice and I will bring the husk; let us mix the two together, and we will divide it equally after winnowing.'"

That is the sort of argument that is at times suggested and probably the majority community sometimes feel that the other communities do not share them in the trouble as much as they do. That is why the majority community thinks that certain privileges should be only theirs and none else, and all those who are in a comparatively advantageous position do not like arguments of adequate shares as they class such arguments as anti-national and communal when any demand of equality is pressed. When we are busy in asking for further powers from our so-called masters, the Englishmen, the majority community does not feel at this time inclined to discuss the question of adequate division. We, the Mussalmans, are so unfortunately placed, that even if Indians do get into powers to manage their railways, we will have to face our rival friends the majority community, in this country who at times are not willing to accept us as partners in the same position as they may be themselves placed. Of course it would be too much for me to say that sometimes they give themselves the air of "masters" or of *kartas* of a joint family of India, where the other members are in constant danger of being ignored. Our unfortunate experience has been that if we at all climb the bar of "our masters", our legs are pulled down by our own majority brothers. Sir, I admit that the position of Indians is most unsatisfactory on the whole, but the position of the unfortunate Muslims is much worse in subordinate services. It is deplorable in intermediate and upper subordinate services and absolutely hopeless in officer's grade. I draw the attention of the House to the figures on pages 58 and 59 of the recent Administration Report where I find the Muslims in higher services are only 4.41 per cent., and, in the intermediate grades, they are only 4.73 per cent. I am confident that non-Muslim Members of the House will agree with me that Muslims deserve more than 4.73 per cent. in subordinate services.

Sir, we claimed 33 1/3 per cent. as the adequate share of Muslims in all the services in India. Unfortunately the Government brought down the percentage to 25 per cent., but here I find that our share is not even five per cent., and no steps are taken by the Government to increase this percentage to any reasonable figure. The most unfortunate feature of the whole argument is, as I notice, that in all the arguments brought forward by certain classes of Honourable Members, including my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, they have never laid any stress on the point that Muslims and other minority communities in India like the Indian Christians

and the Sikhs or any other minority community will have their respective share in the services in the same ratio as the majority community claims. Sir, it is common knowledge that Muslims are kept back from promotion sometimes on the ground of absence of seniority, sometimes on the ground of efficiency and sometimes on the ground that there is no one to speak in their behalf. It is not surprising, therefore, that in many cases the Englishmen, that is, our masters, are not responsible for the supersession of Mussalmans, but our own brethren belonging to the Hindu community, are responsible for such actions. There is very poor representation of Muslims in the higher grades and they are treated everywhere like orphans.

The next point to which I would like to draw the attention of the Railway Board is the great injustice done to Muslims in the manner in which the twenty-five per cent. proportion of jobs have been distributed to the Muslims among the various railways. This distribution is not done in the interest of Muslims, not in the interest of the Hindus, but entirely in the interest of the most favoured Indian community—the Christians. Mr. Hassan, in his report after elaborate calculation, recommended a certain percentage according to which 25 per cent. of the places reserved for the Muslims may be distributed in the four State railways. The Muslim Members of the Central Legislature repeatedly drew the attention of the Railway Board to the fact that they agreed to the distribution, but the Railway Board, for reasons which they alone understood and which we cannot understand, changed the distribution. They never published the figures on account of which this change was made, and I challenge the Honourable Member for Railways and the Railway Board that their recommendation of the new distribution does not give us 25 per cent. in the State-managed railways. They had only one point of view. They did not care for Muslims or for Hindus. They only cared for Anglo-Indians and Indian Christians. I do not say that they should not have a proportionate share in the services, but all I say is that they should not have a favourite position. This is what I object to. (Hear, hear.) It was originally recommended that the percentage of Muslims in the East Indian Railway should be 35 per cent. but the Railway Board wanted to keep the present percentage of the Anglo-Indians who were employed in large numbers on this line unaffected. I have very great regard for my Honourable friend, Colonel Gidney, and his constituency, but I also have some regard for myself and for my community, and I want to impress the whole truth of the situation. Sir, I ask the Government whether they can satisfy the Muslims that the new distribution which they have made does really give them 25 per cent. Can they meet my objections by publishing the figures or satisfying the representatives of the Muslims in the Central Legislature.

Sir, before I sit down, I would like to point out one thing more, that in spite of our continued efforts, in spite of our demand in the
 3 P.M. Legislatures, in the House and outside, and in spite of solemn promises of the Government, both inside and outside, the percentage of Muslims has actually gone down. The law of diminishing return is applied so far as Muslim recruitment is concerned. The greater the efforts, the less our percentage. We have so far received only verbal and empty promises, and I should advise my community to take every possible step, so that Muslims might get their adequate share. I would also invite the attention of my Hindu friends that they should be more generous and they should give us a more adequate share than they have agreed to at present.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Then drive out the Europeans.

Mr. Muhammad Nauman: So far as Europeans are concerned, they claim a certain percentage. By all means let them have it, but they should have some percentage only in the Company-managed railways on the ground of vested interest representations. Of course, at the present moment, they have not a fixed percentage, but they usurp the whole thing. This is simply most disgraceful and was only possible here in a country like India. This is rather a new theory. We, in India, are not treated properly so far as representation in services is concerned. I remember an incident that took place in 1922. In that year, a group of American visitors came to India to visit India, and I had an opportunity to meet them and narrate to them the way in which things were managed in India by the Government and by vested interest companies, and they were simply shocked. Probably the Englishmen do not tell the outside world how things go on here and how the vested interests in the Company-managed railways are taking advantage of poor Indians. However, it will be out of order to discuss these things here. I would impress on the Government that even in those railways, which are not State-owned, the Government should always try to give adequate share to the sons of the soil keeping a certain share for the Englishman on the ground of vested interest. With these words, Sir, I close my remarks.

Mr. Fakir Chand (Jullundur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I rise to support the motion of Mr. Aney whole-heartedly and not half-heartedly as my Honourable friend, Colonel Gidney, has done. Of course, it is quite true that most of the Honourable Members belonging to different communities have put in their respective claims for special percentage for their own community, but I may submit that I do think that I do not belong to any particular community, except the Indian community. I do not claim to belong to any particular community. We have had from the previous speakers that the question of Indianisation has gone through several stages. We had first the Islington commission in 1910. Then we had the Montagu Reforms declaration in 1917 that they wanted to have an increasing association of Indians in every department of the administration. Then, after that, we had the Lee Commission in 1924 which stated that the recruitment of Indians should be 75 per cent. to the superior services. In spite of all this, just look at the figures. You will find that, as a matter of fact, so far as Indianisation goes, we are still very backward so far as the figures are concerned. I will just read one short sentence from the latest report of Railways for 1933-34, because the report of 1934-35 is not available. At page 16, para. 76, we find:

"It will be observed that the Indian element in the superior services has risen from 28.02 per cent. on State-managed and 17.74 per cent. on Company-managed Railways in 1925 to 41.25 per cent. on State-managed and 33.21 per cent. on Company-managed Railways in 1934 by a corresponding reduction in the European element."

So that, up to 1933 or 1934, the maximum limit to which Indianisation had reached was 41.25 per cent. on the State-managed railways and 33.21 per cent. on the Company-managed railways. Now, after about 70 years of the advent of the railways, is it not a matter for great regret that the Government should not have thought it fit to increase the ratio of Indians in the services? They only come up to 41 per cent. so far although we have had several pledges and declarations by various Prime Ministers

and Royal Commissions that the representation of Indians in the higher services will be increased even up to 75 per cent. It is not only that. Another plea is advanced that, so far as certain departments are concerned, Government are not going to employ Indians inasmuch as they lack special technical knowledge. Well, there may be some such departments, but the question is, what about those departments which do not call for any special technical knowledge other than what is possessed by Indians? Take the Stores Department or the Engineering Department. Have you completely Indianised those departments? I submit you have not. So that, so far as these excuses are concerned, they have no meaning. The Lee Commission recommended the provision of increasing facilities for the training of Indians for special services, and what was done? A college was opened at Dehra Dun, but, soon after, it was closed, and we have no college since. So that it is only an empty excuse to deny to Indians their birthright to be associated in all departments of railway administration. They have only to pay for these railways but so far as appointments go they are not to get them, particularly so far as appointments in the higher grades are concerned. And there is something still more funny about it. In the North Western Railway, so far as I know, the policy in the last few years has been to increase the number of superior officers and to decrease the number of subordinates. For instance, take this divisional system about which two Honourable Members spoke, though they did not dwell upon it in detail. If you only look at it with a greater scrutiny, you will find that it means this. We had first of all the district system under which the district officers controlled their subordinates. They were in touch with them, but now they have introduced the divisional system. The whole of the North Western Railway area has been divided into seven divisions and divisional officers have been appointed, each drawing from Rs. 500 to Rs. 900. But there is absolutely no necessity whatever for the appointment of these divisional officers. On the other hand, so far as the personal touch goes, that is gone and the higher officers are not so much in touch with their subordinates now as they used to be before, and they have no chance of coming into contact with their subordinates. And the expenses of the railway have increased to a very great extent by the employment of this divisional system. I submit that it is entirely unnecessary. Many speakers have dwelt on this subject, and I appeal to the Railway Board to abolish this system.

In addition to that, I say that when you talk of Indianisation, you have not only to look at the matter from one point of view. Indianisation means, as a matter of fact, looking after the interests of the Indians. But what is going on now is this. So far as the higher officers are concerned, they are given all sorts of privileges. Take the case of Delhi, for instance. You will find that Government have got specially built bungalows for the highly paid officers. On the other hand, so far as the subordinate departments are concerned, these clerks who may number about three thousand or more have no arrangements made for their accommodation. They have to go to Subzi Mandi or some other dirty quarters of the City, with the result that they have got to take medical advice on every subject concerning the health of their families. Not only have they to pay high rents in the City, but they have to live in dirty quarters and to pay for the medical attendance of their families and children. Just look at the matter from this point of view that, for these highly paid officers, Government provides special accommodation on cheap rent. So far as the subordinates are concerned, they are nowhere. And it is not in Delhi

[Mr. Fakir Chand.]

only that you find this. In other places also like Karachi or Lahore, there is no provision for them, nor is any allowance given to these subordinate officers. So that, when we talk of Indianisation, I say you must treat these subordinates who are all Indians at least fairly and justly. So I submit that not only should there be Indianisation from top to bottom in the railway administration, but also that the Indians who are employed, whether they are in the subordinate staff or elsewhere, should be treated fairly and squarely. With these words, I support the motion.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Sir, the subject of Indianisation has been described by one or two speakers as a hardy annual. It certainly raises its head at every budget discussion, and it raises criticism along more or less familiar lines. Equally, it evokes a reply which, from the very nature of things, cannot differ very materially from its predecessors except in so far that the figures which are marshalled in support of the reply may have to be brought up to date. Now, Sir, so far as the principle of increasing Indianisation is concerned, there can be no difference whatsoever between Government and Honourable Members opposite, always excepting, Mr. Ram Narayan Singh. We are committed, Sir, to the principle of Indianisation, but we are committed to something more. We are committed to its definite and effective application in practice; and, I am quite sure, that if Honourable Members would study the figures carefully, they would realise that we have done everything in our power to secure an effective increasing Indianisation in the superior services of the railways.

Now, Sir, Mr. Aney was quite correct in saying that the year 1924 was an important year. It was then decided, following the recommendations of the Lee Commission, to regulate the racial proportions in the services, so as to secure definitely a considerable preponderance in the recruitment of Indians. My Honourable friend was quite right when he said that the proportions then laid down were 75 Indians to 25 Europeans. Now, Sir, let us see since that time what progress has been made. Let us also take account of the limitations imposed by the fact that, until that year, recruitment of Indians had not been made on a substantial basis. I expressed in connection with another motion that it was the general view, a view shared by one of my European predecessors, that Indianisation had begun late in the day. It is no use now going back to those old unhappy far-off days. I would ask the House to realise that we have, once a new policy was instituted, done everything in our power to give effect to that policy. Let me give the figures which Mr. Aney anticipated that I would give: but evidently he has been alone, I think, in studying these figures, because no one else seems to have made reference to them. This is what I said last year:

"Take the question of recruitment to the superior services in the last four years on State-managed railways, and those are the railways for recruitment to which we are ourselves responsible. The ratio of Indian recruitment is 74.62 per cent for superior services and over 79 per cent for all gazetted posts. It is perfectly true that during the last three years our recruitment has been diminished very considerably but Honourable Member know the reason for that. Owing to retrenchment we have either definitely stopped recruitment or cut it down to a very large extent. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding the size of the cadre there has, since 1926, been a very considerable improvement in the enlargement of the Indian element and the reduction

of the European element. Since 1926 when the Indian element of gazetted officers on State-managed railways amounted to 28 per cent. we have progressed to 38.79 per cent. in 1933, the number of Indian officers having increased from 320 in 1925 to 429 in 1933, and the European officers during the same period having decreased from 822 to 677—a decrease of 17 per cent. My Honourable friends will realise when they ask for more rapid Indianisation that we really are limited in this matter by the number of recruitments which we are in a position to make from year to year owing to retrenchment."

It is a little difficult to answer Honourable Members opposite who speak with different voices and voice different sentiments. For instance, my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, advocated Indianisation on the ground that it would conduce to economy. One other speaker got up almost immediately and said: "Here are cases in which Indians appointed to posts which Europeans have held have been treated differentially in the matter of pay." We are then at once accused of discriminatory treatment. I am afraid that my Honourable friends do not specialise in consistency . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is your policy?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: Then my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, pointed out that no progress had been made in the matter of appointing Indians on the Railway Board. When it was brought to his notice that owing to reasons of economy—I think he mentioned the fact himself that the personnel had been reduced in numbers owing to economy—and when it was suggested to him that out of the three existing members one was an Indian, he said: "Oh, yes, but he is an official Indian: what I want is a non-official Indian." Now, if that is the view held by my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, then he should welcome the new Railway Statutory Authority with open arms (Laughter), because the majority or possibly the whole of them may be non-officials . . .

Mr. M. S. Aney: I am sorry I have not got the right of reply . . .

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: Then, Sir Henry Gidney made the point that while State Railways were following the policy of pushing on Indianisation on a substantial scale, the Companies were not following in the foot-steps of the State Railways. My Honourable friend is perfectly right. As far as my recollection goes, it is only the South Indian Railway which has worked up to 75 per cent; the Assam Bengal Railway, I think, has worked up to about 70 per cent.; but all the other railways are in deficit and that despite of pressure which has been exerted by the Railway Board. I can only assure the House that that pressure will not cease to be exerted in the future.

Then, certain Muslim Members of this House drew attention to the state of Muslim recruitment to the railway services. I do not think that I should go into details in regard to this question, for the simple reason that I think we are for the moment considering the much larger principle of Indianisation as a whole; but I would like to say this: that now that a definite percentage has been fixed and orders have been issued in respect of Muslim recruitment, I hope that the sense of grievance under which the Muslim community have been labouring in the past will be removed. We

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

realise that in giving effect to those orders, difficulties may be encountered, and for that reason the Chief Commissioner will be consulting the Agents of Railways who are expected to meet here next month in order to ascertain whether any special machinery is required to give effect to those orders in practice. If that machinery is required, then we shall not hesitate to bring it into being

An Honourable Member: You will not get votes in spite of that!

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Then, certain Members have referred to the paucity of Indians in the higher posts of the railway services. In regard to that, I think, I can only say, with all the emphasis I can, that it is not due to any lack of desire to give effective application to the principle of Indianisation. We are limited by certain inexorable limitations, and I will just repeat what I said in regard to this last year:

"Therefore, we are bound by a basic consideration, namely, the consideration of justice towards serving officers. Honourable Members will realise that Indian recruitment on any material scale did not take place till comparatively recently. The result is that the senior officers are largely European. When, therefore, it comes to appointments to the higher selection posts, it naturally follows that the officers who are senior must have their claims considered first. Now, I can understand the attitude which says that if an Indian and a European officer have approximately the same claim, the balance should be weighted in favour of the Indian. That attitude I can understand, but I am sure that the House like myself cannot and will not agree to pass over a European officer who is efficient and who has superior claims for a post simply because he is a European."

Nevertheless it seems to me that the Railway Board itself affords the best illustration of the spirit in which the principle of Indianisation is being applied in practice. My Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, said that so far as the Railway Board is concerned, there had been practically no improvement since the year 1924. Now, let me give to the House just a few figures. In 1924, the superior officers in the Railway Board's office were 17 in number. Of these, fifteen were Europeans and two were Indians. Today, the number of superior officers in the Railway Board's office is fourteen, and of these no less than eight are Indians, and six are Europeans. I hope that the figures which I have given will satisfy the House that we are doing everything we can to push forward the principle of Indianisation, subject to the limitations imposed upon us by the racial proportions in the higher ranks of the service and subject also to the limitations imposed upon us by the necessity of treating fairly and equitably serving personnel. I hope, Sir, that Honourable Members will not persist in pressing this motion, and that I have satisfied them that, although in the aggregate the results may not be what they hoped for, still the fault for that does not rest at our doors, and that we have, so far as lies in our power, pushed forward the principle and applied the rules in order to secure the application of that principle as effectively as we could.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works,' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—81.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ba Si, U
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
 Baqui, Mr. M. A.
 Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
 Nath.
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Venecatchelam.
 Das Mr. B.
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed.
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
 Fakir Chand, Mr.
 Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
 Gauba, Mr. K. L.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.
 Giri, Mr. V. V.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
 Iswar Saran, Munshi.
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.

Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Khan Sahib, Dr.
 Khare, Dr. N. B.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
 Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
 Mangul Singh, Sardar.
 Mody, Mr. H. P.
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
 Parma Nand, Bhai.
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
 Makhdum Syed.
 Rajan Dr. T. S. S.
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
 Sant Singh, Sardar.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Sham Lal, Mr.
 Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
 Nawab.
 Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
 Som, Mr. Surya Kumar.
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.
 Thein Maung, Dr.
 Thein Maung, U
 Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.
 Vissani, Mr. Mathuradas.
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—44.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.
 Venkatarama.
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.
 Bhole, The Honourable Sir Joseph.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.
 Clow, Mr. A. G.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 D'Souza, Mr. F.
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
 Drake, Mr. D. H. C.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.
 Hockenpall, Mr. F. W.
 Hossack, Mr. W. B.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.
 The motion was adopted.

Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.
 Monteath, Mr. J.
 Mukerjee, Mr. N. R.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Owen, Mr. L.
 Raisman, Mr. A. J.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Scott, Mr. W. L.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumn Prasad.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
 Sloan, Mr. T.
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

Manipulation of Railway Freight Rates without due regard to all the Interests involved.

Mr. W. B. Hossack (Bombay: European): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department' be further reduced by Rs. 100."

This cut is moved in order to ventilate the opinion of this Group in regard to the manipulation of railway freight rates without due regard to all the interests affected. In our opinion we are supported by a large number of commercial organisations, both Indian and European, and many important public bodies.

The motion is made in the hope that a principle will be established to protect those interests whose contributions to the economic well-being of India is as important as that of the Railways themselves.

The interests to which I make particular reference are the ports of the country, their communications and the livelihood of those connected with the ports.

At the outset, I would say that it is universally recognised today that any claim of one mode of transport to enter into competition with another must be considered on public and economic grounds and only permitted if, after an exhaustive enquiry, it is found that it will serve the public more efficiently and at cheaper rates than the existing service. Any attempt to increase earnings by capturing traffic, which has been built up step by step, by private or other enterprise, from the very foundation, often at huge initial loss, is to be deplored and should be vigorously opposed unless the good of the country is at stake.

At the Road-Rail Conference held in 1933, it was said by the Chief Commissioner for Railways that what the Railways claimed was fair play. This being so, the Railways should respect a claim for fair play from other modes of transport—e.g., Inland Navigation and Shipping, which were established long before the railways came into existence.

I wish it to be understood that in anything I hereafter say I do not include any concession railway rates which may be quoted for the benefit of a particular trade or industry which has no bearing on the general economic position of India.

I have no definite knowledge of any manipulation of rail freights in order to detract from the traffic of the Inland Navigation Companies in Bengal and Assam, but, if proof is needed to show that the railways are out to capture as much of this river traffic as possible, I need only refer to a reply which the Inland Navigation Companies received when they advocated the construction of a few miles of road leading to their waterways in Assam. They were told these might be found detrimental to the interests of the railways in existence or projected.

I turn, however, to concrete cases. The railway freight on tea from Calcutta to Bombay is Rs. 1-2-0 per maund, the rate to Nagpur (half the distance and on the same line) is Rs. 1-8-0 per maund. This special rate of Rs. 1-2-0 was, I submit, introduced in order that the traffic should go by rail across India instead of by the cheaper sea route round India. On piece-goods the railway freight from Bombay to Calcutta is Rs. 1-1-0. The freight to Lahore which is approximately the same distance is Rs. 3-9-2

per maund. Here the Punjab is penalised, not for the benefit of Bengal, but in order that the traffic shall not go by sea, the naturally cheaper route. Now, these low rail rates introduced cannot be said to be economical ones. If they were, then the same rates should apply generally throughout. But they are not, of course, in view of the enormous losses the railways have incurred in the past five years which my Honourable friend, Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant, clearly showed in his speech on Saturday.

Then, there is the recent policy of the Railway Board under which supplies of coal for the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway are now carried by rail instead of by sea as formerly, and it is now rumoured that the Board are also bringing pressure to bear on the South Indian Railway similarly to get their supplies by rail. As I have already said, it is incontestible that sea carriage is cheaper than rail unless the latter reduces its rates for such carriage to an uneconomic level. On a previous occasion, the European Group pressed for a radical change intended to secure the co-ordination of the Departments of the Government of India, including those of the Railway Board.

There is one commodity, wheat, in regard to which Karachi, the port in my constituency, may claim to be the most important in India. Here again the policy of the Railway Board is to divert this traffic to all rail routes. In case any one doubts the Board's policy, permit me to refer to Mr. Rau's reply to a supplementary question asked in March, 1934, when he said: "Freight per maund of wheat from Lyallpur was reduced in 1932 in order to encourage the transport by rail and discourage shipments from Karachi by sea". Varying regulations in the rail rate of freight on wheat have been made from the Punjab to Bombay, Madras and Calcutta, all of which have been designed to divert the trade in Karachi's particular commodity from Karachi by sea route to the consuming centres. It is on record that these special rates for wheat from the Punjab to Calcutta and Bombay were given in adjustment with the rates by the rail *cum* sea route *via* Karachi. Naturally no corresponding reduction was made in the freight rates from the Punjab to Karachi over the North Western Railway, which was principally, if not entirely, converted to broad gauge for the carriage of this particular commodity. In the North Western Railway's reply to the Municipal Corporation of Karachi on this subject, it was stated that as the railways will benefit by keeping the traffic to the all-rail routes, it would not be consistent with this policy to reduce the rates to Karachi so as to render ineffective the special rates by the all-rail routes. I am very doubtful if the railways as a whole really do benefit but if they do now, will they be able to supply the new rolling stock which will be necessary to meet the additional traffic and at the same time still maintain the present cut rates? I am sure not. Where does this railway policy lead us? Already it is depriving firms and individuals of their natural livelihood and if pursued to the utmost will threaten to isolate the ports completely as India becomes more and more self-contained and imports diminish.

In time it can only mean that the ports will be hard put to it to find the interest on the loans raised on their behalf. These ports are national assets and I submit it is of the utmost importance that their trade be maintained in so far as it is humanly possible to do so. I am well aware that the railways are also a national asset, but they should not be used in an uneconomic manner in competition with private enterprise. What would not some countries give for our ports and our sea board which requires little

[Mr. W. B. Hossack.]

or no maintenance. Any uneconomic adjustment of freight rates by rail to capture the legitimate trade of others is no policy at all, and I hope it is realised that so long as we have a deficit budget, these rates must be uneconomic. What is wanted is that in any co-ordinated transport system ports and railways should be regarded as complementary to each other and any rate cutting should be discouraged as contrary to national interests. I consider that the country's general well-being should not in this matter be subordinated to railway interests.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department' be further reduced by Rs. 100."

Babu Baijnath Bajoria (Marwari Association: Indian Commerce): Sir, if I say anything on this subject, I do so not with the motive of only criticising the actions of the Government, but with the sole motive of bringing to their notice certain defects in the freight policy of the Government, which, if removed, will tend to the betterment of Indian agriculture and Indian industries. My standpoint is quite different from that taken by my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, but both of us want a change in the policy. I know that Government have a soft corner in their heart for Indian agriculture and industries (*An Honourable Member*: "Question") and are trying to help them in various ways. They have also helped Indian industries by giving some concessions in railway freight for raw materials required by them, and I must thank them for all they have done till now. (*An Honourable Member*: "For what little they have done.") But, Sir, what I wish to prove by citing a few cases is that the action taken by Government is not sufficient to meet the situation. I think I must not dilate on the question to prove that the freight policy of any National Government is based with the sole object of developing the national industries in a country. I think I will not be wrong if I say that India, being an agricultural country, has abundance of raw produce, and, if opportunities are given, Indian industries can be developed very rapidly.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

Sir, the main difficulty that the Indian industries are experiencing is that, in a vast country like India, the cost of transportation of raw materials from the distant parts of the country to the factory site and again the transportation of finished products to the various parts of the country is a very costly affair, and this is one of the main handicaps which restricts the development of industries in India and this is a matter in which the railways can go a long way to assist the industries. The present railway freight policy is simply guided on the principle to levy the railway freight on goods to the extent to which the traffic can bear and is based with the sole object of having an increased goods traffic earning without having any other objective in view. I object to this principle and to this policy, and, in the past, this very House has also denounced this theory and proved it to be injurious to the interests of the country. What I demand is that the freight policy of the Government should be so manipulated by which

the movement of agricultural produce from place to place or from the sites of such produce to the ports may be increased and also by which Indian industries may secure the required raw materials at cheap rates. Sir, the present rates of freight were levied at a time when the prices of all agricultural produces were on a much higher level, and, indeed, in many cases the prices were double than those obtaining at present. Hence, in my opinion, it is high time that there should be a revision and reduction of railway freights on agricultural and industrial commodities. If the railway freight rates are manipulated in the way suggested by me, the traffic on the railways will greatly increase and the price level of agricultural produce will also increase which will go a great way towards giving a substantial relief to the agriculturists.

Now, Sir, in coming to the side of industries, I may quote an example by which the railway freight policy of Government is ruining an industry in Bengal which was once in a very prosperous condition. I quote the example of the mustard oil mills in Bengal which are being ruined, due only to the railway freight policies of Government. These oil mills in Bengal have to depend for their mustard seeds from Northern India, as very small quantities of mustard seeds can be grown in Bengal. During the last few years, the Railway Administration has increased the railway freight on mustard seeds from Northern India to Bengal. This is having a very disastrous effect on the once prosperous oil mills in Bengal and several of them have had to close down. I think by this small example I have been able to prove to the House how the freight policies on raw produce can have a ruinous effect on industries.

Then, Sir, I quote the example of another national industry in Bengal, namely, the coal industry. During the last few years, the industry has been passing through very bad times, and, instead of giving relief to the industry by the reduction of railway freights for its movement from Bengal to other industrial centres like Bombay, Ahmedabad, Surat and other places, the Railway Board imposed a heavy surcharge of fifteen per cent on it. I must thank my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, for reducing the surcharge by two and a half per cent, with a maximum charge of one rupee per ton for long distances. I think it will give some relief to the industry, but this small mercy at such a late hour is not sufficient to improve very much the condition of the industry, as foreign coal from South Africa is still competing with our Indian coal at these industrial centres very unfairly. As such, I would still request the Government, not only to abolish the surcharge altogether, but to manipulate the railway freight in such a way as to give impetus to Indian coal to compete favourably with imported coal at the industrial centres.

Then, Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the Railway Administration one question regarding the differential rates charged on the same class of goods by different railways. I do not understand the reason for such differential rates, and I must insist on having a uniform rate for a particular commodity on all railways. I quote here the example of the railway freight charged by the East Indian Railway and the East Bengal Railway on jute and hemp. The freight on such articles over the East Indian Railway is lower than that charged by the East Bengal Railway on these very articles. Again, the rates of freight for jute to Calcutta from those stations on the East Bengal Railway, e.g., Goalundo and others, where an alternative facility of transporting goods by river steamer service is obtainable, are much less than from those adjoining

[Babu Baijnath Bajoria.]

stations where such alternative service is not available. This proves that the rates for jute on the Eastern Bengal Railway have been purposely and unjustly kept on a much higher scale than it should reasonably be. Sir, jute is one of the most important agricultural produces of Bengal, on the price-level of which depends the prosperity of the Bengal agriculturists. I am confident that if the railway freight is reduced on jute to the ports and to the mills, it will go towards raising the price of the commodity at the growing centres which will be of great benefit to the agriculturists of my province. I think I will not be wrong if I say that every Government in the world in these days of trade depression is trying to find out ways and means by which the price level of the produce of the respective countries can be raised, and I think it deserves serious consideration by Government as to how far railway freight manipulations can raise the price level of this particular commodity and for all classes of agricultural produce in the country generally. Sir, there is another way in which the railway can assist Indian industries, and I venture to suggest that this is by fixing differential rates of freight for goods manufactured in this country and for those imported from foreign countries.

Before I conclude, Sir, I must say that it is up to the Railway Administration to take the Indian industries and Chambers of Commerce into confidence so as to investigate as to how best the freight policies may be revised by which the freights not only on raw materials required by our Indian industries should be reduced, but also to give favourable freight rates to the manufactured goods to compete favourably with imported goods in the Indian markets. Sir, the standpoint taken by my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, may be different from mine, but still both of us want a change in the freight policy of the railways, and, as such, I shall go into the same lobby with him. (Applause.)

Mr. B. Das: Sir, while I congratulate my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, on his excellent maiden speech, I do not congratulate him on the theme he has chosen. Sir, as usual, my mind is always suspicious, and whenever any new stunt comes from my Honourable friends of the European Group, I rather naturally grow very suspicious. Sir, if my Honourable friend had wanted, for the sake of the economic well-being of the Indian people, that the railway freights should be revised, if he would have insisted that the Rates Advisory Committee should be changed into a Rates Tribunal and that the rates and freights for Indian manufactured commodities as now charged from place to place should be revised, I would have supported him; in fact, that point received only ten per cent. of his support, but what my Honourable friend wanted was a different thing. It was the thin end of the wedge by which, under the new Constitution and under the new Statute, my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, and his friends want to compel the Railway Authority and the Government of India to grant economic rates, so that British shipping interests may thrive along the coasts of India.

Sir Leslie Hudson (Bombay: European): No, no.

Mr. B. Das: Sir, we know what happened to the Coastal Traffic Bill, and we know what the desire of an Indian shipping company to demand a certain proportion of the traffic on the Indian coasts costed us. It forced

on Burma separation from India: If Burma wants to be separated, let Burma be separated, and I wish Burma all good luck, but I cannot be a party to any scheme whereby a British shipping company, that is gloating on the patronage of the Government, on the subsidies that it receives, the royalties that it receives for the carriage of mail and other things, today can be allowed to come in competition with our own railways,—railways which are running at a loss for the last five years. Sir, I do not think five years hence the railways will be as prosperous as to be able to pay back to our general revenues the contribution of five to six crores that we asked them to pay us annually and which they have not paid for the last five years. That being so, Sir, I cannot allow any claim that the shipping companies should be granted special facilities. Sir, I know the claim of the Scindia Shipping Company to be called "national"—and yet my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, called all the shipping companies "national". Well, I am glad to welcome my friend, Mr. Mody, back from his toils at Bombay; he is a Director of the Scindia Steam Navigation Company, too, and will he agree to style the B. I. S. N. Co. or other British shipping companies as "national". But, Sir, where is the spirit of co-operation between the Scindia Steam Navigation Company and the Shipping Company under the control of my Honourable friend, Sir Leslie Hudson?

Sir Leslie Hudson: It has nothing whatever to do with me.

Mr. B. Das: I am glad to know that. It was the old love of my Honourable friend, Sir Leslie Hudson—the B. I. S. N. Company and the P. and O. Company—that conspired together in London. I know that the management of the Scindia Company came back with a little bit of a smiling face from London because of the intercession of my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member. Yet this combine between the B. I. S. N. and the Scindia has wrought great harm to the travelling public. Sir, from Rangoon to Orissa, the coolies used to be conveyed in old times for Rs. 8 and the National Scindia Steam Navigation Company, combined with other "national" shipping companies,—the B.I.S.N. Co.—raised the third class fares to Rs. 14 per passenger.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: They are not coolies, but porters.

Mr. B. Das: Any labourer that goes from Orissa to Burma has to pay today Rs 14, and that is the result of this national combination of the Scindia Steam Navigation Company and the British India Steam Navigation Company. I would like to know from some friend of the European Group, when he rises to speak, whether the Scindia Steam Navigation Company is a party to this demand, this unnatural demand, which my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, has made that Government should reduce the railway freights, so that it may enable the coastal shipping companies to carry goods in competition with railways.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Supposing it is a party.

Mr. B. Das: If it is a party, then we know who is what. Sir, my Honourable friend also talked of the Inland Steam Navigation Company. This is not the first time—probably this is the hundredth time—when this House has been told how Inland Steam Navigation Companies,

[Mr. B. Das.]

started by Indians, were driven to the wall by the rate war which the Inland Steam Companies, controlled by Europeans in Bengal, launched on them. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, if he rises after me, will be able to give those distressing tales and even today we know what is happening on the Bombay side. The small Indian shipping companies are not getting the same advantage from the B. I. S. N. Company or the Scindia Steam Navigation Company although a bird has whispered into my ears that the Directors of the Scindia Company are interesting themselves on behalf of these small Indian shipping companies. Of course, I am speaking subject to correction by my Honourable friend, Mr. Mody.

My Honourable friend also talked of co-ordination of road and railway traffic. Last year, my Honourable friend, Mr. James, demanded that the portfolio of railways should be under a Minister of Communications. If that is the demand, I support it whole-heartedly. I would like to remind the Treasury Benches of the promise made by Sir George Schuster that when portfolios are to be changed next, they will have an Executive Councillor in charge of the portfolio of Communications. I will be sorry to part with my old friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, but when a new Member is appointed in his place, I hope that Member will be in charge of all communications—Railways, Aviation, Posts and Telegraphs, etc. But there it will end. If today motor transport has developed, it has fulfilled a necessity of the public and let it be developed freely. The railways have squandered 800 crores of rupees and have mismanaged themselves. After taking 300 crores of rupees from the public revenues and writing it off as contribution to the guaranteed system of railways, today, to save themselves from bankruptcy, they would like to control and restrict the motor transport. I have never been a party to it, and I am not going to be a party to permit any Provincial Government or the Central Government to control motor transport, so that in its disguise the Railway Board or the new Statutory Railway Authority will conceal their bad system of management and maladministration of the Indian railways. Let there be co-ordination. I would support that part of his speech where he suggested that there should be co-ordination of all communications under a Minister. But I would not like that, today anybody in this House, in the name of nationalism—whether it is Indian nationalism or the nationalism of Westminster,—should claim reduction or enhancement of railway freights in the interests of shipping. Not only that, but my Honourable friend laid the charge of manipulation against the Government. Sir, I am not in love with this Government. This Government did manipulate the railway freight. I think my Honourable friend, Sir Darcy Lindsay, will be able to tell the story as to how British goods were transported at cheap rates upcountry, while Indian goods could not get the same concession by the railways. If there had been manipulations, they have been in the interests of the British nationals. And today for British nationals to pose as Indian nationals and to charge this Government of manipulation of railway freights, in order to damage the British shipping interests, is, as my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, would say when he gets up to reply, “et tu Brute”—“you British merchants, for whom the Government of India have sacrificed all honour and all prestige, you also charge us”. Therefore, Sir, I do hope, my friend, the spokesman of the European Group, will be wise enough to withdraw the motion.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What are you going to do?

Mr. B. Das: I have condemned it and I condemn the insidious attempt by which they are bringing forward a proposition, and a year or two hence, they will compel this Government to yield advantages, so that British shipping will thrive in India.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, I would like to concentrate my attention only to one point. I would not like to mention the rates and freights of various articles from one place to another. The point which I would like to make out is that rates and freights should always be fixed by the Government which is responsible to the Legislature. This is really the point which I would like to emphasise. It should be the duty of the Government to avoid the rate war between the river communications and rail communications and also to avoid a rate war between one company and another company, as we have already drawn attention to it in connection with the traffic between Chittagong and Rangoon. Now, in support of my argument, I should like to mention that in every country the rates and fares are never left to railway administrations. It is the business of the Government to supervise them. I have got before me the constitution of various European countries. Let us, first of all, take Belgium. She has a sort of a Statutory Railway Board, but the power of increasing or diminishing rates rests with the Government. I will read to the House the actual words:

(The Honourable Member read out in French.)

Munshi Iswar Saran (Benares and Gorakhpur Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. Is an Honourable Member entitled to use a language which most of us do not understand?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I translate it.

Mr. M. S. Aney: What is the guarantee that the translation is correct?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I have also got a printed translation of this document, and I shall read from it.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Where was it printed?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: It was printed in London.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Are you satisfied about its genuineness?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: When translated, it means:

"Nevertheless the Government will always have the right to insist on rates being lowered or being raised."

In Germany also, we have the same provisions:

(The Honourable Member read in German language from Sarter and Kittel.)

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Does it relate to railways or shipping?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am dealing at present with railways. I will come to shipping later on. As I said, you have in Germany also similar provisions. But, here, in this country, we find that the fixation of rates and fares is always left to Government. Now, in the London Committee, we discussed this question of rates and fares, and it was clearly suggested in the report that the maximum and minimum rates and fares should be fixed by the Railway Authority subject to the control of the Federal Government, and, by Federal Government, the Committee meant it must be a Government responsible to the Federal Legislature. Unfortunately in the Bill that has now been placed before the Parliament, they changed entirely the substance of the report and the purport of what the London Committee recommended and what is the practice in every country. I would just like to quote one clause about it from the Bill:

"That the amendment making provision for regulating the fares and rates to be charged on any railway shall not be introduced or moved in either Chamber of the Federal Legislature except on the recommendation of the Governor General."

So, the power which in every country is exercised by the Government of the day, responsible to the Legislature in fixing the rates and fares, is denied according to the present practice and will be denied in future. What is the practice now? The practice now is that the maximum and minimum rates are fixed by the Government, but the maximum and minimum rates are so wide that according to my friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, who was here in the last Assembly, that even an elephant could pass through it. The Government prescribed the maxima and the minima, but there is such a great difference between the two that the Companies can do anything they like. The present practice is that although the Railway Board have prescribed the maximum and the minimum, the range is so wide that the Agents could arrange the whole thing in any way they liked. In this way, the Companies manipulate the rates. If the public have got any grievance, they have only provided an Advisory Committee, called the Railway Rates Advisory Committee, but that has only an advisory capacity according to the Administration Report, that Committee decided only four cases during the year. I refer to page 7 of the Administration Report where all these four cases are mentioned. What is the cost of deciding these four cases? We have got a votable item of Rs. 57,000 and a non-votable item of Rs. 28,000 total Rs. 85,000. The Committee has got only an advisory capacity, but the cost of the Committee is enormous, compared with the amount of work entrusted to it. We expected that Government would appoint a Rates Tribunal on the lines provided in the British Railway Act. But no such provision is made in the Bill which is now before Parliament.

Mr. M. S. Aney: On a point of order, Sir. In view of the ruling of the Chair yesterday, that the provisions of the Bill before Parliament should not be discussed here, on a cut motion, is the Honourable Member in order in referring to that Bill.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: The point I should like to make out is, the existing provisions of determining the rates and fares are anything but satisfactory and they will be much worse in future, and the present practice is quite out of keeping with the practice in every other country in the world. This is the issue I should like to make clear, and I believe

this is the issue in the cut motion before us, as I understand it. We want some kind of Government control to fix the rates; that is, we want a Government responsible to the Legislature to fix these rates. This, I believe, is the issue before the House. In the interests of the people, in the interests of the agriculturists, I hope the Government will so regulate the rates that neither the Companies nor individuals nor any particular class of people will be made to suffer.

Mr. A. H. Ghaznavi: Sir, I oppose the motion. If I understood the Honourable the Mover correctly, what he wants to do is this, that he wants the railways to increase the freight to all ports, the port of Calcutta, the port of Bombay, the port of Madras and the port of Vizagapatam and the port of Karachi.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) resumed the Chair.]

He wants this to be done, not in the interest of the railways, the national assets, as the Mover called them, but in the interests of British shipping. Sir, in this Honourable House, last year, when we were discussing the Railway Budget, it was pointed out to the Honourable the Railway Member that for many years coal for railways was sent to Madras, not by rail, but by ships, and the railways had been losing to the tune of more than a crore of rupees.

An Honourable Member: Prove it.

Mr. A. H. Ghaznavi: Not now; but I shall do so tomorrow. I do not want to go into it just at the present moment and thereby waste the time of this Honourable House. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, who also supported me when I raised the question last year, pointed out that blood was thicker than water. Why were the railways throwing away this freight and giving it to shipping companies? Sir, the Honourable the Railway Member gave us to understand that, in spite of endeavours, the Company-managed railways still persisted in having their coal sent to Madras by boat, but after great persuasion they agreed to have their coal carried by rail. In these times of distress, when the rolling stock of railways was rusting, we were sending coal from Calcutta to Madras through British shipping concerns. Even then, it was pointed out that if it cost a little more to send out coal by rail, the whole money remained in the country, because the railways earned it, and not any one outside India, as indeed would be the case if the coal were to be sent by ships and the freight earned by shipping companies as at present constituted. To tell the truth, there is no Indian shipping company existing now except Scindia which does very little business, so far as these ports are concerned, and has no independent existence for all practical purposes. The business is practically a monopoly of the B. I. S. N. Company now. My Honourable friend quoted the rate of Rs. 1-2-0 for tea from Calcutta to Bombay and Rs. 1-8-0 to Nagpur, and said how absurd it was. May I ask him, what are the shipping freights from Calcutta to Bombay? They compete with the railways. There is no such thing as a controlling board. They reduce day in and day out to compete with the railways. The railways, however, cannot reduce their rates

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

without the sanction of the Railway Board, and there is also the minimum rates fixed. The shipping companies have been keeping out the railways from carrying these commodities to these ports by frequently reducing their rates. But they increase their rates many times more to destinations not fed by railways and thereby make up for the losses due to railway competition. The railways do exactly the same thing. They certainly lose when they have to carry by rail at Rs. 1-2-0. They charge similarly Rs. 3-2-0 to Lahore to make up the losses. Sir, I should have thought that the time has come for legislation, so that the shipping companies may not at their sweet will reduce the rates whenever they like and compete with the railways. So far as the coastal ports are concerned, the time has come for regulating the rates by legislation. Sir, why has this motion been brought today? At the beginning I thought it was a very good motion. I saw it was about freight, and I thought the Mover was trying to reduce the freights, so that Bengal coal might go from Calcutta to Lahore and other places at cheaper rates. But when he developed his point, I found that that was not the case. The point was to put money into the pockets of the shipping companies.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: And the coal is to remain in Calcutta!

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi: Yes, and the coal is to remain in Calcutta. He finds that the South Indian Railway which used to have its coal carried by ships is not going to do it now by ships, but by rail; and he raises his voice against it in the interest of the shipping companies. We, on the other hand, want the Railway Board, not to give it to shipping companies, but to carry it by rail, which in the long run is also cheaper. And that I will prove here and now. Sir, carrying coal from Calcutta to Madras, you load it at the collieries, you unload it at the Kiddyerpore docks. Again you load it on board the steamer and unload it at Madras. You load it once more in the railway wagons and you unload it in the railway yard. So these six loading and unloading processes reduce the coal by ten per cent. at least, if not more, and the coal is reduced to dust. Therefore, even a little higher freight which the consumers have to pay is cheaper for them in the long run. On these grounds, I oppose this motion.

Mr. Frank D'Souza (Government of India. Nominated Official): Sir, in the course of the debate on this subject, reference has been made to the question of uniform rates. I think it was my Honourable friend, Mr. Baijnath Bajoria, who suggested that for all commodities on all railways we should have uniform rates.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: No, that was not my point. My point was that for one particular commodity there should be a uniform rate.

Mr. Frank D'Souza: I accept that correction. It comes to this then that if we start off with one particular commodity, say wheat, and apply uniform rates, by which I understand is meant rates per maund per mile, irrespective of the distance over which wheat is carried, or even if we had a telescopic scale of rates, these rates are to apply to wheat booked to an station in India, we would get into a position where we would not be able, with the rates that would be quoted on that basis, to get any traffic

to move for the longer distances. The point I am making is this, that we have to consider India as a whole and must base our rates on uniform scales so far as their general applicability is concerned. But conditions arise necessitating reductions being made. One illustration will, I think, explain the whole position to the House, and it is this. If we start off, for instance, with grain, we find that on the distance basis the rate for it from Delhi to Karachi would be something like Rs. 1-10-0 a maund. That would be on the distance by the North Western Railway route from Delhi to Karachi. But there is a shorter metre-gauge route *via* Kuchaman Road and Hyderabad (Sind), the distance by which is only 779 miles. The rate by that route comes to something like Rs. 1-6-0 a maund. Now, if we allow the rates from Delhi to Karachi by the broad-gauge North Western Railway route to remain at Rs. 1-10-0 a maund, not one maund of traffic in grain would be carried by that route to Karachi. The result would then be that the metre-gauge route would get the whole of that traffic. You might say that that would not be unreasonable. But this forces the other railway concerned, which is the North Western Railway in this case, to quote a rate equal to that by the shortest route to Karachi. Then, apart from the two routes to the port of Karachi, there is another port, Bombay, equally interested in this traffic. The traffic, if we have to consider wheat, is really or was formerly export traffic, and with two railway administrations equally interested in securing the wheat traffic for their respective ports, it is not unreasonable that the railways serving the port of Bombay should seek for equalisation with the rates to Karachi.

Now, my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, suggested that because the rate from Calcutta to Bombay for tea was about Rs. 1-2-0 a maund, the rate of Rs. 1-8-0 from Calcutta to Nagpur for tea would appear to be unreasonable. It is not unreasonable, for the simple reason that at the rate of Rs. 1-8-0 tea would move in the ordinary course from Calcutta to Nagpur, and if we had a rate on the same basis from Calcutta to Bombay it would be something like Rs. 2-14-0. But tea to Bombay would not move by rail at this rate, and the entire traffic would go by the sea route. Now, by reducing the rate for tea from Calcutta to Bombay to about Rs. 1-2-0, the railways hope to secure some additional traffic which helps to pay their overhead charges, and this revenue, which they earn, enables them to maintain lower rates for other commodities moving in other directions.

Now, taking the question of coal to which reference was also made by more than one Honourable Member, I am glad that we have the support of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi. But the point of view that he took is not entirely the same that we in the Railway Board take. We look at this question merely from the point of view of railway economics. We had wagons lying idle; the coal was railway coal, and surely it cannot be suggested that when we have our own traffic to carry, we should allow a shipping company to come in and carry it for us by sea. Take the reverse position. The shipping companies carry enormous amounts of coal from Calcutta to Bombay for bunkering purposes. Even when tonnage was scarce, they did not dream of sending that coal by railway to Bombay for bunkering purposes. They took it in their own steamers. We did not quarrel with them for doing that: may the Railway Board not, therefore, ask, why should they dispute the railways' right to carry their own coal when they have their wagons lying idle? It has been

[Mr. Frank D'Souza.]

suggested that our doing this is uneconomic. Well, the mere statement does not prove it to be uneconomic. We examined the position very carefully, and found that by carrying our coal to southern India we were scoring to the extent of roughly Rs. 9 lakhs.

Reference has also been made to the question of the wheat rates from the Punjab to Calcutta. Now, I think if my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, had examined his statistics, for, say, four or five years back, he would have found that little or no traffic in wheat was being carried from Karachi to Calcutta: whatever traffic there was offering for Calcutta went from the Punjab direct by rail to Calcutta. Now, it was at the request of the exporting firms in Karachi in 1930, and again early in 1931, that it was decided to reduce the rates for wheat to Karachi to facilitate exports overseas. Those reductions did not result in exports overseas, but gave an impetus to the coastal trade from Karachi to Calcutta. The shipping companies having secured that traffic by the reduction in the railway rates from the Punjab to Karachi have been making every endeavour to keep this traffic to the sea route. I ask the House to agree that the Railway administrations have a right to make every endeavour in the interests of the State to try and get that traffic back to the all-rail route. The Railways have done nothing more than attempted by just a little reduction in the railway freight to get that traffic to move by the route by which it had been moving up till 1930 or 1931.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: May I ask the Honourable Member why it was legitimate for the railway company to capture the tea traffic from Calcutta to Bombay which, I presume, was carried by the sea before?

Mr. Frank D'Souza: The particular point raised by my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, has been also examined by us, and the position, as far as I have been able to make out, is that even in the pre-war period the railways were carrying a large amount of traffic between Bombay and Calcutta by rail; and it was only the action of the steamer companies in cutting down their rates by sea, between Bombay and Calcutta, that forced the railways to reduce their rates. As my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghumanavi, pointed out, the shipping companies are not bound by any minimum as the railways are. The railways can go down in their rates to the minimum of 1/10th pie per maund per mile for commodities like grain, wheat and other low-priced commodities. For the more valuable commodities, such as piece-goods, the railways cannot get down to a rate below 1/6th of a pie per maund per mile. If the shipping companies are prepared to have similar limitations placed upon them, I suggest then it would be time enough for representatives of the shipping companies and those interested in them to say that the railways should be controlled as regards any action they may take to compete with the shipping companies.

There was another suggestion made, if I may just refer to it, and it was by my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad. He referred to the possibility of putting an elephant through the wide margin that exists between the maximum and minimum rates; but I do not know whether he realises that in many other countries in the world railways are not bound by minimum rates. They have maximum rates imposed by Government for the protection of public interests as in India, merely because

railways have a monopoly. The fixing of minimum rates here in India is only intended to prevent railways from exercising their discretion so very freely as to result in a definite loss of railway revenues. Railways in other countries in the world are not controlled by such minima; so that if you can drive one elephant between our maximum and minimum rates in India, you can drive things much bigger than an elephant through the power railways have in certain other countries in the world.

Referring again to what my friend, Mr. Baijnath Bajoria, said about reductions in rates for agricultural commodities, may I just say that people have come frequently and asked me whether they could not get a concession for the movement of their produce? I have always asked them if they realised what the rate was between the stations to which they referred. Except in the case of men who knew their business thoroughly well, the reply always indicated that they had no knowledge of what the position was. I do not suggest for a moment that my friend, Br. Baijnath Bajoria, had no knowledge of what he was saying: My point is that generally, when people ask for concessions, they do not really realise what concessions already exist. In the case of the main agricultural commodities, particularly the lower priced commodities, the actual rates charged on railways are considerably below the rates which the railways are authorised to charge. That, I think, will be recognised as the granting of concession rates. My friend, Mr. Baijnath Bajoria, also referred to the mustard oil mills of Bengal which, he said, might go out of existence, merely because the freight rates on mustard seeds

Mr. M. S. Aney: May I ask the Honourable Member whether he will illustrate the point that railway authorities are charging less rates than they are authorised to do?

Mr. Frank D'Souza: If I may go back to the point made by Mr. Aney, the maximum rate for wheat is .88 pie per maund per mile. With a few exceptions, railways charge rates which, for distances over one hundred miles or so, represent reductions varying from about 15 per cent. to nearly 50 per cent. as the distance increases. Apart from the reductions that they make, which are of general applicability, railways also quote other rates on a lower basis between those points where their enquiries show that lower rates than those normally applicable are required to facilitate the free movement of commodities. Again in the case of agricultural commodities, we have to consider the possibility of existing markets elsewhere being affected, a point that was specially brought to our notice during the discussion at the Crop Planning Conference, in June last year, when a suggestion was made for reductions in the railway freight rates for agricultural commodities. More than one representative of the various provinces pointed out that they would not like railways to make these reductions without first consulting the agricultural officers of those other provinces into which these commodities were likely to move, to enable them to examine the extent to which, if at all, the commodities in which they were concerned were likely to be affected by commodities from other provinces coming into their areas.

Reverting now to the mustard oil question, when I was interrupted by my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, Mr. Baijnath Bajoria stated that mustard oil mills in Bengal were likely to be ruined. The mustard oil

[Mr. Frank D'Souza.]

question has been under examination now for nearly two years, and the knowledge which the trade had that the East Indian Railway were contemplating making some adjustments in the rates for mustard seed from the United Provinces to Calcutta brought forth a howl of protests from practically every oil mill in the United Provinces and also from certain Chambers and other trade organizations interested in the oil mills of the United Provinces. It is believed that the position of the oil mills in the United Provinces would be very seriously affected if a reduction in the rates for mustard seed were made for the oil mills in Bengal. But we have a machinery in the Railway Rates Advisory Committee to undertake the examination of conflicting interests in cases of this kind, and so long as this machinery exists, I think the trade interests concerned will realise that they have a means of obtaining redress or rather of having their particular point of view examined in detail for the consideration of Government. There is nothing more, Sir, that I think I need refer to. (Cheers from Official Benches.)

Mr. Sami Vencatachelum Chetty (Madras: Indian Commerce): Sir, may I ask a question to the Honourable Member who just sat down? Is it a fact that the railway freight on piece-goods from Bombay to Madras is considerably higher than the shipping rate from Bombay to Madras, and, if so, is it particularly designed to facilitate the shipping trade as against the railway traffic?

Mr. Frank D'Souza: I have not quite caught the Honourable Member's point.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelum Chetty: Then, I shall repeat it. Is it correct that the railway freights from Bombay to Madras for piece-goods are considerably higher . . . ?

Mr. Frank D'Souza: I have no idea what the shipping rates from Bombay to Madras are, but they could not be greater than the railway freight from Bombay . . .

Mr. Sami Vencatachelum Chetty: No, it is less, and why is it?

Mr. Frank D'Souza: Substantially less.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelum Chetty: Yes, why is it less?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, it occurred to me in the course of this discussion that lest our position should be misunderstood or misconstrued, it is necessary that I should make a few observations. If I may be permitted, I should like to offer my congratulations to the Honourable the Mover on his eloquent speech. If it had been a motion for a general revision of the tariff rates and freights with a view to bringing about a reduction, I would have supported it, because I have very strong feelings on the question.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: That is my demand.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: But that is not your motion. As I understand it, the grievance of the Mover has arisen out of the reduction of the freight rates on goods on inland traffic from ports to ports in India which are also connected by maritime routes. That seems to be the gravamen of his charge. I believe I have interpreted him correctly. He nods assent, and so I take it that that is the gist of his charge. I may say at once that I am blinded neither by prejudice nor by greed in determining my attitude towards this question. I would like to know how the Honourable the Mover attacks the railway position; what is his real complaint? Has the producer of raw materials suffered because of this reduction in the rate? Has the trader suffered because of this reduction in rate? Has the exporter suffered because of the reduction in rate?

Mr. Lalchand Navarai: Karachi says it has suffered.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: He says that the Karachi Port Trust will not be able to raise a larger revenue than it would if it had received a larger quantity of goods. But the people of India do not exist for the maintenance of the ports. The ports exist for the promotion of the interests of the people. Which of the two is to be given preference?

Sir, the question seems to me to be a very simple one. In fact, the grievance of the Mover seems to be that the rates are not being so manipulated as to yield a protection to the shipping industry. If that be the charge, then, unfortunately, I do not agree with him. He wants manipulation against a national organization in the interest of a particular trade, for the benefit of the individual's interest in that trade. If I have correctly interpreted his motion, then he has to justify his position.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): No.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I hope he will throw further light and correct me, and I shall be glad to keep my mind open. But he has to satisfy me that I am wrong. Sir, is this the first occasion when the railways have hit others by their competition. What is the history of the last 80 years since the first mile of rail road was laid in this country. Has it not displaced millions of people engaged in transporting goods in this country? What was the state of affairs in former days? People with bullock carts, people with pack ponies, people with other contrivances and devices of an indigenous character, used to carry goods from one place to another. How many of them have not been thrown into the wilderness? How many of them have not been practically killed? On account of the extensive net-work of the railways, millions of transport workers in this country have been economically annihilated. I do not stress this point further as it was perhaps inevitable. Unfortunately, mechanical means of transport and production have come to stay, and they are bound to have their reactions. But did it ever strike the Honourable Members sitting over there, that, on account of this competition in the matter of fares and rates, the poorest in the country had been made poorer, and for a series of years large sums of money had been sent abroad on account of interest on capital and purchase of railway material? The difficulties arising out of competitive rates should have been realised earlier. In fact, the competition, of which the complaint is now made, is just of the right type: healthy rivalry of this sort against a private corporation for the benefit of the State

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

is perfectly wholesome and desirable in the larger interests of the country. Sir, this doctrine that the State should not come in conflict with private enterprise is one of those old shibboleths which stands discredited today. There was a time when such propositions were put forward by economists, but there has been a considerable change during the last 30 years since Joseph Chamberlain parted from the Cabinet of Balfour, and now when his son, Neville Chamberlain, is directing the policy of protection and Imperial Preference. Today the State stands as the representative of the economic interests of the people, and it is the foremost duty of the State to promote the economic welfare of the people as a whole. In these circumstances, I submit, Sir, Honourable Members should not be scared by the old bogey of *laissez faire* or immunity of private enterprise. In fact, unless the motive of profiteering is shackled, there is no hope for any progress in the world today.

Mr. F. E. James: I wonder whether my Honourable friend would permit me to interrupt him for a moment. I think, quite unwittingly, he is a little misinterpreting what my Honourable friend, Mr. Hossack, meant, and I am quite sure.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: I should have thought that Mr. Hossack would be able to correct me better. You may be misinterpreting him.

Mr. F. E. James: I know his mind better than the Honourable Member.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Is this really in order, Sir,—some other Member explaining.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. The Honourable Member (Mr. Hossack) can explain it for himself.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Today the State, in fact, stands for nationalisation of means of transport. That is one of the first and foremost functions which civilised States discharge; in fact, the principal method by which trade and commerce can be encouraged is by means of nationalisation of means of transport. If the Honourable Members opposite are prepared for the nationalisation of the shipping industry for the promotion of maritime trade, I for one would advise the Government to acquire their interests, so that this competition, this conflict between the railways and the shipping industry in this country might be put an end to not only for a day or two, but for ever. I hope they will consider this suggestion and put an end to the present unstable order of things before it is too late. The world today does not accept any interest apart from that of the masses,—the producers and the consumers. When you take all this into consideration, the only rational policy which the railways in this country need adopt is one which would promote production, export and import trade, and if the railways have introduced such rates as will facilitate the movement of goods from the country side to the ports or from the ports to the country side or from one port to other, they are for once in the right, and I see no reason why any reasonably minded person should complain against this sound and correct policy.

Sir, I will not take more time of the House. I can assure Honourable Members opposite that we do not allow ourselves to be deflected from the

right by any racial considerations. In fact, we want to eliminate all invidious racial discriminations in this country. If we have to bring in the racial point, it is not to exploit racial bias but because the dies are weighted against us on the racial ground and we are the victims of it. We are not in any way actuated by any petty considerations and I would advise the Mover and his Group, in case they want to secure the position of true citizens of this ancient land, to merge their sectional interests in the larger interests of the people and masses of this country.

Some Honourable Members: Let the question be now put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is that **5 P.M.** the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The question is:

"That the demand under the head 'Working Expenses—Expenses of the Traffic Department' be further reduced by Rs. 100."

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 26th February, 1935.