

Tuesday, 15th March 1932

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

VOLUME III, 1932

(14th March to 6th April, 1932)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

**FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1932**



CALCUTTA: GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH
1982

Legislative Assembly

President :

THE HONOURABLE SIR IBRAHIM RAHIMTOOLA, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.

Deputy President :

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen :

SIR HARI SINGH GOUR, Kt., M.L.A.

MR. ARTHUR MOORE, M.B.E., M.L.A.

SIR ABDUR RAHIM, K.C.S.I., Kt., M.L.A.

SIR COWASJI JEHangIR (JUNIOR), K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MR. S. C. GUPTA, C.I.E., BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistants of the Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Public Petitions :

MR. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

MR. ARTHUR MOORE, M.B.E., M.L.A.

SIR ABDULLAH SUHRAWARDY, Kt., M.L.A.

DIWAN BAHADUR HARBLAS SARDA, M.L.A.

MR. B. SITARAMARAJU, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—14th March to 6th April, 1932.

	PAGE.
Monday, 14th March, 1932—	
Members Sworn	1923
Questions and Answers	1923—1948
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1948—1950
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Excesses of the Police in Delhi and Desecration of the Mosque in Kucha Rahman—Negatived	1951, 1985—2008
Election to the Standing Committee for the Department of Educa- tion, Health and Lands	1951
The General Budget—List of Demands—	1951—1985
Demand No. 28—Executive Council—	1952—1985
The Constitutional Issue	1952—1985
Tuesday, 15th March, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	2009—2018
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2018—2025
Bill passed by the Council of State laid on the Table	2025
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2025—2083
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	2025—2083
Retrenchment	2025—2083
Wednesday, 16th March, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	2085—2095
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2095—2096
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2096—2144
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	2096—2144
Avoidance of Income-tax	2096—2118
Indianisation of the Army	2118—2144
Thursday, 17th March, 1932—	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2145—2199
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	2145—2199
Royal Commission on Labour	2145—2155
Lack of Supervision over the Coal Transactions of Railways	2155—2172
Separation of Burma from India	2173—2193
Improper Interference by the Secretary of State in the Financial Affairs of India	2194—2199
Friday, 18th March, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	2201—2217
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2217—2224
Statement laid on the Table <i>re</i> Report on the Howard-Nixon Memo- randum regarding Financial Questions arising out of the Separation of Burma from India	2224—2229

Friday, 18th March, 1932—contd.

Statement of Business	2229—2231
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2231
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	2231—2281
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>concl'd.</i>	2231—2232
Demand No. 16—Customs—	2232—2266
Insufficient Economy effected by Government under Customs	2232—2266
Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income	2267
Demand No. 18—Salt	2267
Demand No. 19—Opium	2268
Demand No. 20—Stamps	2268
Demand No. 21—Forests	2268
Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	2268
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)	2268—2281

Saturday, 19th March, 1932—

Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Alleged Maltreatment of Women Political Prisoners—Request for leave to be renewed on Wednesday	2283
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	2283—2345
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department— <i>cont'd.</i>	2283—2288
Demand No. 25—Interest on Ordinary Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	2288
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2288
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	2288
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2288
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2289
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2290—2314
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2314—2325
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2325—2334
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2334
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2334
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2335
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2335
Demand No. 39—Army Department	2335
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2335
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2335
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2335
Demand No. 43—Audit	2336
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2336
Demand No. 45—Police	2336
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2336
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	2336
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2336
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2337
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2337
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2337
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2337

	PAGE.
Saturday, 19th March, 1932—contd.	
Demand No. 53—Archæology	2337
Demand No. 54—Mines	2337
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	2338
Demand No. 56—Education	2338
Demand No. 57—Medical Services	2338
Demand No. 58—Public Health	2338
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	2338
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	2338
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2339
Demand No. 62—Industries	2339
Demand No. 63—Aviation	2339
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	2339
Demand No. 65—Census	2339
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	2339
Demand No. 67—Emigration—External	2340
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2340
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	2340
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	2340
Demand No. 71—Currency	2340
Demand No. 72—Mint	2340
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2341
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	2341
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	2341
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	2341
Demand No. 76-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel Charged to Revenue	2341
Demand No. 77—Refunds	2341
Demand No. 78—North-West Frontier Province	2342
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan	2342
Demand No. 80—Delhi	2342
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara	2342
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands	2342
Demand No. 83—Rajputana	2342
Demand No. 84—Central India	2343
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad	2343
Demand No. 85-A—Aden	2343
Demand No. 86—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State	2343
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India	2343
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay and Security Printing	2343
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay	2344
Demand No. 90—Irrigation	2344
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	2344
Demand No. 93—Capital Outlay on Currency Note Press	2344
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	2344
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	2344
Demand No. 96—Commuted Value of Pensions	2345
Demand No. 96-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel Charged to Capital	2345
Demand No. 98—Interest-free Advances	2345
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances bearing Interest	2345

Wednesday, 23rd March, 1932—

Members Sworn	2347
Questions and Answers	2347—2385
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2386—2408
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Alleged maltreatment of women political Prisoners—Negatived	2408—2409, 2442—2463
Statements laid on the Table	2409—2414
The Hindu Marriages Dissolution Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Committee on Public Petitions	2414
The Hindu Untouchable Castes (Removal of Disabilities) Bill— Presentation of the Report of the Committee on Public Petitions	2415
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee	2415
Election of Members to the Standing Committee on Emigration	2415
The Ancient Monuments Preservation (Amendment) Bill—Appoint- ment of Sir Cowasji Jehangir to Select Committee	2415
The Indian Medical Council Bill—Introduced	2415—2416
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Passed	2416—2438
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2438—2442
Appendix	2465—2466

Thursday, 24th March, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2467—2489
Election to the Standing Finance Committee	2490
Election to the Standing Committee on Emigration	2490
Statements laid on the Table	2490—2499
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2500
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	2500
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2500—2542

Tuesday, 29th March, 1932—

Members Sworn	2543
Questions and Answers	2543—2590
Short Notice Question and Answer	2590—2591
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2591—2608
Death of Mr. K. V Rangaswami Iyengar	2608—2612
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2612
Election of Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Rail- ways	2612
Statements laid on the Table	2612—2617
Draft Convention and Recommendations <i>re</i> Protection against accidents of workers employed in loading and unloading ships	2618—2619
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2619—2654

Wednesday, 30th March, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2655—2664
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2664—2667
Death of Mr. F. W. Allison	2668—2670
Statements laid on the Table	2670—2671
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2671
The Bengal Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill— Passed as amended	2672—2714

Thursday, 31st March, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2715—2721
Short Notice Question and Answer	2721—2728
Election to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2729
Message from the Council of State	2729
Statements laid on the Table	2729—2730
The Port Haj Committees Bill—Introduced	2730
The Hedjaz Pilgrims (<i>Muallims</i>) Bill—Introduced	2730
The Foreign Relations Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2731—2776

Friday, 1st April, 1932—

Members Sworn	2777
Questions and Answers	2777—2784
Short Notice Question and Answer	2784—2785
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> unsatisfactory reply of the Leader of the House in regard to the expediting of the Reforms with Mahatma Gandhi in Jail—Negatived	2785—2788, 2820—2847
Statements laid on the Table	2788—2794
The Foreign Relations Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2794—2821
The Sugar Industry (Protection) Bill— <i>contd.</i>	2821—2829
Appendix	2849—2850

Saturday, 2nd April, 1932—

Statement of Business	2851—2852
Statements laid on the Table	2852—2854
The Sugar Industry (Protection) Bill—Passed	2855—2879
The Foreign Relations Bill—Passed as amended	2879—2902

Monday, 4th April, 1932—

Member Sworn	2903
Questions and Answers	2903—2908
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2908—2909
Short Notice Question and Answer	2910—2912
Statement laid on the Table	2912
The Indian Air Force Bill—Passed	2912—2925
The Indian Tariff (Wireless Broadcasting) Amendment Bill—Passed	2925—2933
The Public Suits Validation Bill—Passed	2933—2962

Tuesday, 5th April, 1932—

Member Sworn	2963
Statement <i>re</i> South Africa	2963—2966, 3012—3014
Statements laid on the Table	2966—2969
The Ancient Monuments Preservation (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of Select Committee	2969
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed	2969—2970
The Indian Partnership Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to	2970—2971
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2971—2978
The Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2978—2998

Tuesday, 5th April, 1932—contd.

The Port Haj Committees Bill—Referred to Select Committee	2998—3006
The Hedjaz Pilgrims (<i>Muallims</i>) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	3006—3009
Resolution to amend the previous Resolution on Roads—Adopted	3010—3012
Report on financial questions arising out of the proposed separation of Burma from India	3014—3025

Wednesday, 6th April, 1932—

Question and Answer	3027
Message from the Council of State	3027
Death of Sir Bomanji Dalal	3027—3029
Statement laid on the Table	3029—3030
Report on financial questions arising out of the proposed separation of Burma from India—Consideration postponed till the next Simla Session	3030—3050

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 15th March, 1932.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RATES FOR COMMON LABOUR IN THE DELHI PROVINCE.

791. ***Mr. E. F. Sykes:** (a) Will Government please say what rates are being paid for common labour in the various Government Departments and Municipal bodies in the Delhi Province?

(b) If Government have any information as to the rates paid by private employers, will they be good enough to give them?

Mr. A. G. Clow: (a) and (b). I presume that the Honourable Member means by common labour unskilled labour. An endeavour will be made to ascertain the level of earnings for such labour on building work for Government and private employees. If reliable figures can be secured, they will be placed on the table.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: May I ask the Honourable Member if he means to say that he does not know what is being paid at the present moment?

Mr. A. G. Clow: Not by private employers, certainly, Sir.

Mr. E. F. Sykes: May I ask how long he will take to ascertain this?

Mr. A. G. Clow: I hope it will not take very long.

†792—800.

DISREGARD OF THE CHILD MARRIAGE RESTRAINT ACT.

801. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla:** (a) Will Government please state if they are aware that the Child Marriage Restraint Act of 1929 stands only in name on the Statute Book and is being utterly disregarded in practice?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what steps, if any, they or the various provincial Governments to their knowledge have taken for the strict enforcement of the above Act?

(c) If the reply to part (b) be in the negative, will Government please state what measures they now propose to adopt in this matter?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave in this House to parts (b), (c) and (d) of starred question No. 72 on the 9th September, 1931, on the same subject.

†These questions were included in the list of questions on the 14th March, 1932.

NUMBER OF CONVICTIONS UNDER THE CHILD MARRIAGE RESTRAINT ACT;

802. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla**: Will Government please state, after enquiring from the various local Governments, the total number of convictions made in their respective provinces on account of disobedience of the Child Marriage Restraint Act?

The Honourable Sir James Orerar: 34, according to the information available.

COST OF BRITISH AND INDIAN SOLDIERS AND OFFICERS IN INDIA.

803. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla**: (a) Will Government kindly inform the House of the approximate expenditure incurred on the maintenance of the British troops in India?

(b) Will Government please state the starting salary of an Indian soldier and also that of a British soldier?

(c) Will Government please also state the highest salary at present drawn by an Indian military officer and also by a British officer?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) About Rs. 13 crores a year.

(b) The minimum pay of an Indian sepoy is Rs. 16 a month; that of a British private Rs. 1/8/- a day.

(c) The most highly paid combatant Indian King's Commissioned officer so far is drawing Rs 975 a month, less a temporary cut of 10 per cent. The most highly paid British officer is His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, whose salary is Rs. 1 lakh a year, less a temporary cut of 15 per cent.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am sorry I could not catch the Honourable Member's answer: what is the pay of the Indian soldier and of the British soldier per month?

Mr. G. M. Young: Rs. 16 a month, and Rs. 1/8/0 a day, respectively.

RETRENCHMENT IN MILITARY EXPENDITURE.

804. ***Lala Rameshwar Prasad Bagla**: (a) Will Government please state the total number of representations received by them urging the necessity of making drastic retrenchment in the military expenditure?

(b) What response do Government propose to make to the above representations and when?

Mr. G. M. Young: (a) I am afraid that no count has been kept of such representations.

(b) Government have already responded. A memorandum showing the latest reductions in full was circulated to Honourable Members on the 7th March.

CENSORSHIP OF FOREIGN NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS IN INDIA.

805. ***Mr. K. C. Neogy**: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the speeches delivered by the Right Honourable Sir Samuel Hoare in the

British House of Commons on the 29th February last in the course of the debate on the India Office estimates were based on facts supplied by the Government of India?

(b) If so will Government refer to his statement that "no check to-day was placed on any foreign newspaper correspondent in India in sending news to his country or any part of Europe", and say whether the restrictions regarding censorship to which Indian newspapers and Indian news agencies are subject do not apply to foreign newspaper correspondents?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: (a) The Secretary of State is kept fully informed by the Government of India of all important matters and the Honourable Member may assume that the speeches referred to were made in the light of information in his possession.

(b) There is no censorship or interference with messages addressed to reputable newspapers or Press agencies outside India.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: May I know if Indian newspapers are subjected to a greater restriction in the matter of sending telegrams than English newspapers in this country?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: I think there is a difference between the publication of a possibly alarmist or false report in Cawnpore, where it might immediately lead to disorder, and the publication of the same report in, say Carrickfergus where it would be innocuous.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Do I take it that the Indian correspondent is placed on the same footing as the European correspondent in this country in the matter of sending telegrams to newspapers in foreign countries?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: That, I believe, is so.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Do I take it that nothing depends upon the nationality of the correspondent but that everything depends upon the destination of the telegram?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: And the responsibility of the news agency or correspondent.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: The Secretary of State is reported to have said—vide clause (b) of the question that "No check to-day was placed on any foreign newspaper correspondent in India in sending news to his country or any part of Europe". Is there any particular point in the phrase "foreign newspaper correspondent". Would any national of this country be placed in the same position?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: I think this particular observation was intended to refer to correspondents of newspapers out of India.

Mr. K. C. Neogy: Do I take it that the Indian correspondent of a foreign newspaper is in the same position as the foreign correspondent of a foreign newspaper working in India?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: Yes, I think that is so.

Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarda: Do the words "to his country or any part of Europe" exclude America?

The Honourable Sir James Crerar: Geographically, Sir, I think they cannot.

INCONVENIENT TIMINGS OF TRAINS AT ALIGARH.

806. ***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (on behalf of Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan): (a) Is it a fact that for the last four or five years, the 16 Down East Indian Railway express used to give connection to the Agra-Bareilly Passenger, No. 69 Up, at Aligarh?

(b) Is it also a fact that with effect from March 1st, 1932, this 16 Down express reaches Aligarh only a few minutes after the departure of this Agra-Bareilly passenger?

(c) Do Government know that it was the only convenient train for third class passengers specially who wanted to travel in the evening from Delhi to Bareilly? If so, what special necessity arose to discontinue this arrangement?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of bringing this matter to the notice of the Agent, East Indian Railway, with a view to removing this new inconvenience to the travelling public at an early date?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Prior to 1st March 1932, 16 Down was timed to pass through Aligarh before the arrival of 69 Up at that station. I have, however, not been able to verify how long this arrangement was in force, but am prepared to accept the Honourable Member's statement on this point.

(b) Yes. 16 Down arrives at Aligarh 15 minutes after the departure of 69 Up.

(c) According to the East Indian Railway Time Table in force from 1st March, 1932, a train leaves Delhi at 18-15 by which passengers can travel via Moradabad arriving at Bareilly at 8-19. Government are not aware of the reasons for the changes in the timings of 16 Down and 69 Up.

(d) I will send the Agent, East Indian Railway, a copy of the Honourable Member's question and of this answer for such action as he may consider necessary.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Why are the Commercial Managers changing the timings so often, to the great inconvenience of the public? Is it not due to the fact that they have nothing else to do?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I hope not, Sir.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What is the meaning of negation? Do they not change the timings for no cogent reasons but simply to while away their time?

Mr. P. R. Rau: At present I believe the railways are always considering the possibility of reducing the number of trains owing to the fall in traffic.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: But you do not reduce the number of trains by changing the timings 10 minutes forward or backward?

Mr. P. R. Rau: If you alter the number of trains, you have necessarily to alter the timings also.

PROMOTION OF CERTAIN TOWN INSPECTORS OF POST OFFICES.

807. ***Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** (on behalf of Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the posts of Town Inspectors attached to first class Head Post Offices in India which were time-scale appointments were converted into lower selection grade posts in 1927, and the then existing incumbents of the said posts were promoted to selection grade in preference to their seniors?

(b) Will Government be also pleased to state whether it is under contemplation to reconvert these posts into time-scale posts? If so, what are the reasons for it and will the existing incumbents, who were specially promoted for their qualifications as Town Inspectors, be allowed to remain in selection grade in other vacancies or revert to time-scale?

(c) If they will not be reverted, will Government kindly state the reasons for it?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) The facts as stated are substantially correct.

(b) This is one of the items of possible economies awaiting further investigation as suggested by the Posts and Telegraphs Retrenchment Sub-Committee, and Government are not in a position to anticipate their future line of action.

(c) Does not arise.

CLAIMS OF INDIAN HOLDERS OF ROUBLE NOTES.

808. ***Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal:** (a) With reference to the answer given by Government to my question No. 1234, dated the 7th November, 1931, regarding the claims of Indian holders of rouble notes, will Government kindly inform the House if they are in a position to state whether the claims of such holders of notes have been referred to the Anglo-Asiatic Debts and Claims Committee sitting in London and if the same have been admitted?

(b) Are Government aware that considerable hardship has been caused to a large number of Central Asian traders in British India who had their funds locked up in these notes and have been patiently waiting for the settlement of these claims ever since 1917?

Sir Evelyn Howell: (a) The claims were so referred, but the negotiations have proved abortive.

(b) Government are aware that there may have been hardship in individual instances but can suggest no remedy.

Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal: Do I take it that this is now a closed chapter, and that there is no possibility of any relief being given?

Sir Evelyn Howell: The negotiations may of course be resumed at some future date.

**NUMBER OF PERSONS DISCHARGED FROM THE OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER
OF MILITARY ACCOUNTS, LAHORE.**

809. ***Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal:** (a) Will Government kindly inform the House of the number of persons recently discharged from the office of the Controller of Military Accounts, Lahore?

(b) What are the principles on which such discharges have taken place?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) It is presumed that the Honourable Member refers to the individuals who have been served with notices of discharge under the Retrenchment terms. If so, the number of those selected for compulsory retirement is 33, and of those who have volunteered for retirement is 21.

(b) Since the establishment of the Military Accounts Department is on an all-India list, the final selection was made on an all-India basis. To provide the material for this, Selection Boards were constituted in every Military Accounts office, and these Boards were required to submit classified lists of personnel with details as to age, length of service, community, etc. From these classified lists the final selection was made, following the general principles laid down by Government for the selection of personnel for retirement. In accordance with those principles, retrenchment was carried out in the following order:

(a) by the acceptance of voluntary resignations or retirements;

(b) by the compulsory retirement of those classified as persons whose work was so consistently unsatisfactory that their retention, while others were discharged, would be unjustifiable;

(c) by the discharge of selected men with 25 or more years' service or less than 10 years' service.

In the application of these principles the condition laid down by Government regarding communal proportions has been fulfilled: that is, on an all-India basis, the ratio between the various communities represented by their numbers as they stood before retrenchment has been maintained to the nearest practicable figure.

EMPLOYEES OF THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

810. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra** (on behalf of Mr. B. N. Misra): Will Government be pleased to state the number of employees in the Bengal Nagpur Railway drawing a salary of (a) Rs. 500 and above, (b) Rs. 50 to 499, and (c) Rs. 49 and below?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The information available will be found in Appendix F of Vol. I and Appendix C of Vol. II of the Report by the Railway Board on Indian Railways for 1930-31, copies of which are in the Library of the House.

PASSES ISSUED DURING HOLIDAYS ON THE BENGAL NAGPUR RAILWAY.

811. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra** (on behalf of Mr. B. N. Misra): (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of passes issued by the Bengal Nagpur Railway in 1931:

(i) during the Durga Puja holidays,

(ii) during the Christmas holidays, and

(iii) during the whole year 1931 besides the above mentioned occasions?

(b) If Government have no information, are they prepared to enquire and lay the information on the table of the House?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government have no information.

(b) The compilation of the information asked for would involve a very considerable amount of labour disproportionate to any use to which it could be put, and I regret, therefore, that I am unable to agree to obtain these particulars.

FEEES CHARGED FROM VISITORS TO STEAMERS.

812. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it a fact that Government have authorized the various shipping companies to recover a fee of Rs. 3 per permit to allow visitors on board a steamer?

(b) If so, is the authority given to all companies or only to a few?

(c) If only to a few, will Government please state to which companies the authority is given?

(d) Is it a fact that such authority is given to companies on the understanding that such collections should be used for charitable purposes?

(e) Will Government state the amounts recovered by the companies during the last two years?

(f) Will Government state how these collections have been utilized by these companies?

The Honourable Sir George Rainy: The Government of India are not in possession of complete information on the subject. Enquiries are being made from Local Governments, and on receipt of the information a reply will be laid on the table of the House.

NAMES OF ROADS IN NEW DELHI.

813. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it a fact that the different names given to different roads in New Delhi were given in consultation with somebody or any committee appointed for the said purpose?

(b) If so, will Government please state the name of that body or committee or department whatever that may be?

(c) Is that body or committee still functioning?

(d) If not, will Government please state which body at present is dealing with this matter, that is the naming of roads and associating them with some important personages of the past or present?

Mr. A. G. Clow: (a) and (b). An informal Committee consisting of the Chief Commissioner, the Chief Engineer, the Superintending Engineer and the Consulting Architects went into the matter and made various suggestions in 1919. These were adopted with minor alterations by the New Capital Committee at their meeting on the 24th December, 1919, and given effect to.

(c) No.

(d) The Government of India, in consultation with the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, and the Chief Engineer, Central Public Works Department, without prejudice to the rights of the New Delhi Municipal Committee in this matter, under section 179 of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911.

REFUSAL TO EXHIBIT CERTAIN JEWELLERY AT MOHENJODARO.

814. ***Mr. K. P. Thampan** (on behalf of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai): (a) With reference to the answers of Sir Frank Noyce to parts (d) and (e) of my starred question No. 58, given on the 26th January, 1932, in which it was stated that "There is no ground for the suggestion that there has been differential treatment between Indians and Europeans" in the matter of exhibiting the jewellery to visitors at Mohenjodaro, has the attention of Government been drawn to a signed article by Mr. A. S. Iyengar published in the *Hindustan Times* of 22nd and 24th February, 1932, under the heading "The Message of Mohenjodaro"?

(b) What steps have Government taken on the complaint of the writer that although Mr. Mackay, the officer in charge of explorations at Mohenjodaro, protested innocence as to the charge of racial discrimination contained in my question, he refused to exhibit the jewellery even when Mr. A. S. Iyengar made a specific request therefor to him? If not, why has no action been taken?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state if on this occasion when the jewellery was refused to be shown to Mr. Iyengar, the key of the safe was available or not?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) As no definite instructions had at that time been issued in regard to the exhibition of jewellery to visitors to Mohenjodaro and, as Mr. Iyengar did not press the point, the jewellery was not shown to him. Instructions have however since been issued that the jewellery should be shown to any visitors or students of archæology who are genuinely interested in it. It has also been impressed upon the staff attached to the Museum and excavations that every courtesy should be shown to visitors.

(c) The key of the safe containing the jewellery was available.

ACCOUNTS OF DISCOVERIES AT MOHENJODARO.

815. ***Mr. K. P. Thampan** (on behalf of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai): (a) Has the complete collection of writings on the Mohenjodaro discoveries by Sir John Marshall arrived in India and are any of the new volumes available in the Library of the House?

(b) Is it a fact that the cost of each new volume is over Rs. 150?

(c) Do Government propose to take up the suggestion of Mr. A. S. Iyengar that accounts of excavations and discoveries together with photographs be published in popular language in English and in principal vernaculars? If not, why not?

Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Copies of Sir John Marshall's work on Mohenjodaro, which is in three volumes, have only recently been received in India. A set will be placed in the Library of the House.

(b) No, the price of the complete set is £12-12-0.

(c) The suggestion will receive the careful consideration of Government.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is it a fact that Sir John Marshall gets a share from the sale proceeds of the book?

Sir Frank Noyce: No, not from the sale proceeds of this book.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Who has paid the cost of the printing of this book?

Sir Frank Noyce: The publishers, Sir.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: And not the Government?

Sir Frank Noyce: No. The book is published by Messrs. Probsthain and Co.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: And they have paid the cost of printing?

Sir Frank Noyce: Obviously.

ABSENCE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE WIRELESS BRANCH OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

816. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the total period of absence of the Superintendent in the Wireless Branch of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs' office after the retirement from the service of Mr. deMagry;
- (b) whether any Superintendent was employed in the Wireless Branch during Mr. deMagry's leave; if so, whether he was a man of the Postal Branch or Telegraph Branch of the Department; and
- (c) what the reasons are for his absence from the Wireless Branch?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) The Wireless Branch dispensed with a Superintendent from the 18th July to the 23rd December, 1931.

(b) Yes; a senior assistant of the telegraph traffic branch officiated as Superintendent.

(c) It was considered that he could be more usefully employed as officiating Superintendent in the branch where he had previously been working.

EMPLOYMENT OF A SEPARATE SUPERINTENDENT FOR THE WIRELESS BRANCH OF THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.

817. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** (a) Is it a fact that the Wireless Branch of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs' office is now located in a room in which the Engineering Branch of the same office is also located?

(b) Is it a fact that besides the Director, Wireless, who is in charge of the Wireless Branch, the major portion of the wireless technical matters is the concern of the Chief Engineer, Telegraphs, who is in charge of the Engineering Branch more than any other Branch Officer of the Department?

(c) If the reply be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the necessity for re-employing a separate Superintendent from the Postal Branch instead of placing the Branch under the supervision of the Superintendent of the Engineering Branch?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Yes, as regards the clerical staff.

(b) The meaning of the question is obscure. The Director of Wireless is the head of the Wireless Branch and is primarily responsible for all Wireless technical matters. He refers certain questions to the Chief Engineer who is naturally more concerned than non-technical branch officers with engineering technical matters.

(c) The Wireless Branch is a distinct section of the office which requires its own Superintendent, especially now that the officer strength of the branch has been reduced owing to retrenchment.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

RETRENCHMENTS IN THE MILITARY FINANCE DEPARTMENT.

173. **Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total number of men in the ministerial as well as the officers' staff in the Military Finance Department as it stood before and after the retrenchments were given effect to?

(b) Is it a fact that, generally speaking, when carrying out retrenchments, care is taken to safeguard the interests of the permanent men as compared with those who hold temporary appointments in the office concerned or are on deputation from other Departments?

(c) Is it a fact that the above principle has not been followed in the Military Finance Department and that not a single man who is on deputation from the Military Accounts Department has been axed and that all the retrenched men belong to the substantive staff of the Military Finance Department?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a)

	Before retrench- ment.	After retrench- ment.	
Officers	11*	10*	*Excludes the Deputy Financial Adviser (Royal Air Force), who gets Rs. 150 only from civil estimates, the balance of pay being borne by Military Accounts Department.
Ministerial establishment including Gazetted Superintendents.	108	98	

(b) In carrying out retrenchment consideration is given to the interests of all classes who may be affected, and an endeavour is made to find the

solution which will cause the least hardship consistent with the maintenance of efficiency. In the Military Finance Branch, the establishment includes, as a regular element, a proportion of personnel drawn from the Military Accounts Department and the interests of that class require consideration equally with the interests of the ordinary Secretariat element.

(c) No. One of the Military Accounts staff was reverted to his Department. The number of the ordinary Secretariat personnel who were retrenched is 7. On the basis of the total numbers in each category the Military Accounts element took a proportionately larger share of the burden than the Secretariat element. It must be remembered that heavy retrenchments are being made in the Military Accounts Department and that the reversion of personnel from the Military Finance Branch merely transfers the burden to that Department.

RECRUITMENT OF ASSISTANT FINANCIAL ADVISERS FROM THE MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

174. Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state why one of the appointments of Assistant Financial Advisers is reserved for an individual of the Military Accounts Department in addition to the Deputy Financial Advisers who are also recruited from that source?

(b) Will Government kindly say whether in view of the fact that one of the posts of Assistant Financial Advisers has been abolished, it is still proposed to reserve one such appointment for a Military Accounts man? If so, will Government please state reasons?

(c) Is it a fact that no Indian Assistant Financial Adviser has ever been appointed to the superior staff of the Military Accounts Department? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) The reservation of one post of Assistant Financial Adviser for a gazetted officer of the Military Accounts Department is in accordance with the view that the efficiency of the Military Finance Branch is increased by a leaven in all grades of personnel who have had practical experience in a Military Accounts office. Moreover, the reservation of this post is some measure of compensation for the fact that Assistant Financial Advisers of the Secretariat category are eligible for promotion, by selection, to the Superior Service of the Military Accounts Department.

(b) The reasons for the reservation of one post for a Military Accounts officer are not affected by the reduction by one of the total number of posts of Assistant Financial Adviser.

(c) The reply is in the affirmative. Vacancies in the Superior Service of the Military Accounts Department are filled to the extent of two-thirds by direct recruitment and to the extent of one-third by promotion. Assistant Financial Advisers have no claim to promotion to the Superior Service but are eligible for consideration along with gazetted officers of the Subordinate Service of the Military Accounts Department. Promotions are made on the recommendation of a Selection Board. No Indian Assistant Financial Adviser has so far been recommended by the Selection Board for promotion.

**MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT MEN ON DEPUTATION IN THE MILITARY
FINANCE DEPARTMENT.**

175. Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is it a fact that there are persons in the Budget Section of the Military Finance Department on deputation from the Military Accounts Department? If so, what rates of pay and allowances are they drawing?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I lay a statement on the table.

Statement showing rates of pay and allowances drawn by the Accountants and Clerks of the Military Accounts Department on deputation in the Budget Section of the Military Finance Department.

		Rs.	
Assistant-in-charge	Pay	440	} 708
	Local Allowance	80	
	Duty	88	
	Spl. pay	100	
Second Assistant	Pay	410	} 490
	Local Allowance	80	
Clerks—			
First	Pay	170	} 235
	Local Allowance	65	
Second	Pay	145	} 210
	Local Allowance	65	
Third	Pay	225	} 295
	Local Allowance	70	

Apart from the special pay admissible to the Assistant-in-charge, the remuneration is on the scales sanctioned for personnel employed in the office of the Military Accountant General.

**APPOINTMENT OF UNDER SECRETARIES IN THE MILITARY FINANCE
DEPARTMENT.**

176. Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is contemplated to create some posts of "Under Secretaries" in the Military Finance Department? If so, what is to be the grade of pay of the officers and how are they to be recruited?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether at the time when the officer holding the post of Assistant Financial Adviser was axed, there were two vacancies in that grade? Are the posts referred to still filled up temporarily?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. As an experimental measure of economy one post of Deputy Financial Adviser is being reduced in status

and pay to that of a Junior Deputy Financial Adviser. The post is to be filled by an officer of class II of the Superior Service of the Military Accounts Department, who will draw his substantive departmental pay with additional pay at Rs. 200 a month.

(b) The reply is in the affirmative.

APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIMS TO VARIOUS APPOINTMENTS IN AJMER-MERWARA.

177. **Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Is it a fact that out of half a dozen or more judicial gazetted appointments in the grade of Rs. 300—20—600/40—800 in Ajmer-Merwara none is held by a Muslim, and that all the gazetted revenue appointments in Ajmer-Merwara are held by non-Muslims?

(b) Is it a fact that all the posts of clerks in the English line in Ajmer-Merwara in the grade of Rs. 275—15—350, the grade of 200—10—270, and the grade of 150—7—185 are held by non-Muslims?

(c) Is it a fact that of the 21 posts in the upper division of clerks in the English line in Ajmer-Merwara only two are held by Muslims?

(d) Is it a fact that out of 43 posts in the lower division of clerks in the English line in Ajmer-Merwara only four are Muslims?

(e) Is it a fact that all the posts of clerks in the vernacular line in Ajmer-Merwara in the grade of Rs. 200—8—240, the grade of Rs. 150—5—200, the grade of Rs. 150—7—185, and the grade of Rs. 90—5—120—150 are held by non-Muslims?

(f) Is it a fact that there is no Muslim holding a post of above Rs. 20 per mensem in the service of the Ajmer-Merwara Forest, Jail, and Income-tax departments, except one jamadar in the jail?

(g) Is it a fact that out of six appointments in the Excise Preventive staff in Ajmer-Merwara only one is held by a Muslim?

(h) Is it a fact that Muslim graduates are kept in the lower grade of clerks in the English line, *viz.*, Rs. 40—2—60—3—90, in Ajmer-Merwara whereas non-Muslim non-graduates are holding posts in the higher grades, including the grade of Rs. 275—15—350?

(i) Is it a fact that the Muslims form about 35 *per cent.* of the total population of Ajmer-Merwara?

(j) If what are stated at parts (a) to (i) above are facts, what steps do Government propose to take to secure an adequate representation, on the population basis, of the Muslims in Government service in Ajmer-Merwara?

Sir Evelyn Howell: (a) None of the 5 Judicial and 3 Revenue gazetted appointments in the grade mentioned is held by a Muhammadan, nor does a member of this community hold either of the other two revenue gazetted posts in this District. The highest judicial post, that of Additional District and Session Judge on Rs. 1,000—50—1,250, is held by a Muslim.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes.

(d) No.

(e) Yes.

(f) Yes, so far as the Forest and Income-tax Departments are concerned.

No, as regards the Jail Department.

(g) Yes.

(h) No distinction is made between Muslims and non-Muslims in making promotions from the Lower to the Higher grades. There are two Muslim graduates in the lower grade, one of whom has taken his degree since he was recruited. On passing the prescribed tests they will be promoted in the ordinary course.

(i) No. Seventeen per cent.

(j) The questions contain material omissions and mis-statements. 28 per cent. of the posts in the various branches of the clerical cadre (44 out of 156) are held by Muslims. A Muslim holds the highest judicial appointment. Three of the eight posts of Tahsildar and Naib Tahsildar are held by Muslims, and these will be eligible in due course for promotion to the higher (gazetted) posts. Muslims are well represented in the higher appointments in other departments such as Police and Education. It so happens that at present none of the 8 Revenue and Judicial appointments in the Rs. 300—800 grade is held by a Muslim. The incumbents of these posts are senior officials whose services obviously cannot be dispensed with merely to create a vacancy for a Muslim.

RECRUITMENT OF TWO UNQUALIFIED NON-MUSLIM CLERKS IN AJMER-MERWARA.

178. **Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** Is it a fact that two non-Muslims, one under-graduate and the other an unpassed Commercial Diploma candidate have been directly recruited in Government service in the Upper Division of clerks in the English line in Ajmer-Merwara, and that the rules allow the direct recruitment of only graduates in the said Upper Division? If so, why were the two candidates referred to directly recruited?

Sir Evelyn Howell: This question apparently relates to one appointment made in 1925 and another in 1928. The persons appointed had special qualifications, and their recruitment did not involve the infringement of any rule.

NON-APPOINTMENT OF QUALIFIED MUSLIMS IN AJMER-MERWARA.

179. **Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** (a) Are Government aware that a large number of Muslim graduates and LL.B.'s have been unsuccessfully trying for appointments in Government service in Ajmer-Merwara, whereas the local Administration has been defending its policy of not giving the Muslims adequate representation in Government service by the argument that competent Muslims are not available?

(b) If so, what action do Government propose to take in the matter?

Sir Evelyn Howell: (a) and (b). The appointments in this small district are very limited in number and there is a very large number of graduate candidates for any vacancy that may from time to time occur. There have been a few Muslim graduates and LL.B.'s among the unsuccessful candidates, but the claims of all suitable candidates of all communities are fully considered when appointments are made.

**APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIMS TO THE OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
AJMER-MERWARA.**

180. Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: (a) Is it a fact that the post of the Superintendent of the office of the Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, has never been held by a Muslim?

(b) Is it a fact that the non-Muslim who holds the post of the Head clerk of the office of the Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, is only a matriculate?

(c) Is it a fact that the present Superintendent of the office of the Commissioner, Ajmer-Merwara, has already been given several extensions of service?

(d) If what are stated at parts (a) to (c) above are facts, do Government propose to give no further extension to the said Superintendent and to appoint a Muslim graduate on his retirement?

Sir Evelyn Howell: (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. He is an exceptionally experienced and capable clerk with a record of over 28 years of excellent service to his credit.

(c) No.

(d) It is not possible to earmark the selection post of Superintendent, which requires very special qualifications, for any particular community.

NON-APPOINTMENT OF QUALIFIED MUSLIMS IN AJMER-MERWARA.

181. Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: (a) Is it a fact that under the present Commissioner of Ajmer-Merwara the claims of the Muslims to increased representation in Government service have been repeatedly disregarded?

(b) Is it a fact that the said Commissioner has appointed a matriculated non-Muslim Girdawar to the post of a Naib-Tehsildar overlooking the applications of Muslim LL.B.'s and graduates?

Sir Evelyn Howell: (a) No.

(b) The appointment to which this question apparently relates was made in accordance with seniority and no candidates' claims were overlooked.

**APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN STATION MASTERS ON THE BOMBAY, BARODA
AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.**

182. Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: With reference to the Government's reply to starred question No. 1033, on the subject of the appointment of certain Assistant Station Masters on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, given in the Legislative Assembly on the 20th March, 1931, will Government please state whether the Agent of the said Railway has taken any action in the matter? If so, what?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Government have no information.

**TERMINATION OF THE SERVICES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES ON THE BOMBAY,
BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.**

183. Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: With reference to the Government's reply to part (c) of starred question No. 1032 (relating to the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway authorities utilizing clause 2 of the service agreement of the employees of the Traffic Department in the said railway in terminating the services of the employees who have put in many years' services), given in the Legislative Assembly on the 20th March, 1931, will Government please state whether they have received any report on the subject from the Agent of the said Railway? If so, will Government please place the report on the table of the House?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have neither asked for, nor received any report.

**TERMINATION OF THE SERVICES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES ON THE BOMBAY,
BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.**

184. Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin: With reference to the Government's reply to parts (d) and (e) of starred question No. 1032 (relating to the termination of services of employees of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway), given in the Legislative Assembly on the 20th March, 1931, will Government please state:

- (a) what are the rules which empower the Administration of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway to terminate the services of an employee without assigning any specific reason;
- (b) what are the reasons that justify the giving of such arbitrary powers to the authorities of the said Railway of terminating the services of their employees without assigning any specific reason;
- (c) whether the authorities of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway possess the same powers of terminating the services of an employee of theirs even after the enforcement of "the rules and regulations of discharge and dismissal of subordinates" published in Memo. No. E./60/C.-2, dated the 12th June, 1931, of the Agent of the said Railway; and
- (d) if the reply to part (c) be in the negative, whether Government are prepared to instruct the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway authorities to re-instate the employees of the said railway whose services have been terminated without assigning any specific reason?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) It is not a matter of rules, but of conditions in the service agreements.

(b) All railways have similar conditions in the service agreements of their employees. They are necessary to secure the commercial working of railways.

(c) The rules referred to do not remove the power to discharge without assigning reasons.

(d) Does not arise.

TERMINATION OF THE SERVICES OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES ON THE BOMBAY,
BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.

185. **Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin:** With reference to the Government's reply to part (f) of starred question No. 1032 (relating to the termination of services of the employees of the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway), given in the Legislative Assembly on the 20th March, 1931, will Government please state the reasons for refusal to instruct the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway administration to re-instate the employees whose services have been terminated without assigning any specific reasons in the order terminating their services?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The matter is entirely within the competence of the Railway Company.

BILL PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF STATE LAID ON THE TABLE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, in accordance with the provisions of rule 25 of the Indian Legislative Rules I lay on the table a Bill to validate certain suits relating to public matters which was passed by the Council of State on the 14th March, 1932.

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

DEMAND No. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—*contd.*

Retrenchment.

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): On a point of order, Sir. Before Mr. Mitra moves his motion, I should like to know what has happened to the motion that was moved yesterday which was not terminated.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member is aware of the arrangement which the House unanimously agreed to. Yesterday was allotted to the Nationalist Party, and if the motion that was put before the House could not be carried to vote, it dropped. Today is the day allotted to the Independent Party and the Chair has called upon Mr. Mitra to move his motion.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Sir, I have been put in charge of this motion on behalf of my Party to initiate discussion about the general question of retrenchment. My duty will be in my speech to do the spade-work and I expect other Members of my Party and other friends belonging to other Parties will develop the general proposition. My leader, Sir Abdur Rahim, who was the Chairman of the most important Sub-Committee namely, the

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

General Purposes Sub-Committee, will deal with the general principles and higher questions of finance. Sir, this is the first time that I am taking part in a Budget discussion, although I have been in this House for more than five years, because I belonged to the Swaraj Party of which I was the Chief Whip. The Party followed the principle of obstruction because they maintained that, without political control in the general administration, it was futile attempting to have any control over finance. As a matter of fact, it has been said by a great Bengali leader of public opinion that "a subject nation has no politics" and unless we can get rid of the subjection, it is no use to try to control the finances of the country. I shall wait and see as to what will be the result of my change of policy by trying to criticise the Government on their Demands and asking them to mend their way. Sir George Schuster in the concluding portion of his speech said:

"On a broad review I think we may feel satisfied with the position. We can face next year with a prospect of a fairly substantial surplus."

Later on he says:

"If one looks round the country and at the outward signs of its economic and financial position, while I fully recognise that the difficulties are still immense and that large sections of the people are in dire straits, owing to the present low level of prices and trade depression, nevertheless there is not a total absence of encouraging signs."

Further on he says:

"Even if the sales of gold may to some extent represent a forced realisation of savings, yet as against this there are indications that the masses in India still have a considerable amount of money available for investment."

Then he illustrates this by a reference to the case of Savings Banks. My reading of the situation is that the prosperity of this country should not be so easily guessed by the fact of the mere investment of a few crores of rupees in the Savings Banks. We have found that there has been a serious fall in the Customs revenue all-round, and the railway earnings have gone down to a considerable extent, and in a large part of the country people had even recourse to non-payment of taxes and rents. The purchasing power of the people is very low. This shows the real condition of the people and not the mere investment of 6 crores of rupees by the middle-class people in Postal Cash Certificates. I wonder what it is that is common between India and the other countries, so far as the Government are concerned. In every self-governing country the primary purpose for which the Government exists is to look after and administer to the social and the beneficent services for the people. In any country if we look for the main functions of the Government, we will find that its first concern is the national well-being of its people. Every free country has its system of free education, not only primary, but in many cases secondary, also; there is ample provision for medical relief; there is provision for old-age pensions, sickness, insurance, and above all it looks to the solution of the unemployment question as one of the most important of its various functions. What do we find in India? When we look to India, we find the Government here are primarily concerned with law and order first, and next they look after the scales of pay of officers and civil servants, and next they try to lessen the burden of England to as great an extent as possible. We pay for Persia Rs. 6,95,000, for Kabul Rs. 3,63,000, for China £12,000 and for Aden £150,000 and these large sums go to lessen the burden of

England to some extent apart from the military burden that India bears for Imperial purposes. These are more the concern of the Government of India than the vital issues that affect the people of India. We see that all other countries in Europe and America are anxious to solve their unemployment question. Here we have never heard this question even being raised. When we see countries like Germany and England are in dire necessity for funds, and when they speak of a financial crisis, it is to solve their unemployment problem which is increasing and they take recourse to retrenchment. What do we find in India? Do the Government in India ever care to consider it as their duty to solve the unemployment question? If anybody ever intended to try to solve this great national problem, it was that "naked *faqir*", Mahatma Gandhi, now rotting in jail. He suggested that by the introduction of the spinning wheel, to a certain extent the unemployment question could be solved. I consider that the true functions of a Government, a Government that really cared for its people, and any Government worthy to be called a Government should look after these social and beneficent activities for the people. It won't do in future for the Government only to care for the law and order and payment for the police and the soldiers and for lessening of the burden of England and then declare in the House that the condition in India is satisfactory and the country is prospering. The other day it was really a lamentable thing to see my Honourable friends Mr. Das, Mr. Mody and Mr. Joshi quarrelling amongst themselves as to on whom the additional burden of taxation should fall. They are patriotic gentlemen and they must know that the limit of taxation both for the rich and the poor has already long ago been reached. You always find that when the Government put some tax on luxuries, the law of diminishing returns operates. You do not get more money by extra taxation. So it was no use on the part of Honourable Members on this side of the House to quarrel amongst ourselves as to who should be taxed more. The other day my Honourable friend Mr. Das was saying that we should devise some means, some additional sources of taxation. Has it not been already proved, have not the Government themselves known that the limit of taxation has long ago been reached in this country where the average income of a man according to all calculations is less than two annas a day. The Honourable the Finance Member threw out an indirect hint that he had some chance of getting more money from salt and kerosene. Everybody knows and it is an elementary thing in economics that some money may be had from inelastic demands where the primary necessities of life are taxed. But is it fair taxation, is it good finance which any Honourable Member should be proud of mentioning in this House? I do not wish to level any personal charge against the Honourable the Finance Member who has had experience of three Continents. I know that had it been a free India and if we could get the services of a gentleman like Sir George Schuster, he would have given us a different Budget. Every year he goes on changing his views and principles. Every day he knows our position better and he feels his own helpless position, that whatever he may think to be for the good of the country, he will not be free to enforce it, in this unfortunate country. There is the Secretary of State for India who will pull him from the back at every stage on higher financial questions when England's interest is at stake; there are the Local Governments on the other side, and above all there is the Civil Service, all these in their turn will put obstacles in his way. The very astute and the keen intellectual man that

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

he is, he is doing his best under the circumstances. I say that really the true functions of a Government are not being discharged in this country and so it is useless to compare the Government of this country with that of any other country. As a matter of fact when this Government agreed to retrenchment, they felt that there was no way out of it and that there was no chance and no avenue for fresh taxation. As regards retrenchment, I shall read out to the House from the speech of the Honourable Sir George Schuster, showing that he himself did not put much faith in retrenchment. In his speech on 9th March, 1931 he said:

"I maintain that we have gone as far as we could go in the making of cuts, which would not interfere with the efficient working of the machinery of Government, I want to satisfy Honourable Members opposite on this, and Honourable Members opposite, I take it, want to be satisfied, and this is where the difficulty comes. Honourable Members say,—I refer particularly to what my Honourable friend Sir Abdur Rahim said in his speech. 'You have got to satisfy as that you have done all that is possible to cut down expenditure before we listen to your demands for new taxation'. Quite a reasonable attitude, and I am quite prepared to admit that we have got to satisfy this House. But, how are we going to satisfy them? They do not accept our general statements, and that is one of the reasons why I thought that a Retrenchment Committee, on the lines which I had proposed, would be of great value. I come before this House and say, 'I have done all that is reasonably possible now, but I think that to meet abnormal circumstances something more might possibly be done, and I want to have the support of non-official Benches in further demands for economy. I want to give non-official Members a chance of satisfying themselves that everything has been done, because I quite agree that it is only after they have done that, they, in the discharge of their public duties, are justified in voting for new taxation.'"

My leader, Sir Abdur Rahim, agreed to serve on these Committees and I do not know whether he will not repent years afterwards the result of his action. This country has felt the curse of these Retrenchment Committees. I say not in anger, but I feel when my countrymen tell me that these retrenchment proposals meant only the dismissal of a large number of lower paid officials in this distressing time. I will have to say a great deal about this later on. The Government have not really touched the sources where from they can get some money for this poor country. They have gone about the business in the wrong way. Now, as regards the compensation that was given to some of these retrenched people, I see that even on the last occasion when people were retrenched on the Incheape Committee's Report, they were allowed 20 per cent. enhanced pension subject to full pension of the grade. I will quote from the circular:

"Those who have completed ten years or over will be granted the pension admissible under Article 474 of the Civil Service Regulations together with an additional percentage which will be decided on the merits of each case but will not in any case exceed 20 per cent. The total pension will be subject to the limit of the full pension admissible under the ordinary rules."

As a matter of fact they were given 20 per cent. additional pension up to the limit of the full pension which is 50 per cent. of a man's pay. But now under our present scheme these people are given only half a month's gratuity for each year's they have served in addition to their pension. I have made some calculations on some figures, and this is what I find. Suppose a man gets Rs. 300; he is a Second Division clerk, his grade being up to Rs. 350. Now according to the Incheape scheme he would have got Rs. 150 plus 20 per cent., i.e., Rs. 30. But his maximum pension being half of his pay it will go up to Rs. 175. But according to the present scheme

if he is a man with 25 years' service, then for the five years loss of career he will get 2½ months' pay which is roughly about Rs. 750. But the commutation value of this Rs. 25, *i.e.*, Rs. 175—Rs. 150 of pension would have been approximately Rs. 2,500 or Rs. 3,000. Now he gets only Rs. 750 on the present scale of compensation. Then also as regards travelling expenses the present rules are very harsh. They get only repatriation T. A. and not ordinary transfer T. A. which is on a higher scale and includes incidental allowances. These people came into your service knowing full well that they could only be discharged for gross negligence of duty or some such major fault. Now for your purposes you have to do away with their services, and in consideration of this the General Purposes Committee made particular suggestions for compensation for people getting a lower scale of pay or people getting Rs. 200 or 300. But some of our recommendations, which were of use in retrenching these people, were accepted, but in giving them compensation not a word has been said about our recommendation.

Then, Sir, I shall show from the figures how they are manipulated by the Finance Department for their purposes. At the time of the supplementary Budget it was necessary to show that by retrenchment Government will get less money and for compensation while they will have to pay more, so that the effective result of retrenchment will be lost. The figures will presently show how an expert body like the Finance Department have miscalculated them or have intentionally misled this House. Sir George Schuster in his speech at page 169 gives the figures. He says :

"In my speech on first introducing the Emergency Finance Bill in September I indicated that as regards civil expenditure we hoped to achieve retrenchment measures providing for a reduction of Rs. 3,25 lakhs, against which we allowed for terminal charges, compensation, etc., about 75 lakhs."

What are the actual figures now as he presents them?

"The net figure (to be compared with my earlier figure of Rs. 2,50 lakhs) is increased to 4,00 lakhs."

He accounted for 2,50 lakhs for the next year at the time of the supplementary Budget, but he actually found that the retrenchment was to the tune of 4 crores. While for compensation he thought that he would have to pay 75 lakhs, actually, according to his own figures, it is 33 lakhs. I am quoting his own figures. So you see he cuts both ways. As regards retrenchment Sir George Schuster's figures go in one way. He gave this House to understand that it will be in round figures 2,50 lakhs, he finds it 4 crores. While for compensation, where our people are concerned, he said he would have to pay 75 lakhs, he actually pays for all retrenched people only 33 lakhs. That shows that when it is necessary for a supplementary Budget the officers of the Finance Department are masters of jugglery. They can make a deficit Budget turn into a surplus Budget and *vice versa*, if they so like.

Now I shall go to these figures from the report of the Special Retrenchment Officer, Mr. Nixon. I am glad he is present here and he will be able to point out the wrong figures if I quote any. In the second summary of the result of retrenchment operations, in the first four pages he has covered these points. Sir, the General Purposes Committee alone in their first Report suggested retrenchment of 121·21 lakhs; in the second report 168·57, and in the third Report 133·18. In all, the General Purposes Committee recommended retrenchment of 423·18 lakhs. I find that

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

in the third page of Mr. Nixon's report he says that in our second Report we have recommended retrenchment only for 158·8 lakhs. That is not correct because he has not taken account of 15 lakhs on the Lee concessions. Government in their wisdom may decide that they will not touch a pice of that, but when they speak of the General Purposes Committee's recommendation, they should include these 15 lakhs also, that is of the Lee concessions. Out of this Mr. Nixon takes out 31 lakhs for Ecclesiastical expenditure. Then it leaves 124 lakhs, of which they have accepted 86 lakhs, to which they added another 19½ lakhs, making a total of 105½ lakhs and out of our third Report, Government accepted a reduction of 72 lakhs. So we find that in the supplementary Budget, Sir George Schuster says that he accepted only further retrenchment of 90 lakhs from the Demands that were to be examined by the General Purposes Committee. But, as a matter of fact, of these 90 lakhs, 23 lakhs are automatic, because of the Census operations which have largely ceased from this year. So really he accepted only 70 lakhs, but according to their own figures they have given effect to about 177 lakhs. I give these figures to prove conclusively that an expert body like the Finance Department commits such gross mistakes. They also, in putting forward their supplementary Budget, minimised the amount for retrenchment and put in compensation, which they now find to be 33 lakhs for all and 22 lakhs concerning the General Purposes Committee, at 75 lakhs, *i.e.*, more than 3 times as much. From this I think I have proved that these figures, in the way in which they have been calculated, are manipulated. Of course the Government have carried out reductions in addition to what we suggested, because law and order must be maintained, and the expenditure for defence and police must not be touched. This is the principle on which they have acted. The General Purposes Committee definitely recommended that no reduction should be made in educational, medical and public health expenditure, but reductions in the extravagant scale have been made in the beneficial Departments, and police expenditure has not been touched. Government have crippled these beneficial subjects and departments. This is how even the 65 per cent. of reductions they have accepted is made up. Of course the Lee concessions cannot be reduced. The police must not be touched. The expenditure relating to defence, part of which is cleverly debited to civil charges, must not be cut. Ecclesiastical establishment must be maintained, because part of the expenditure is military expenditure and part of it benefits vested interests. So the only heads left are education, medical and public health and some other Budget heads.

As regards how far retrenchment has been carried out amongst Indians, some figures of the total number have been given: it is said that 299 officers and about 5,279 clerks have been reduced. If we look to the Demands, we get some indirect evidence as to how many Indians are affected. Of course it is not mentioned here how many Indians and how many Europeans have been affected: but from page 619 of the Demands for Grants, we find that that Demand—No. 764—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to revenue—gives the expenditure on retrenchment of personnel by leave salary in India and in England and repatriation charges. From that I find that the total under non-voted comes to Rs. 275,000, of which Rs. 104,000 is to be spent in England: that is to say, the European retrenched personnel will get Rs. 104,000 as against

Rs. 1,71,000 for the Indians; which means that a larger number of Indian non-voted officers has been reduced. The spokesmen of Government have on more than one occasion stated that Indianisation will not be retarded as a result of retrenchment. But this is not all. Against the Rs. 1,04,000 required for European officers, the total amount required for Indian officers and clerks is Rs. 20,96,000. Honourable Members will thus observe that, against the insignificant number of European retrenched personnel, a large number of Indian officers, voted and non-voted, have been sent away, because it may be taken for granted that though the amount is Rs. 1,04,000 for Europeans, the scale of pay for them is so high that when we come to know the actual number of Europeans retrenched later on, the House will be in a position to judge whether the progress of Indianisation has been maintained.

Before I come to the details of these Demands, to show how far the Government have accepted the advice of the Retrenchment Committees, I would like to say something about the method by which retrenchment has been carried out. I understand that they have passed certain orders for retrenchment—and here I am speaking subject to correction: I understand in the first category come people who are incompetent or not quite up to the mark: secondly, officers who have put in more than 30 years' service: thirdly, officers who have put in more than 25 years' service, and then fourthly, officers who have put in less than 10 years' service. Now these classes are not mutually exclusive. That is to say, it is not as if when the first category is exhausted, you come to the second; and when the second category is exhausted, you come to the third, and so on. That is not the case. These are the four classes from which any one can be chosen for the purpose of retrenchment. I understand there has been a committee composed of two or three men of the department to select the persons to be retrenched, but in the committee the words of the senior officer always prevailed. What happens? I find from the Report of the Railway Enquiry Committee that they also found a similar state of affairs there. I quote from their report:

“Victimisation and favouritism can best be avoided by having a single clearly defined ground for discharge.”

If the Government lay down certain rules and say that of these few categories, first you will exhaust all the people who come under the first rule for retrenchment, then you go to the second; and after exhausting those, you go to the third; then alone justice may be expected, if the rules are strictly followed; but now Departments retrench any body they like who comes under any of the rules. What happens is this: anybody who is for the time being not in hot favour with the head of the department is found to be the most incompetent after a service of excellent work for 20 years or more. A man might have worked strenuously for a number of years and pleased his superiors; but if he now happens not to be pulling on well with a particular man, he is under this method found incompetent by the particular man and he is sacked. I say this gives room for much jobbery and corruption and it has happened.

The second category deals with people who have put in more than thirty years' service. I have collected some figures hurriedly from the history of the gazetted officers—a Government publication; and from that book I find that there are many people who have put in more than twenty five years' service and some over 30 years service and they are still happily

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

enjoying their posts, while people who have put in less than 10 years have been discharged. It is usual that people who have been for a long time in Government service know all these tricks, how to please the official heads; and so all these old men are retained; and though there is a rule that men with over 30 years' service should be pensioned off, that rule is not binding: under the present retrenchment rules such men need not be retrenched—their list need not be exhausted before they touch men with less than ten years' service. I also find it stated in one of the speeches of Sir George Schuster that by these indiscriminate discharges the pension liabilities of the Government will be highly increased and that he will look into the position. Now these old and superannuated people who are at the head, have a chance to influence the higher officials, and the junior officials who have put in only 7 or 8 years are being discharged. I will give the House some idea of what this means. I have taken at random some departments showing some of the men with their service:

Home Department.

	Years.
Rao Sahib K. P. Anantan	34
Mr. E. H. Brandon	28
Mr. M. J. Macdonald	28
Rai Sahib Tarapado Roy	30
Rai Bahadur Sohan Lal	31
Mr. U. C. Stuart	31
Rai Bahadur Munshi Devi Daya	33
Rai Bahadur Lala Bhagawan Das	36
Khan Bahadur Shaikh Hakim Siddiki	34
Munshi Khairat Nabi	26
Lala Nand Kishore	26
Mr. Ernest Long	28
Mr. J. C. McDermott	28
Khan Sahib Chaudhri Nimat Khan	28
Mr. F. B. Pool	28
Rai Bahadur P. C. Ray	25

Some of these might have gone on pension only this year, because I am quoting from the last edition of this book.

Foreign and Political Department.

	Years.
Lala Harichand	34
Rai Sahib Munshi Kishan Lal	35
Khan Bahadur P. S. Master	32
Khan Bahadur Sardar Mir Muhammad Khan	30
Mr. Aga Khan Sahib Mir Muhammad Shah	31
Rai Sahib Munshi Mahabir Pershad	32
Rai Sahib Lala Rama Nand	48
Rai Sahib Munshi Rash Behari Lal	32
George Alexander Richardson	37
James R. Rogers	36
Khan Bahadur Mirza Sher Muhammad Khan	36
Lala Sundar Das	33
Sardar Sahib Sardar Sundar Singh	33
Khan Sahib Zehoor Masih	34

THE GENERAL BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

Indian Stores Department.

	Years.
Mr. R. S. D'Arcy	29
Rai Bahadur J. P. Ganguly	32

Army Department.

Mr. S. Banerjea	29
Mr. H. P. Bates	31
Rai Bahadur J. C. Das Gupta	30
Mr. A. P. Dube	27
Mr. J. W. B. Gardiner	27
Rai Sahib Hari Das Ghose	27
Rai Sahib S. S. Ghose	29
Mr. W. G. Mcleod	33
Mr. R. A. Pereira	26
Mr. N. N. Sen	27
Mr. R. W. Simpson	26
Captain F. W. Spears	26
Mr. A. P. West	26

Legislative Department.

Mr. D. D. Baird	28
Rai Bahadur A. L. Banerjea	27
Mr. C. H. F. Pereira	29
Mr. F. A. Thorpe	30

Civil Veterinary Department.

Mr. G. P. Goff	25
Mr. Keiller	29
Khan Sahib Md. Wazir	28

Survey of India Department.

Col. H. J. Couchman	32
Mr. S. S. M. Fajlding	33
Mr. P. A. T. Kenny	33
Mr. H. P. Dee Morton	33
Mr. V. W. Morton	31
Mr. H. B. Simons	32

Commerce Department.

Mr. P. N. Bannerjee	26
Mr. E. R. Coutts	30
Mr. N. A. DaCosta	31

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

Bengal Covenanted Pilot Service.

	Years.
Mr. J. D. Allison	32
Mr. C. W. H. Ansell	29
Mr. E. G. Bacon	27
Mr. H. L. Lindsay	27
Mr. C. A. D. Greenland	29
Mr. D. I. Halford	26
Mr. F. Lungley	30
Mr. A. H. Mauger	30
Mr. H. J. May	29
Mr. A. W. Michie	38
Mr. C. T. Park	30
Mr. A. F. Paull	36
Mr. S. H. Reake	32
Mr. G. S. Scooby	26

Department of Industries and Labour.

Mr. Balkishen	28
Rai Sahib A. M. Bannerjee	32
Rai Bahadur S. K. Bannerjee	27
Mr. Barkat Rai	28
Rai Sahib Deepchand	25
Maulvi Feroz Din	28
Rai Sahib Gauri Shankar	25
Rai Sahib Nihal Chand	30
Mr. A. M. Price	25
Mr. Mami Ram Sharma	28

Indian School of Mines.

Mr. S. K. Bose	32
--------------------------	----

Printing and Stationery Department.

Mr. H. M. Bhattacharjee	27
Mr. S. C. Chunder	28
Mr. J. N. Ghose	27
Mr. R. A. Halfhide	27
Mr. Jawahir Khan	26
Mr. A. F. Slater	25

Meteorological Department.

Rao Bahadur M. G. Subramaniam	30
Rao Sahib M. V. Unakar	28

Public Works Department.

Mr. A. Brebner, C.I.E.	25
Mr. L. S. Spisbury	29
Mr. W. R. Mustoe	26
Mr. J. L. Sale	26
Rao Sahib Shyam Lal	29

I could not complete the list. I was going through it only this morning, but this list will show that there is a number of people who come directly, under either the first or the second category, and still they are not touched, while poor junior clerks who have put in less than 10 years have been discharged. My point is, if Government make any rules, why don't they follow those rules? You have laid down certain categories, why don't you select men according to those categories, because only when the list of men who come under the first category is exhausted, you should deal with men who come under the second category, and if such a method of selecting men for discharge is followed, there cannot be much room for injustice or hardship. As a matter of fact, as a general rule men with 25 and 30 years' service should first be selected for discharge; instead of that, you are selecting men with less than 10 years service, with the result that it will tell heavily on the pension liabilities of the country. The rule is all right, but favouritism and corruption prevail in some of the departments. That was the reason why my friend Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen moved a Resolution here. Unfortunately Members on this side are always absent, and so we cannot carry any motion, but that is no reason why the facts of the case should not be disclosed here or why Government should not do justice in this important matter. The Honourable the Finance Member should explain why, when in all other matters Government strictly try to follow their rules, in this matter they have departed from the rules they have made in regard to selecting men for discharge. If you make a rule, you should follow it without showing any partiality for this or that man.

Now, we know that in the Government of India whatever is done by any departmental head, holds good. If a case is initiated in a branch, it is sent up for approval, and thus the case goes to the head of the department and it comes back with his signature without any alterations, and then it is said that the decision is of the Government of India or that it is the deliberate and considered opinion of the Government. But what happens is, the departmental head who may in some cases be very fair-minded, cannot always be expected to do justice in many of these cases, because how can we presume that he will always do the just thing, that he will have no favouritism or no partiality for some people who are just near about him? What I say is, the rules that you make should be very rigidly enforced irrespective of any personal consideration.

Now, Sir, with your permission I shall deal with some of the items referred to in the summary of the results and show how the recommendations of these Committees have been given effect to. I shall take up the first Demand under the head Customs, because it is one of the big items which deal with 12 lakhs and odd rupees—Abolition of the entire system of overtime allowances for future entrants and the reduction of 50 per cent. in the case of those who are already in service, and 50 per cent. reduction in the payment of Seamen's and other welfare institutions. Here the Customs head deals with 12 lakhs of rupees, and I read from the General Purposes Committee's Report, page 81:

"The 1931-32 grant contemplates receipts of 12.35 lakhs by way of overtime fees realised from merchants and shippers and shipowners (6.52), penalty fees levied for work on Sundays and special holidays (4.73) and bond and other fees realised from merchants for work done during ordinary working hours (1.11). Out of this 12.35 lakhs the 1931-32 budget provides for the following payments, namely, (a) 5.47 lakhs to officers out of merchants' overtime fees (b) 3.39 to officers out of the penalty fees

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

including crown overtime (c) 1.34 plus .57 brought forward from 1930-31, i.e., 1.91 lakhs which is the amount available for grants out of penalty fees to seamen's and customs welfare institutions.

We have examined very carefully the theory and practice of the system of levying penalty fees and overtime charges. We have no doubt that shippers and shipowners find it convenient to pay these rather than let their cargoes remain uncleared. We therefore propose that the system of charging such fees should remain unaltered in essence. We consider this case to be somewhat analogical to the case of "late fees" and "double charges" in the Posts and Telegraph Department.

We are not, however, convinced that it is necessary to pay to customs officials the whole or even a large part of the fees so realised. A large proportion goes to preventive seamen, who, we consider, are already well paid. Their duties correspond to the duties of police officers and the men used at one time to be drawn, to some extent, from the police. The scales of pay are, in our opinion, extremely liberal when compared with those in force for the corresponding grades of provincial police services operating in the ports concerned."

We proposed that the whole of this 12 lakhs was due to the Government, and our main argument was that these customs officials are also, like other Government officials, whole-time Government servants and there was no justification for paying these people extra money for overtime work. But fortunately or unfortunately the Customs Department is manned by gentlemen belonging to my Honourable friend Sir Henry Gidney's community. Is that any reason why, in these days of financial stringency, these 12 lakhs should be kept for paying overtime allowances? The police, who are the greatest favourites of Government, are also required to work sometimes for 24 hours; similarly there are the Posts and Telegraphs people, who also serve Government for 24 hours, and these people are not paid anything by way of overtime allowance. So what justification is there for showing favouritism to these people in the Customs Department? It is not a question of a few thousands, but it is a question of some 12 lakhs and odd which should be appropriated by Government. But now Government have condescendingly accepted the 10 per cent. reduction in the rates of overtime fees paid to the staff and also a reduction in the Demand for the Grants in aid due to welfare institutions and so forth, but they only accepted about Rs. 97,000 out of a total sum of Rs. 5,88,000. Government have discharged people with very large families, getting small salaries, on the ground of financial stringency, but here in the Customs Department they are throwing away a precious 6 lakhs: while the Committee were of the opinion that the Government were entitled to the whole of these 12 lakhs.

Sir, there will be no time to dilate on this matter at great length, but I merely refer to it. In this Customs Department they have already reduced two Indian I. C. S. officers, and thus the future for
12 Noon. Indian I. C. S. officers to occupy the higher posts in the Customs Department will be barred for a long time.

The next item is "Taxes on Income". I do not like to say anything here because the Honourable the Finance Member has said that the Department requires extension due to lowering of the taxable limit to Rs. 1,000, so the question of reduction does not arise now.

As regards Salt, the Committee recommended the abolition of the post of the office of the Commissioner, Northern India Salt Revenue, Rs. 80,000. The Government say in their reply that this proposal has been negatived,

and they have given their reasons. I shall discuss the question so that the House may consider who is right. The Committee in their decision was helped by the evidence of Sir Chunilal Mehta, who was the President of the Salt Survey Committee. He was of opinion that, if the manufacturing divisions were in charge of fairly good men, the Commissioner's post and his office were not needed. The Committee further say, "We understand that the question of its abolition was at one time considered in the Finance Department. We definitely recommend that it should be abolished."

At page 5 of the Summary of the results of retrenchment operations you will find the reasons why it has been refused. The first ground of the Committee was that an important part of the Commissioner's duties can be transferred to the General Managers. The Government say:

"In view of the lower status and lack of administrative experience, the General Managers cannot be invested with the powers of the Commissioner."

Now, the Committee suggested that, instead of this Commissioner of Salt Revenue, a European I. C. S. officer getting very high pay, the two Managers should be entrusted with his work. What is the status of these Managers? The Managers get a pay of Rs. 1,100—1,400, *plus* overseas pay £30, which means Rs. 400, free house and electricity, in all about Rs. 2,000 per month. Therefore, the Managers get Rs. 2,000 as total emoluments. They are men of lower status and they lack administrative experience! Another ground on which the Government turn down the proposal is:

"The Commissioner has to maintain official relations by correspondence and in personal negotiations, with Indian States, Local Governments and Railway Administrations. These require an officer of a definitely superior position. . . ."

As if the I. C. S. are the only superior people who can hold any good post! As regards Native States, Government have their political officers in all the Native States, and the Managers can negotiate with the States through the political officers. Then, what is the difficulty in dealing with Local Governments and Railway Administrations? They are not mere clerks and Superintendents getting Rs. 400 or Rs. 600 pay.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Who are those Managers?

Mr. S. C. Mitra: They are all Europeans, they are not Indians. Again, the Government say:

"The Commissioner has to devote much time to interviewing merchants, etc., employed in the salt trade."

As if the Managers who are actually managing these big salt manufactures and getting such emoluments, are not in a position to deal with these merchants, and it requires men in the Secretariat to do the job! Then, they say:

"The problems of manufacture by solar evaporation are entirely different from those of mining, and also vary from source to source."

As if every I. C. S. Commissioner knows either of the two systems,—that is, the solar system of evaporation, or the other system, namely, mining! One could understand if the Commissioner was a person who knew all the different systems so that he would be in a better position to know which was which. That is the argument advanced when the post of a high European officer is concerned.

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

Let us come now to Opium. The Committee recommended the withdrawal of the concession of giving free medical attendance to the families of the officers at Ghazipur, and abolition of the allowance of Rs. 100 a month to the medical officer there. The Committee said:

"We see no justification for the continuance of the exceptional amenity which opium officers at Ghazipur enjoy (*viz.*, free medical attendance on their families) and which costs Government Rs. 100 per mensem by way of an allowance to a medical officer at Ghazipur. We recommend that it should be cut. Savings will be Rs. 1,200."

Then we recommended the abolition of the factory allowance of Rs. 250 to the Factory Superintendent and of Rs. 150 to the Assistant Factory Superintendent, if rent-free quarters are provided, but, if not, the amount of allowance to be reduced to 10 per cent. of pay. The Government's reply is "Under consideration as a general question". Again the Committee said that the question of the retention of personal allowance of Rs. 100 each to three officers for war service should be scrutinised. That is also not accepted, but no reasons are given.

Then, we come to Stamps. That was left to Mr. Nixon to visit the different places and suggest his own recommendations.

The next is Forests. Here the Committee suggested that the present Timber Testing Expert, who is drawing a pay of Rs. 2,000 per mensem, is expensive and his post should be retrenched. The reply is, that is under consideration. Whenever an European is concerned, that is "under consideration," but when an Indian is concerned, their consideration takes little time. Another of our suggestions was that one gazetted post in the Cabinet Making Section should be abolished.

There has been a mistake in this summary. What the Committee said was this:

"Seasoning and timber testing should be placed in charge of one officer. As an alternative, timber testing might be placed in charge of the Wood Technologist, who, it is understood, received special training in this class of work in America in 1929. Such an arrangement would be conducive to economy and work efficiently. The Inspector General's scheme proposes to retain the present Timber Testing Expert whose pay is Rs. 2,000 per mensem. This post is not now necessary and should be abolished."

That is the recommendation, but in this Summary—item No. 5—it has been wrongly put as Cabinet Making Section. That is not our suggestion. It is wrong there.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster (Finance Member): May I ask the Honourable Member to look at page 188 of the Report, item (vii), which reads as follows:

"What is generally known as the cabinet making section can and should be subjected to retrenchment more than the other sections. As contemplated in the Inspector General's scheme one gazetted post in this section should be abolished."

Mr. S. C. Mitra: That is quite correct, but what I complain about is that in page 10 of the Summary, it is wrongly put under item No. 5; it should be 7.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: We are not trying to follow the numbers in exact order.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Mr. Nixon will understand better that it is wrongly entered here. It will take more time for Sir George Schuster to understand the details. Really there is no reply as regards our proposals

regarding the Wood Technologist, the timber testing expert, whose pay is Rs. 2,000. Then I come to the Inspector General of Forests. We recommended unanimously that the post of this officer and his office should be abolished, the Government getting whatever help they required from the Chief Conservator of Forests, of the North-West Frontier Province. Government say that nothing should be done pending the inauguration of the new reforms. I know Forests is a provincial subject and in some places it is a transferred subject. If everything is to be postponed pending the inauguration of the reforms, then the question of retrenchment will suffer very much. Government have accepted the abolition of the I. F. S. College, and so the duty of the head of the College is now over and it is not necessary to have such a highly paid officer there for the purpose of any help that the Government of India may require. I do not like to deal with Irrigation and Posts and Telegraphs. Then I come to the house rent concession to the Honourable Members of Council in the matter of paying the full economic rent. The existing rate for each of these houses is Rs. 539 and Rupees 8 annas 4 for a tennis court. I think before we ask anybody else we must ask Honourable Members of the Executive Council to pay proper rents for their tennis courts. The next item is abolition of the post of President of the Council of State. This is also under consideration.

Then comes the question about the Secretariat and the exodus. Mr. Nixon takes trouble to show that it will be very difficult in this summer in Delhi to provide for 2,000 men extra. The result of the inquiry indicates that it might be possible to leave in New Delhi staff to the extent of 17 officers, 255 clerks and 114 inferior servants, and the estimated saving here would be 1½ lakhs out of a total cost of 9½ lakhs. Now, the population of old Delhi is 4½ lakhs and of New Delhi during the winter months is 66,000 but in summer it comes to 56,000, that is 10,000 people less. Then it is argued that in summer people to the extent of 5,000 come to occupy the vacant places in New Delhi. Now there is a Joint Water Board. The argument of the Government of India is that there is enough water for 4½ lakhs of old Delhi and 60,000 people here, but not enough for 2,000 people more and that if these are kept here there will be great scarcity. Why did not they anticipate this when they spent crores and crores on New Delhi? When the Government of India was transferred from Calcutta to Delhi, it was said that the Government would be out of touch with the Indian people, but the Government said that Delhi will become a great city and they will not be out of touch. Now my point is that when the Government of India spent 18 crores on the New Delhi city, they could not make provision for water for 2,000 people more. They say that another 12 lakhs of rupees is necessary to provide for the necessary additional water supply for this additional 2,000 men and they expect us to swallow all these stories. Why could not they anticipate that there will be this scarcity? What is the P. W. D. for? They have a hierarchy of officials, from the Honourable Member and the Superintending Engineer downwards, and so many Engineers, and they could not anticipate this small thing, and they now expect us to be convinced on these flimsy grounds.

Then there is the Secretariat re-arrangement. This subject will be taken up by some other Member, and so I do not like to deal with it, but without divulging any secret, I may say that we had a sub-committee, of which Mr. Nixon himself was a member, and we discussed the question of devising some method by which this process of sending notes from one

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

officer to another, from the clerk to the assistant, from the assistant to the Superintendent and Assistant Secretary, from the Assistant Secretary to the Under Secretary and from the Under Secretary to the Joint Secretary, and so on, could be curtailed and we even suggested our own scheme, but the Government did nothing. Apparently the Government, when they brought in the Supplementary Finance Bill, thought that they would get enough money by taxation and no more retrenchment was necessary. And then I do not know whether it was by chance or otherwise, beneficial departments and scientific departments like Archæological Survey, Geological Survey, Civil Aviation, Agricultural Research and things like these came up first for immediate retrenchment. Afterwards the Finance Department did not seem so anxious about retrenchment. The Honourable the Finance Member himself says that next year there will be a surplus of 5 crores or 2½ crores at least. That may be the reason for the Finance Member saying that they have accepted up to 65 per cent. of our recommendations and even then, as I shall show later, this percentage is misleading. We recommended that the educational and medical institutes and the grants to scientific research institutes should not be interfered with, but, going beyond our recommendations, they have not spared any of these institutions.

As regards the Secretariat reorganisation, they say :

“As regards the first question, the Sub-Committee's recommendation admittedly relates to a standard which will be suitable under normal conditions of Secretariat.”

I do not know, Sir, what is the abnormality in the conditions now.

Then under the Foreign and Political Department, the Committee suggested that there should not be two Secretariats, because the Department is really one; and I think Sir Charles Watson himself agreed that really the Department is one. There is no clear-cut division in the Departments. Then, I ask, why cannot there be two Deputy Secretaries and one Secretary who can be responsible for the work of the whole Department. Then they accepted the cut about pay of officer on special duty. That of course was only temporary, so it was automatically abolished. The permanent post of Attache filled by an Indian was, however, very easily abolished in pursuance of our recommendation.

Then under Home Department, we suggested the abolition of the post of Joint Secretary, but they say that it is not possible to abolish the post of Joint Secretary as the present conditions render its retention very necessary.

Then we come to the Public Service Commission. The Committee recommended the reduction of the number of Members from five to three and the reduction of the status of the post of Secretary to that of Assistant Secretary and the reduction of the special pay of Rs. 200 for the incumbent recruited from an all-India service. As regards the first question of the reduction of the number and pay of officers, that is still under consideration. Now the Committee knew at the time that a gentleman in the Police Service, who had earned his full pension, was going to be appointed, and so they hurried to make their recommendation that five men are not necessary and they examined the President of the Public Service Commission, who told us that there is not work even for three, and that he personally was of opinion that even one could do the work. Now as a matter of fact in some of the Dominions, the Public

Service Commission work is done by one man. Yet the Government say, "This is under consideration". In the meantime they fill up every vacancy! And they say "No, it will not be possible to retrench these people". But I think, Sir, as regards the pensioned officer, it should be possible that a man who is enjoying his pension may be asked to retire if Government find it necessary even now.

Then under Legislative Department, the organisation of the Solicitor's Branch is stated to be as follows:

"This Branch is manned by three officers—a Solicitor on Rs. 3,000, a second Solicitor on Rs. 1,200—1,800 *plus* overseas pay, an Assistant Solicitor on Rs. 1,200. The present Solicitor also gets a personal pay of Rs. 350, a special pay of Rs. 250 for work connected with the Local Clearing Office. The Solicitor is due to vacate his office in March 1932. This establishment consists of 2 clerks and half a dozen men."

The recommendation regarding retrenching one of the Solicitors has not been accepted.

Then there was a recommendation for a 10 per cent. reduction under Contingencies, but there is not a word said about it. I think my Honourable friend, Sir Lancelot Graham, who is in charge of the Department, is evidently too strong for any retrenchment officer. (Laughter.)

Then coming to the Department of Education, Health and Lands, here we suggested the abolition of the posts of Joint Secretary, Additional Deputy Secretary and Officer on Special Duty, but they have accepted for the present one recommendation, namely, that the post of the Under Secretary (which is filled by a Muhammadan gentleman, Mr. Akhtar Hussain) should be retrenched, and they say that the question of the strength of officers will be further examined.

Then we come to the question of the great Finance Department itself. (Hear, hear.) They agreed to abolish the post of Assistant Secretary, but now want mere conversion. They themselves suggested this. "The Department's final offer consists of the following items:

"Abolition of the following posts, namely, Assistant Secretary and six Assistants, and seven posts in the Second Division."

That was the offer of the Department. Now that there is sufficient money—perhaps that is the reason—they say, "Let the Assistant Secretary go, but let there be a conversion of the post into that of a Chief Superintendentship". As regards the offer of the abolition of 6 Assistants, the abolition of only one Assistant will do; and no further reduction is possible". Sir, if that is the ideal that the Finance Department itself holds up for other Departments to copy, we can easily understand the fate of "retrenchment". I hope the Government will explain as to why their own offer of retrenchment in the Finance Department has not been acted upon. (*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney*: "Hear, hear.")

As regards the Commerce Department, if anybody refers to page 167 of the Detailed Estimates for Grants, he will find in respect of retrenchment that there are three items,—additional permanent staff Rs. 48,000, temporary establishment Rs. 3,000, staff for registration of accounts Rs. 3,000". Actually, all this is increment.

As regards the Central Board of Revenue, there was a recommendation for the reduction of one Member of the Board. The Government's reply is that both the customs and the income-tax work of the Board involve the disposal of a large number of complicated and technical cases. As

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

a matter of fact, though the present incumbents are one from the income-tax side and the other from the customs side, what will immediately follow? For a time Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Hardy, both from the customs side, were the Members at that time and there was no difficulty then in discussing questions concerning these highly technical problems coming up.

Then under Ports and Pilotage, we suggested the abolition of the post of Nautical Officer saving Rs. 60,000. They show as if they have accepted the reduction to Rs. 14,500, but really it means that a junior man has come on a lower salary on transfer; so they take credit for that. But they have been prompt in abolishing one post occupied by an Indian, a Parsi gentleman, in the Shipping Office, Bombay. So even a Parsi is not spared.

As regards the Survey of India, here we suggested that the people that are from the Royal Engineering side of the Military Department should be paid from the military funds and that should not be borne on the civil estimates. As a matter of fact, that recommendation has not been accepted. Government have considered various schemes of retrenchment and now they have adopted a way, but here the figures are also misleading. So far as I know, in Class I there were 50 officers. Out of these, 19 posts were not filled up, but kept in abeyance for a long time, and only one man has been retrenched, but as a matter of fact it has been shown that the posts not filled up of these 19 men are all shown to have been retrenched. Even then, 4 men with 30 years' service were retained and they were promoted to Class I, and 5 men—3 Hindus and 2 Muslims—were promptly retrenched, but not a single Anglo-Indian in the service was retrenched. Even Anglo-Indian probationers have been retained. (*Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney*: "Which Department?") Survey of India Department.

As regards Botanical Survey, we suggested that the post of the Director be abolished and in the first summary of the retrenchment we found that this suggestion was tentatively accepted by Government. But now we find that because he is a European and draws a special pay, only his pay has been reduced by Rs. 100 and his allowance of Rs. 50 has been altered perhaps after his return from England, but his service has been maintained.

Sir Frank Noyce (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member, but may I point out that the Directorship of the Botanical Survey is a part-time appointment. The sole allowance attaching to it as salary which is paid from the Government of India revenues amounts to Rs. 300 a month only.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: That is quite true. He is part-time servant, but the gentleman is in the service of the Government of Bengal. His duty is to supervise the cultivation of cinchona in Burma. There is another gentleman, Mr. Russell, who is a highly paid officer and he does not require a man from Calcutta to supervise his work and there is further some little plantation in Madras. We have gone through all these questions and the General Purposes Sub-Committee said that there was no necessity for the Government of India to pay this gentleman Rs. 400 and the Government of India in the Department of Education, Health and Lands accepted that suggestion tentatively. If a reference is required, I will read from the first Report; Botanical Survey, first Summary (page 15):

“The post of the Director be abolished”. Now they have refused to do so because the gentleman has come back from England and has brought some pressure to bear on the Government of India.

Then I come to the Archæological Department. I think there are other Honourable Members who will argue out the case. The Committee suggested the discontinuance of the special duty allowance of Sir John Marshall. I do not like now to discuss in detail the principle of giving allowances to officials who are kept in service for 28 years and then employed for 8 years more on special duty with extra emoluments and full pension. They do not allow other scientific researchers to come into the field and utilise the archæological funds for historical researches for the benefit of the country. When they are pensioned off Government recommend the extension of their service to write out the reports which takes several years. Sir, this practice is wrong in principle from all considerations.

Then, as regards Demand 56, Education. Here there was no recommendation from the Committee, but I find an additional fourth item of cut has been introduced which amounts to Rs. 67,000.

Then I come to the question of Medical and Public Health. Here the Committee suggested the abolition of the appointments of the Director General, Indian Medical Service and the Public Health Commissioner. The reply in this connection is that this recommendation raises an issue which Government have more carefully considered. They have considered both the Committee's plan and earlier recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee for the amalgamation of the two posts of the Director General, Indian Medical Service and the Public Health Commissioner. I think, Sir, they want to wait for the new constitution. It seems that the Government have a sort of premonition that the future constitution will be a very sickly one and it will require expert medical men and some nursing as well. That is the reason why everything is postponed in this Department for the future.

Then I come to Agriculture and the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. We suggested that there was no necessity for this duplication of work. They said that the main ground why the agricultural side of the Secretariat could not be reduced was that there were some European experts in the Pusa College who were not expected to be put under the control of the Agricultural Council. We see no reason why these two departments should work separately and not be amalgamated, thereby saving a large sum of money, the departmental side of Agriculture being replaced by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.

As regards Aviation we find that the Direction cost is Rs. 2,55,000 instead of Rs. 1,26,000. Even in the last Budget it was Rs. 2,27,000. So, in spite of recommendations for retrenchment, it has gone up. Further down they say that the services of a new Aircraft Inspector will be necessary as it is impossible for one man to inspect all the aircraft in India. I do not know how many aircraft we have in India and why it is impossible for one man to inspect all the aircraft once a year.

Then comes Commercial Intelligence, Demand No. 64. Here we suggested the abolition of the I. C. S. post of the Deputy Director General and some other posts. This suggestion was not accepted. Then we suggested the reduction of the establishment by 10 per cent. and the cancellation of certain schemes. We suggested a reduction of Rs. 2,56,000, out of which

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

Rs. 2,26,000 is required for the internal statistics scheme. The Committee suggested that it should be temporarily suspended because it is a very useful institution and should be revived as soon as possible. Sir, in all these matters Government are very keen and they even went beyond the recommendations of the Committee and accepted a cut to the extent of Rs. 2,30,000, which covered the whole statistical scheme and only Rs. 4,000 out of Rs. 26,000 recommended by the Committee.

Then, I come to the Indian Stores Department. In this connection I wish to read out from the Report of the Inchcape Committee itself (page 216):

"We are informed that this Department has been recently constituted in order to encourage the development of the industrial resources of India and to effect economies by co-ordinating purchases for the Central and Provincial Governments, thus eliminating competition between Governments and Departments. At present its activities are confined to the purchase of textiles for the Army Department and to the control of the Metallurgical Inspectorate and of the Superintendent, Local Manufactures and Government Test House, Alipore. We understand, however, that it is contemplated gradually to extend the work."

Finally, they say:

"A system of central purchase may have theoretical advantages, but we recommend that no provision be made for further expansion of the department until it has been ascertained that the provinces collectively are prepared to utilise it for their transactions and that such expansion will be financially justified. The present establishment has been framed with a view to the expansion of the department's activities and is now costing about Rs. 4,00,000 annually. We recommend that the provision be reduced to Rs. 3,00,000, saving Rs. 83,000."

Sir, it is clear from this Report that the department was contemplated to continue if all the Local Governments supported it and the purchases were available from the Army and other departments. As a matter of fact I find from the latest report of the Indian Stores Department that it ran at a loss in 1927-28 of Rs. 5,76,000; in 1928-29 of Rs. 10,61,000; in 1929-30 of Rs. 6,85,000 and in 1930-31 of Rs. 96,24,000. So, it has been all along run as a deficit department costing about 8 or 9 lakhs of rupees annually. It was urged all along that it should be either self-supporting or it should show that its activities help a great deal in encouraging indigenous industry. It has done neither. I think the difficulty is that the superior staff is all manned by Europeans. It is not to their interest to see that the indigenous products are encouraged. I give the figures in this Department:

	Rs.		
Salaries above . . .	3,000	No Indians	1 European.
Salaries above . . .	2,500	No Indians	3 Europeans.
Salaries above . . .	2,000	No Indians	3 Europeans.
Salaries above . . .	1,750	No Indians	9 Europeans.
Salaries above . . .	1,500	1 Indian	9 Europeans.
Salaries above . . .	1,200	6 Indians	15 Europeans.
Salaries above . . .	1,000	7 Indians	16 Europeans.

The salary of Europeans drawing more than Rs. 500 a month is four lakhs annually. That shows why this department has not developed in the way for which it was inaugurated. It has failed to justify its existence either by encouraging indigenous industries or by making the department itself self-supporting and purchasing stores for the Government of India at a cheaper rate.

Under Demand No. 76-Allowances, reduction in lump sum payments to Reuters, Rs. 10,000. This matter is still under consideration. I do not know why it requires so much time to curtail this subsidy to Reuters by Rs. 10,000. There was a recommendation about Committees and Commissions and we suggested that the amount should be reduced by Rs. 10 a day and I think there is no mention about it in this report.

As regards the Local Clearing Office, here is a department where a special pay of Rs. 250 is paid. It is 14 years since the War came to an end, and still the enemies' debts are being paid and the staff is necessary.

In the North-West Frontier Province, Demand No. 78, we find under the Medical head there is a reduction of Rs. 1,64,000, though we recommended only a sum of Rs. 4,000 to be reduced.

In Baluchistan for education we suggested no reduction, but I find Rs. 71,000 has been reduced from this grant according to page 84 of the Summary.

In Delhi under education we suggested a reduction of Rs. 2,000 only, but it has been accepted as Rs. 1,12,200.

Item No. 19, Public Health, is still under consideration.

In Ajmer-Merwara the same thing happens. We did not recommend any reduction, but under education a sum of Rs. 64,000 has been reduced and under Medical, Rs. 23,000.

Sir, I have taken too much of the time of the House, and I feel myself that the discussion had been discursive to a great extent, because I have had to do spade work. But I expect that the main points dealt with by me will be discussed by other Honourable Members. I have not dealt with the Military Budget or the Postal Budget at all and I think my other Honourable friends will discuss retrenchment on these questions.

Mr. President: Motion moved:

“That the Demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced by Rs. 100”.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, out of the six Committees that discussed the question of retrenchment, the work of the Railway Sub-Committee and the Army Sub-Committee had been of a perfunctory character. Their reports remind me of the story of an Oxford freshman who was given £100 by his father and was asked to submit an account. At the end of the term the new undergraduate submitted the following account—new collar, one shilling; one tie, one shilling six pence; miscellaneous, £99-17-6. This is practically what the Railway Sub-Committee and the Army Sub-Committee have done. Out of 52 crores annual expenditure, which is really incurred by the railways, the Railway Retrenchment Committee only scrutinised the expenditure like Oxford undergraduate of under two crores, and about the remaining 50 crores they only put down that the expenditure should be scrutinised by some other Committee. Practically the same was done by the Army Sub-Committee. It only examined a very small proportion of the expenditure, I think 7 crores altogether, and it left the balance to be scrutinised by some one else. I think it was a little wiser than the Railway Sub-Committee in that it did not bring itself into non-existence, but it still exists though it may not be functioning. I do not know whether it will finish its work before the life of the Members of that Committee ceases to exist as far as this Assembly is concerned. I do not want to take up the railway question today in detail because that has already been discussed. But, in view of

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

the fact that this contributes a large sum of money, about 8 crores every year, to the general revenue, especially in view of the fact that the report of the Court of Inquiry did not come into our hands at the time when we discussed the Railway Budget I want to touch upon one or two salient features now. The other day the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour, when asked about giving us an opportunity to discuss this report, clearly said that he was not willing to give time for that purpose. I thought that the reply was rather impolite to Honourable Members of this Assembly, but I find now that the Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore was perfectly right, because there are no points in this report to discuss for any length of time. The Railway Board issued certain definite instructions, and the really crucial problem is this. Is there any machinery by means of which they can find out whether their instructions have been carried out, and if not whether they have got machinery to see how they can be enforced? This is really the crucial point in the whole of the retrenchment enquiry as far as the railways are concerned. This particular point, which I thought they would deal with, was never touched upon by this Court of Inquiry, and if the Railway Board could only solve this particular problem most of their difficulties would disappear. The only recommendation, which the Court of Inquiry made, was that only one principle should be applied in the case of retrenchment, and that principle should be that those persons who have got less service ought to be retrenched irrespective of the question of efficiency, less efficiency and irrespective of any other consideration. If this principle is applied—I am sorry that the Court of Inquiry never went into the figures—what would be the result of this? We all know that Indians entered into the railway service in larger number only after the Convention of 1924, and the Muhammadans joined still later, and the result of their recommendations will be that Indians in general and the Muslims in particular will all be retrenched from the railway services if the principle enunciated by the Court of Inquiry is accepted by the Government. While making this recommendation, it was their duty to have considered the figures and show how the communal inequalities would work out if the recommendations were given effect to. But they were easy going people and adopted an easy method. This question of least service is very easy to calculate and very easy to apply. What would be the result, they never took the trouble to find out. They wasted time and money in considering individual grievances and then gave it up as a hopeless case and asked the Government to appoint some other Committee to go through such grievances.

Now, Sir, coming to the military, which is really the subject-matter of my discussion, I first mention at the outset three points. The first is one to which I have drawn attention repeatedly, that the question of the strategic lines ought to be settled once for all. We know that we spend about 2 crores on the strategic lines, and this amount should either be absorbed in the losses of the railways, or it should be shown in the General Budget as income received from the railways, and afterwards handed over to the military. This method of invisible budget of the military, as I called it, is bad accountancy. It is against all principles of accountancy, and I think it ought to be shown very clearly in the General Budget. Sir, we should adopt either of the two methods. Either it should be shown as a definite loss of the railways, who should be responsible for it, or it should be accepted as a loss to the general revenues and should be debited in the accounts of the military.

The second point to which I wish to draw attention, though attention has been drawn to it repeatedly by the different Retrenchment Committees, is about the Lee concessions. Now the Lee concessions were very rightly given in 1924-25 when the index of prices was very high. The cost of living had gone up very much after the war and some relief was absolutely necessary. The price index in 1924 rose to about 176, but we should now realise that these high prices of 1924 are not in existence in 1932. The price index has fallen as low as 96, *i.e.*, it has fallen by about 45 per cent. When the cost of living has fallen by about 45 per cent. from 1925 onwards, it is legitimate to consider whether the concession that we allowed on account of high prices in 1924-25 should still be continued in 1932 and whether it should not be temporarily withdrawn, to be given back when the index price rises again to the level of 175, as it did in 1924.

The third point is that every Retrenchment Committee recommended that the cuts should be gradual. But contrary to the recommendations of all the Sub-Committees the Government adopted a uniform cut of 10 per cent. I think it is rather unfair to treat everybody in the same way. Those who get a higher salary can really sacrifice a little more than those who earn just enough to make two ends meet. Therefore the principle of a graduated cut should have been adopted by the Government of India. It is a principle which the whole country demanded, which every Retrenchment Committee recommended, and which really has the general support of the Assembly; and in the teeth of opposition from everybody, Government adopted a uniform cut of 10 per cent.

Sir, coming now to the Budget of the military, I find that the Budget in the year 1913-14 was 29·84 crores. Then it rose up during and after the war to 67·75 crores. This abnormal expenditure and the losses in the revenue led to the appointment of the Inchcape Committee. It attributed the rise of the military expenditure to five causes. The first was the rise in prices. I have already said that it does not hold true now because the prices, instead of rising, have actually fallen below the level of 1913-14. The second ground was the enhanced pay granted to all ranks. This is really a consequential effect of the first and I think it does not hold true now. The third is the improvement in the comforts of the troops, large expenditure on houses and various other things. Now, with regard to that, I think we should try to give as much comfort to our troops as we possibly can, but it should be done within our means, and we should not go beyond that. Their fourth ground was the increase in the non-effective charges. Here we find that it increased from 5 to 9 crores, but of course by reducing the non-effective charges, we do not increase the efficiency of the Army. I am really very strongly in favour of keeping up the efficiency of the Army, but I am equally strongly of opinion that we ought to reduce those charges which do not make for the efficiency of the Army. Their fifth reason, and the only cogent reason, was the improvement in the equipment and standard of training. Any expenditure under this head is justified and legitimate and would have general support, but any expenditure under the first four heads is not justified, and I think I will examine these points in detail. Before I examine them, I should like to give some quotations from the report of the Inchcape Committee which are as cogent and relevant today as they were eight years ago. They said about military expenditure:

"In our opinion the repeated huge deficits of the last few years, in spite of the imposition of heavy new taxation, have made it abundantly clear that India cannot afford this expenditure.

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

So long as peace conditions obtain, the first essential is for India to balance her budget, and this can only be secured by a very substantial reduction in the military estimates."

That is to say, the *only* way to balance the Budget is to reduce the military expenditure. That is not my opinion, it is not the opinion of the Assembly or of the Retrenchment Committee; it is the opinion of the Incheape Committee, who knew their business and who were as strong supporters of the Army policy as any Englishman can be. Then again they said:

"We recommend that a close watch be kept on the details of military expenditure with the object of bringing about a progressive reduction in the future."

And then later on they said:

"Though revenue may increase through a revival of trade, there would, we think, still be no justification for not keeping a strict eye on military expenditure with a view to its further reduction."

They recommended reduction even if the revenue increased, but we find that the revenue, instead of increasing, has diminished. We know very well that during the last seven years we increased taxation on import duties by 22 crores, but the net result has been a definite loss of 75 lakhs. Therefore we have really reached the limit of taxation, beyond which we cannot go, and the only way by which the Budget can be balanced is to follow the recommendations of the Incheape Committee and apply the principle of reduction to the principal item which they mentioned, namely, the military. And unless we reduce the military expenditure, it is absolutely impossible for India to balance the Budget by any other means.

Now, Sir, I just briefly want to mention a few items in which the reduction can be made without loss of the efficiency of the Army. First I take up the non-effective charges. In the year 1913-14 the non-effective charges were 5 crores; in 1922-23 when the Incheape Committee met they rose to 9 crores and in the present year's Budget we find that they are 7.62 crores. Therefore there is no reason why this expenditure should not be brought to the level of 1914; and there can be a saving of 2½ crores under this item. The reduction of non-effective charges does not mean the inefficiency of the Army and there is no reason why we should not apply this reduction immediately.

The second item which we can take up for reduction is what I call military works and military engineering. Under this heading in 1913-14 they spent 1.3 crores. In the year 1922-23 the expenditure rose to 4.54, and before the Incheape Committee, the military authorities recommended an expenditure of 33 crores in future, which the Government of India reduced to 9.3 crores. Here in the new estimates now before us, they have provided 4.65 crores. There is no reason why we cannot reduce this expenditure further; This can also be reduced by 2 crores of rupees. Before the war the estimate was 1.3 and now it is 4.65. I only demand a reduction of about 2 crores of rupees, and even then the expenditure will be double of what it was in 1913-14.

The next point where reduction is possible is to reduce the number of men in each regiment. This particular question was discussed by the Incheape Committee and I also pointed out last year in connection with

the Army cut that it is still possible to reduce the number in each regiment according to the recommendations of the Inchcape Committee. What I said was that the Inchcape Committee suggested that during the war time the number should be 766 in each regiment and during peace time the number should be further reduced by 20 per cent. If we apply this principle, then

1 P.M. there is still great room for economy. Sir, we do not want to reduce the efficiency of the Army, but at the same time we do desire that it should be kept in peace time at a level like the one which the Inchcape Committee recommended.

The next phase of retrenchment which I press is the question of the Indianisation of services. I am not pressing it from the point of view of policy, or from the point of view of getting all the services for Indians, but merely in connection with economy. This point of view we will discuss tomorrow. We know that the cost of an English soldier is about five times the cost of the Indian soldier. At present we have got 60,000 English troops, excluding officers; and the number of Indian troops is 249,739 altogether. If we begin Indianisation of the troops and the Indianisation of the officers, then it is quite possible to have substantial reductions in expenditure; and for each English soldier replaced by an Indian, the expenditure will be reduced by about four-fifths. Of course I do not advocate here that we should reduce the English Army or the English officers at once. I think their maintenance is absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the Army; but at the same time we should lay down certain principles by means of which Indianisation may proceed, not only in the rank and file but also in all classes of the officers' grades. If the principles are adopted, then it will be possible that we shall have a substantial reduction, under this heading alone, of, say, about 5 to 10 crores after some years. Of course it is difficult for me to fix a date, but I do strongly advocate, as a measure of retrenchment, that we should adopt some kind of policy of Indianisation of services, both in the officers' grade and in the rank and file, so that our expenditure may gradually be reduced.

It was pointed out by the Finance Member in his speech, I think last year, that there are two ways of reducing the Army expenditure; one is a change of policy and the other by economising expenditure. Unless we have a change of policy, he said, we cannot have a substantial saving. I entirely agree with him, and I think our Retrenchment Committee ought to examine very carefully whether we do require so large an army as we are maintaining at present. I understand that there are three functions which our army has to perform; one is for Imperial defence, that is, to meet the attack from any outside power; the second is really to keep peace on our Frontier, that is, to save the people from attack of the frontier tribes and adjoining power; and the third is internal peace. We ought to reckon the minimum size of the army which we require for each of these purposes, and after determining these things we should determine how large an army we are required to maintain.

As regards the question of imperial defence, this question will have to be worked out in conjunction with the Imperial Defence Council or the War Office, and India should contribute her quota for Imperial defence. India alone should not be considered as a training ground for the Imperial forces. No doubt if the British Government decide to choose India as the training ground for the Empire forces, then England should pay for the training; we can only contribute our quota for the general defence, and

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

this ought to be settled once for all. For the purpose of general defence it should be decided how large an army India is to maintain in a state of efficiency not inferior to the efficiency of the army in any other country. The second question is about the army for our frontier. At present, one-third of our army is located on the other side of the Indus; while the remaining two-thirds are distributed over the rest of India. The question is whether we require such a large army to maintain order and peace among these trans-border tribes. This really depends upon the policy which we adopt about the North-West defence. This was pointed out by the Incheape Committee, and I shall quote what they say :

“We are informed that there is no idea in the mind of the Government of India of continuing a forward policy of military domination up to the Durand Line at the present time—that the idea has been abandoned.”

I do not know whether the Committee was correct and whether the idea of the forward policy has been abandoned, but at any rate it is very desirable that we should define what the border line is, whether the border line of India is the border of the settled districts or whether the border line is the Durand Line; and after settling this problem, we should determine the amount of military strength which is required to keep order in that part of India. The whole population of the trans-border tribes is something like 25 lakhs, out of which there cannot be on active service at any time more than 8 lakhs of people. In order to keep 8 lakhs of people in order, is it necessary for us to maintain an army of about 1 lakh—that is one soldier for every eight persons to keep them in order? I personally believe that on account of the development in our air force and partial development of civilisation it is not necessary to maintain such a large army today as was perhaps necessary about 8 years ago, and this question should be considered by experts and we should keep just as small an army as may be necessary.

While I therefore advocate strongly that we should settle once for all the exact size of the army which is necessary for peace time, we should also gradually try to Indianise the army in the interests of economy and we should also encourage more and more the auxiliary and territorial forces, on whom we could fall back in time of war as a second and third line of defence, as these are not very expensive things, and as at a time of strain we can always have these soldiers ready for active service.

There are one or two small points to which I would like to draw attention. One is the capitation tax. This question has been raised year after year by the Assembly. The expenditure amounts to 186 lakhs and we have been pressing year after year that this amount is too much and should be settled; but no efforts have yet been made to settle it. I thought this was the legitimate duty of our Retrenchment Committee to take up this particular question and to press for its settlement.

Another question which requires to be considered is the question of transport. The Welby Commission recommended that as a measure justifiable in the circumstances half the cost of transport of troops to and from India should be defrayed by the Imperial Government. This was their recommendation, and I think it ought to be the duty of the Retrenchment Committee to see that this recommendation is enforced.

If all the measures of economy I have mentioned are carried out, I am perfectly confident that our Budget will be reduced by at least 15 crores, and we will come down to what it was before the war, that is, about 30 crores; and unless we reduce our Military Budget to this amount, no amount of taxation and no other measures will balance our Budget. No doubt general administration is an expensive item and we can retrench the expenditure thereon by about 3 crores; but this forms a very small part of the entire expenditure; as Mr. Aggarwal pointed out last time our military expenditure is about 67 per cent. of the total expenditure, that is about two-thirds of the whole, and therefore we should apply our axe particularly to an item which involves the major portion of the expenditure.

Then, Sir, the last thing that I should like to mention is about the policy of an Indian Navy. We have provided 67 lakhs for the Indian Navy. I think either we should have a navy of our own or we should not have a navy. If we really want an Indian navy, then we should seriously take up the question and establish a navy of our own, otherwise we should, as part of the British Empire, depend upon the British Navy and make only a contribution as our quota for the defence of the Empire.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Twenty minutes Past Two of the Clock.

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

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): When discussing the Railway Budget, I stated that the Honourable the Railway Member was only tinkering with retrenchment in the railways. If I am asked to give my opinion about the retrenchment policy in the civil administration and the Army side, I will say that the Government of India have only scratched the surface regarding retrenchment. They have not gone deeply into the matter, and if they do not go deeply into the matter, they will have to go on mounting up taxation in subsequent Budgets, and they will never be able to grapple with the situation. As a member of one of the Retrenchment Committees, I am grateful to the Honourable the Finance Member for the bouquet he offered to the members of these Committees for the help that they had rendered. (*An Honourable Member*: "But was it sincere?") But I do think that the Committees would have been able to assist him further had they been allowed the liberty to do so. We have heard from our revered leader, Sir Abdur Rahim, that the recommendations of his Committee have not been given effect to. and my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, was himself a member of the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee, who, like all scholars and professors, does not mind lashing himself and inflicting upon himself wounds like Jesuit monks as long as it helps to clarify the issue—of course, I differ from my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, as I differed from him while he spoke on the Railway Budget, and I do not know why he did not take that opportunity to examine the administration of the various railways. But in the matter of general retrenchment my

[Mr. B. Das.]

Honourable friend, Sir Abdur Rahim, has made it clear that they have pointed out various items of retrenchment which the Government have not yet considered. And they cannot consider them because there are many obstacles in their way. I know that the Members who sit in the front Benches opposite are very loyal to their colleagues and to the officials who work under them. But loyalty to one's colleagues and one's officials is one thing, and loyalty to one's country is another. What does the country's interest require? Does it require the heavy expenditure that is at present incurred? As my Honourable friend the Finance Member said in his Budget speech while we were discussing the Indian Finance Supplementary and Extending Bill, the Government of India pay Rs. 120 crores in pay bills to the Army, and the civil, including the railways and the Provincial Governments. If I take off Rs. 16 crores, which is the salary bill of the railways, it comes to Rs. 104 crores, which is the pay bill of the Central Government and the Provincial Governments, out of a revenue of Rs. 200 crores,—it may be a little less than Rs. 200 crores at present. It is an enormous expenditure, and what is the reason of these heavy pay bills? Accident and circumstances brought the English to rule over India. Then the English civil servants were given high salaries. They were never content to get themselves those salaries, but they created services, and they went on paying even to the Indians similar salaries. They themselves did little work and allowed the work to be done by the Indian provincial civil servants in the provinces and also in the centre. The time has come when we are on the eve of great constitutional changes, and we shall have to revise the basis of salaries of all services, whether Imperial or provincial. Every post should carry a basic salary, and if an European is recruited from abroad, he may be given an allowance. The Indian and the European will get the same scale of salary. Five or six years ago I was opposed to that, because it brought an inferiority complex to the Indian recruit, but at present when we expect to get greater control—it may not be full control in the centre, but full control in the provinces (*An Honourable Member*: “Why not in the centre?”) and adequate control in the centre, the time has come when the salaries should be on an Indian basis. Let the European draw even Rs. 500 or Rs. 1,000 extra allowance per mensem, but this idea of paying the Indian officers and the Indian staff in the Secretariat such high salaries is beyond the compass of the Indian taxpayer. The salary should be based as it is based in Japan and in England. Do the civil servants in England get such high salaries? Do the clerks and office assistants get such high salaries? Nowhere else in the world, as my Honourable friend Mr. Mitra points out, does anybody get such high salaries. But here the civil service went on blindly groping in the darkness, they went on raising their own salaries, demanding overseas pay, and demanding Lee concessions, and at the same time they wanted to be faithful and loyal to their Indian colleagues in the services and they went on raising their salaries also. So, the time has come when we must revise the basic salary of all posts. If that is not done, mere touching the surface of retrenchment will not do any good. The spirit should be Indian. At present the administrative plant that has been transplanted into India is a hothouse plant. It is kept in the hothouse, it does not grow. The official Members of Government must forget everything else before the interest of the country. I do not suggest appointment of another committee. I think if the General Purposes Committee is asked to lay down the basic rate of pay for all

these posts, they will lay it down; but even if they are not asked to do so, I do hope that they will in their final report make some such recommendation. Sir, when the Retrenchment Committee first met in the month of May, 1931 at Simla, the Honourable the Finance Member told us that there was a conference of Finance Members of the Provincial Governments and the Central Government, to discuss what should be the basic pay of future recruits for posts, both provincial and Imperial, and we were given to understand that the Finance Member would at one time circulate that report to the members of the Retrenchment Committee. I must confess that I did not ask the Finance Member in a committee meeting to circulate that report, but that scheme was never circulated to the Members of this House, nor to the members of the Retrenchment Committee unless the members of the General Purposes Committee had a chance to look at it. We were given to understand that the Finance Members of the Central and Provincial Governments wanted a specially low scale of salary for all future recruits. Whether that scale of salary will be in harmony with the revenues of the Central and Provincial Governments, I cannot say, but I do hope that if that report was not circulated to the General Purposes Committee, it may be done now, so that the Committee will express its views whether the scale of salary is high for future recruits or whether they could suggest a different scale of salary.

In talking of retrenchment, we may think that if we cut down the salaries, we have saved the Government from bankruptcy, and that future Finance Members will bring out surplus Budgets. I am very doubtful about it and I will bring out a few instances to illustrate it; I will refer the House to the Demand, "Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations", which is found on pages 134 and 135 of the Detailed Estimates. All provident funds, all investments in the post office, Postal Cash Certificates are supposed to be deposited with the Government of India, but at present the Government of India have no special funds to meet withdrawals. All this money goes to the ways and means of the Budget, and the Government have spent it. Of course every year Government allocate so much to meet obligatory demands. This year they have allocated about 9 crores of rupees as interest charges on miscellaneous obligations. That is so far true, but Government have taken this money in trust. They have spent it away, and we know the solvency position of Government. A time will come when there will be a change of Government or the transfer of Government from that side to this side, and we will then find only certain paper transactions and certain huge obligations which the successor of my Honourable friend the Finance Member will have to meet, but my friend cannot say that he has invested so many crores out of this miscellaneous obligations on productive debts. The money has gone to reduce the debt position of Government to a certain extent. He did not incur a loan of 50 crores per annum, but incurred a loan of 20 crores, say, and that no doubt reduces our debt position. When my Honourable friend became Finance Member, in his first Budget speech he drew the attention of the House to the gravity of the situation of the Savings Bank deposits and the Postal Cash Certificates to cover payments for which no provision had been made. If the Government are carried on as they are now, the Honourable Member will show in paper that the money is there, but the money will have really been spent away, and future Finance Members will have to meet all these obligations and will not be able to provide money for developing the resources of the country, or even for reducing taxation in the country,

[Mr. B. Das]

because all these obligations will have been incurred by previous Finance Members. My Honourable friend may say that he has spent all this money on the productive side, but I cannot say the same thing of his predecessors. I cannot say that his predecessors in the past looked into that aspect of the question, but all the same India's public debt has increased. I want to draw attention to another aspect of the question, that is grant No. 96, "Commuted value of Pensions", on page 907. There is an insistent demand on this side of the House to retrench, but we find that more money is being paid in commuted value of pensions. All these have to be provided for. The pensionary charges which the Government of India keep in deposit is only a book deposit and never funded separately. To-day owing to the retirement of these officers, the commuted value of pensions has also increased. Also the gratuities which will be paid to the men who are retrenched forcibly will commit the Government to the expenditure of so many crores. I think the very retrenchment policy has created more anxieties for the Finance Member. I am asking that the Finance Member should keep these pensionary charges and other deposits, as also the service funds, in interest bearing deposits, so that these are not always a charge on the revenue of the country. I consider that the time has come when the Finance Member will have to shape out his policy so that he must make provision for these obligatory debts and pensionary charges that the country incurs and which become a statutory obligation of the country.

My Honourable friend Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad discussed the Army side of retrenchment. Sir, everybody knows that the constitutional changes have been long delayed. Whether they have been delayed by us or the Government, the fact remains that they have been delayed. When the Government of India wrote their despatch to the Secretary of State in 1930, they must have come to a certain definite decision as to whether the Army expenditure would be stationary at the present figure of 46 crores odd. Supposing then that the constitutional changes take time—as everybody knows, they are going to take two or three years' more time because nobody wants to hand over power, and it is so difficult to hand over power—why, I ask, does not the Honourable the Finance Member, in the present difficult circumstances, address the Secretary of State and the British Government with a view to settling this particular aspect of the question, namely, as recommended in the Government of India's despatch, let India pay a lump sum charge for defence, of say 25 crores or so, or even 30 crores to the British War Office? Then, let the British Army be separated from the Indian Army, and let that be a fixed charge on India for ten years till the Indian Dominion Army has come into being. Sir, if that is not done, if no big cut is made in the Army expenditure, what is the use of our tinkering with the retrenchment problem and driving out a water carrier here from a foot battalion or retrenching a few mules there from the artillery or cavalry? And yet the Honourable the Finance Member asks us to accept his version that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has done his best and to endorse the remark that the Commander-in-Chief considers that this retrenchment that has been effected in the Army cannot be held to be a permanent reduction. Sir, if these constitutional changes had come, as everybody was expecting them to come, in 1931, I am sure the Government of India and the British Government would have had to

come to some definite views in that matter. I ask, why do they not give effect to their own declared views today? Instead, Sir, they make us fight on the communal issues and on the depressed classes *issue* and on the issue regarding the federation of the Indian States and British India, and thus they go on playing with abstract and academic questions instead of tackling the immediate practical problems. And then they ask us to give them suggestions as to how further retrenchment can be effected in the Government of India! Sir, let us, I say, face the main issue, namely, that military expenditure must be reduced; and anticipating the remarks from my friends of the European Group, I would at once say that I am quite prepared to concede the maintenance of a European Army up to a certain number in India, but I am not prepared to give them more than 30 crores of rupees for the present; and if those 20 crores are released, India will then build up a Dominion Army in five years such as will be quite sufficient not only for internal defence but also to render help to the British Empire in case there is a war outside India; and therefore, I say, if England remains our friend, I am quite willing to send out an Indian Army abroad, as we so gladly did to France and to the many other theatres of war, where I daresay we acquitted ourselves so well.

Sir, then there are certain invisible items of military expenditure which it is high time we should all—including my friends of the Round Table Conference who were discussing the actual military expenditure—take careful note of. Sir, my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, made some pertinent remarks about the strategic railways. That is one item of expenditure which involves us in an incessant loss. Then there is the other issue,—the Military Department receives huge concessions from the railways amounting to as much as a crore of rupees per annum. They get concessions in travelling, in freights and so on and so forth, and when I gave evidence before the Railway Retrenchment Sub-Committee, I brought that to the notice of my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, and others. Now that crore of rupees should be debited to the military side of the expenditure. Then there is this huge expenditure on the Frontier Watch and Ward. What is the use of this huge Army, and at the same time of spending all this money on the Frontier Watch and Ward? Sir, all this is nothing but concealed military expenditure. If my submission is accepted and an Indian Army is created, I am sure it can look after the Frontier Watch and Ward side of the work without incurring any additional expenditure.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Simply to provide training for the Indian Army.

Mr. B. Das: But what is the use of this additional expenditure? We are now talking of finance; the country, Sir, cannot go on bearing any more taxation. This expenditure should not be thrown on to the civil side. Then there is the expenditure on civil works incurred for the Frontier Watch and Ward Department. I raised the point often before the Public Accounts Committee. Now if the Military Department requires for its military purposes these military roads, then let the expenditure be debited to the Military Budget. Why should it be debited to the Civil Budget, thus mounting up the taxation of the country? Sir, incidentally, as a member of the Stationery Stores Retrenchment Committee, I want to bring to the notice of the Army Secretary one aspect of military extravagance that we noticed. Now the Stationery Department receives orders

[Mr. B. Das.]

from the Military Department to print any number of forms and books and booklets; these are never indented upon, or requisitioned, and if anybody visits the Stationery Stores Office in Calcutta, he will find these are lying in heaps. Then there is another thing we gathered from the Superintendent of Stationery that, although the other Government Departments agreed in the policy of retrenchment, and use one type of papers and stationery, the military officers are never satisfied with the ordinary stationery issued out for their ordinary office work. Sometimes officers stationed at different places requisition for most costly stationery! Although this is a small item, it may bring out a saving of Rs. 30,000 to Rs. 50,000 in the Military Department, and requires looking into. They sometimes even, I am told, specify the supply of particular types of stationery, even giving the names of the manufacturers or firms of stationery! Why should the Honourable the Finance Member and other Members on the Treasury Benches and their respective Departments alone talk of conforming to one standard of stationery and use that alone in the Government of India, when there is all this waste and extravagance on the military side?

Then my friend, Mr. S. C. Mitra, dealt in detail with the recommendations of the General Purposes Committee of which he was such a worthy member. I wish to draw the attention of the House to one aspect of the question. I gave evidence before his Committee and I pointed out that the size of the Secretariat of the Government of India had grown beyond all proportion. Not only is there one Honourable Member for each portfolio, but there is a Secretary, a Joint Secretary, an Additional Joint Secretary, one or two Deputy Secretaries, one or two Additional Deputy Secretaries, one or two Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries by the dozen! What is the real, tangible work of the departments which affords any excuse for this huge officer-staff? Sir, if the departments are put to the test of being considered as commercial departments, I think those officers should not at all exist. Why, for instance, should the Department of Industries and Labour, the Department of Education, Health and Lands should have the same uniform number of officers, of Secretaries, Additional Secretaries, Joint Secretaries, Additional Joint Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Additional Deputy Secretaries as the Finance Department itself? Of course my friend, Mr. Mitra, says that I always have a soft corner for the Finance Department, due to the fact that that Department after all handles huge expenditure-problems to the tune of four hundred of crores which require careful watching and scrutiny, but why should this precedent be blindly copied by other departments, which have practically no work or work of the nature of post office work, one paper going from the office Superintendent up to the Assistant Secretary, then to the Under Secretary, then to the Deputy Secretary, then to the Additional Deputy Secretary, then to the Joint Secretary, then to the Secretary, then to the Honourable Member marked "H. M.". (Laughter.)

Of course, I do not wish to criticise my friend the Home Member's Department because the Home Department is above God, above Government and above everything. If the Home Department makes a requisition on the Honourable the Finance Member and says I need such and such Secretary for the maintenance of law and order, the poor Finance Member cannot help it. He will have to provide finance somehow. But

whether the exigencies of law and order really demanded so many additional ornaments in the staff of the Home Department, is quite a different matter. At present the Cabinet system of administration of the Government of India has no control over the individual Honourable Members of the Executive Council. I think the time has come for revision of all these as the country is on the verge of ruin and the country has no additional money to pay to the Finance Member. The country was expecting that in the year 1933 the Honourable the Finance Member would bring forward reduction in taxation. Sir, it is high time that these problems are faced squarely and fairly, but nobody wants to do so because it is a matter of prestige. The Honourable the Finance Member had two Secretaries six months ago. Well, it is very nice to have so many Secretaries, but can the country bear the expense? Of course, I am ready to concede to the Finance Member certain extra staff, because he needs it in order to have adequate control of the finances of India. But the other departments must reduce their staff. I think some of the departments ought to have one Secretary and one Under Secretary and the rest of the officers must be taken away. Most of the Superintendents during the reorganisation were made Assistant Secretaries. I do not grudge them their new comfortable rooms, new comfortable chairs and salaries, but who pays the piper? It is the country that pays and the country cannot stand any more this huge burden. This is a matter where the Honourable Member is very touchy, so I ask him to appoint a Retrenchment Committee consisting of the three Honourable gentlemen who are sitting now on the Front Treasury Bench (namely, Sir George Schuster, Sir George Rainy and Sir James Crerar). Let them decide finally what retrenchment should come in Secretariat officers. The real cause for this bloated expenditure is that we asked for Indians to be taken in in the Secretariat as officers. They have done so, but have they decreased the number of highest officials in the Secretariat? That is the point which must be looked into. Whether it is faced by the present Treasury Benches or the future Treasury Benches, it has got to be faced. These Secretariat ornaments should not continue any longer.

Sir, everybody thinks that the Secretary of State, sitting 6,000 miles away, is a mere post office. It is true that for the last few years the salary of the Secretary of State has come out of the British exchequer; but what about the huge staff that sits in that dark building known as the India Office, where so many people sit and manufacture schemes against India and against Indian aspirations? Why should these people be paid from the Indian tax-payer's money at such a high scale of pay? Indeed, the Secretary of State's office should no longer be a burden on the Indian tax-payer. What is the practice in the case of the Secretary of State for the Colonies? The Colonial Secretariat staff is not paid by Australia or the Dominions; it is paid by the British Government. If the Secretary of State thinks that he needs all the staff, let that staff be paid by the British Government and I will have no quarrel with it. It is the most surprising thing indeed that, even after the creation of the High Commissioner's office, the Secretary of State's office should spend so much money.

Then, my friend Mr. Mitra referred to the case of the Indian Stores Department. When this department was created in India, it was expected that the Indian Stores Department in London would be abolished. But then

[Mr. B. Das.]

the prestige goes a long way. There was the Auditor in the Secretary of State's office and the High Commissioner's office. He does not want to work under the instructions from the Auditor General here and the High Commissioners are very chary to reduce the staff in the London Stores Department and they have not reduced it at all. I find, however, that this time there is some reduction in the office of the High Commissioner, but that does not meet the situation. Why should there be duplication of the staff, and why should the Indian High Commissioner have such a big staff, I cannot understand. Let the Honourable the Finance Member get the items of expenditure that Australia spends on its High Commissioner's department. Do they have so many Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, Trade Commissioners and Assistant Trade Commissioners at London? I think the staff should be reduced. It seems to me that there is a conspiracy. When we put a man into a post, he wants to build up his department to show that he is doing some work, and the staff gets multiplied, but poor India cannot any more support such extravagances. I think the General Purposes Subcommittee made a very mild recommendation regarding the reduction of the staff of the Secretary of State and the High Commissioner. There ought to be a drastic cut in the case of these two departments.

Sir, my friend Mr. Mitra did not like to touch the Postal Department. I do maintain that every department should be a paying proposition. The criticisms that I level against the mal-administration of the railways apply equally to the mal-administration of the Postal Department. It is not a benevolent society, that the tax-payer should always contribute to pay high salaries to the staff of the Postal Department. Government must lay down the law that the Postal Department should be self-supporting, and if the salaries were raised, say, five or six years ago, they must be cut down. I shall hear a tirade from my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, who is a labour leader, but I do not understand how the Postal employees can be called labourers. Sir, every commercial department must be self-supporting, and if the Postal Department cannot pay its own way, then either the staff should be reduced or the salaries should be lowered. Another aspect of the Postal Department is the vested interests of my friend Sir Henry Gidney in the Telegraph Department.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): I have no vested interests in that department at all.

Mr. B. Das: Now that my friend is so much interested in the vested interests of railways he has dropped his former love, the Telegraph Department. I am glad that he agrees that he has no vested interests in the Telegraph Department and I hope my Honourable friend, Mr. Ryan, will see that he will do away with all the favouritism in the Telegraph Department where a certain number of posts are reserved for the members of the community to which my Honourable friend Sir Henry Gidney belongs. Those posts should now be thrown open to all.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: So they are.

Mr. B. Das: Then why should the Bombay Office and the Calcutta Office have so many posts which must be recruited from a certain community, and why should these high salaries be paid to them?

Now, I come to the Report of the Public Works Retrenchment Committee, over which my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy, sat as the Chairman. My friend, Mr. Neogy, who was in a hurry to go to the Round Table Conference, finished it in a week. He recommended only the 3 P.M. reduction of one Superintending Engineer in the large number of engineering establishments that the Government have got at Delhi. This morning I said, sack the whole lot of the members of the Public Works Department. Now we have spent 16 to 18 crores on the Delhi capital. What is the use of maintaining this huge staff when there is no necessity at all for it, and even as my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra, pointed out, they are not even able to supply drinking water to 2,000 extra souls if they are left here in the summer season in Delhi. The former Member for Industries and Labour, Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, with whom I used to have tussles on the floor of this House used to say that he had reduced the staff in the Public Works Department. I have gone over the list, and I find there is very little reduction in the staff. Today the P. W. D. deals with the Delhi Province, and they have very little work except to look after the maintenance of these buildings. Why then this huge expenditure of a Chief Engineer, two Superintending Engineers and so many Executive Engineers and so many Assistant Engineers? If I am to formulate a scheme, I say, sack the whole lot of officers, including the Superintending Engineers and even the Chief Engineer. I do not mind if the whole work is delegated to one Superintending Engineer (he may be called the Chief Engineer, but his salary should be of the grade of Superintending Engineer) to look after the roads and buildings of the Delhi Province. Instead of having merely two Executive Engineers, and a few Assistant Engineers, what do we find? We find that the Chief Engineer is so hard worked that he has got a Personal Assistant on Rs. 1,800. He is not recruited from the Engineering staff, but he has been recruited from the Secretariat of my Honourable friend, the Home Member's Department. I do not understand why a Chief Engineer wants a Personal Assistant who is a non-technical man! That is indeed a surprise to me. After looking into the administration of all the provinces I find the Chief Engineer, everywhere, has got a Personal Assistant who is always an Executive Engineer or an Assistant Engineer.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): Why an Engineer?

Mr. B. Das: I must stand for my profession. This non-technical Assistant of the Delhi Chief Engineer is paid Rs. 1,800. A Superintending Engineer who has to preside over the whole of the Delhi P. W. D. ought to get Rs. 1,800. Why should we continue this extravagance? There is a Superintending Engineer looking after the Horticultural Department. I know every Honourable Member of the Executive Council has got beautiful gardens and flower beds, but does that justify the poor tax-payer to maintain a huge Horticultural Department so that Honourable Members should have button-holes in their coats? I am not going into detail, but I think my Honourable friend the Finance Member should refer back again to the P. W. D. Retrenchment Committee this question, because that Committee has not done adequate justice in that matter and we cannot maintain such a high salaried staff. The P. W. D. Committee recommended the abolition of the post of non-technical Assistant but it has not

[Mr. B. Das.]

been given effect to. They also recommended the abolition of the post of the Roads Engineer. The contention of the Government is that the Roads Engineer is paid from the funds of the Roads Committee, and so we should not worry our head because the Central revenues will not be debited with any money. That is not the right way of looking at the subject. As we know, my Honourable friend, Mr. Shillidy, made a statement last session, that owing to the financial insolvency of the Provincial Governments, Government have decided that the Road Fund will be utilised for the maintenance and repair of the roads in the province for the present. That means that no Roads Engineer is at present necessary to remain with the Central Government to look after that Fund, because the Roads Committee of this House will allocate that Fund to the Provincial Government and they will take it and spend it on repairs and maintenance of roads. The Honourable the Finance Member will say that he is expecting the financial solvency of the provinces next year, and so the services of a Roads Engineer is necessary. But I strongly differ from him. There is no chance of solvency in the near future, and so I feel that the recommendation of the P. W. D. Committee should have been accepted.

I have indicated certain lines where retrenchment has been very inadequate and I feel that retrenchment must be adequate—not only in the salaries paid by the Government of India which are to the tune of 120 crores and these should be reduced by at least 33 per cent. or 40 per cent. but also there should be a complete change in the outlook and in the future recruitments. If the Honourable the Finance Member either refers to the General Purposes Committee or to any other Committee to look into the future scales of salaries, he will do justice not only to himself but to the country. I was not a party to the ten per cent. cut as a measure of retrenchment. The Honourable the Finance Member was himself the Chairman of the Retrenchment Committee where we unanimously recommended a graduated scale of cut rising from 3½ to 20 per cent. Unfortunately the Chairman of the Retrenchment Committee, though he happened to be the Honourable the Finance Member, was overruled by the Government of India and the Government of India, taking the cue from the Army Department and the War Office, decided that there should be no cut beyond ten per cent. To pamper and satisfy a few officers today, the whole country has been made to suffer. I think a cut of 20 per cent., and even higher, was necessary, and today looking into the financial conditions of the country, a cut of even more than 20 per cent. is all the more necessary. I think Government should look into the matter again and there should be even a 30 per cent. cut. Another suggestion of mine is that in the case of future recruitment to the services of the Government of India and also in the provinces they should not be paid the same scales of salary in the future as exist at present.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I have listened very attentively to the Mover of this motion and I have made a close study of the reports that have been submitted by the various retrenchment Sub-Committees. Referring to the last speaker, my Honourable friend, Mr. Das, I do not think he showed much gratitude to the opposite Benches when after accepting the Finance Member's bouquet he denied him even the wearing of a button-hole. While I listened to the Mover of this motion, my mind went back to an amusing remark made to me by a railway servant shortly

after the railway report had been submitted. He said, "Sahib, who are these Sahibs who are travelling all over India to cut our pay. We work the trains in which they travel; they get their daily allowance and their travelling allowance out of our taxes and they now want to cut our pay", and with a coy smile he added, "Do you think it would be wrong if we removed fish plates from the rails and derailed the train in which they travel?". This remark was made in jest but I must congratulate the Retrenchment Sub-Committee on having so far had a safe journey all over India.

Mr. B. Das: So, the Honourable Member is in conspiracy with the railway employees for the purpose of removing fish plates.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Apparently! but the Honourable Member's life is quite safe, Sir! I really do not understand what is behind this motion. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to accept and stand by the sobriquet given to me by the Honourable the Finance Member. In his Budget speech he called me a whole-hogger; I frankly admit I am a whole-hogger because I am dead against retrenchment as advocated by the various Retrenchment Sub-Committees. On close examination of the work of these Retrenchment Committees I feel I can aptly describe them as itinerating hydra-headed cobras roaming over the country putting their stings into the purse of every employee and in emptying them shouting "Down, down with the public servant and save the public".

Mr. H. P. Mody (Bombay Millowners' Association: Indian Commerce): That's a mixed metaphor.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: My interrupter can have the metaphor if it is suitable; if it is not, he can have the mixture. He can please himself, but I shall be pleased if he will not interrupt me again. Sir, let us look at the composition of the General Purposes Retrenchment Sub-Committee; there was not a single workman on it. I believe it consisted mainly of legal men. If the gentlemen who formed the Sub-Committees had belonged to the working classes and had their pay retrenched as they have advocated, I wonder what speeches we would have heard from them today. Sir, I was co-opted as a member of two of these Committees, "Railways" and the "Army". But I am glad I did not help to cut the wages of the lower paid employee. My intention in joining these Committees was to operate as a dose of anti-venom so as to be an antidote to the poisonous effects of these hydra-headed reptiles. In my efforts I also supported many of the points to which my Honourable friend Mr. Mitra referred, particularly to adequate retrenchment of higher paid appointments and also to what my friend Mr. Das demanded, namely, that these Retrenchment Committees should in addition have undertaken the task of revising the new scales of salaries for new entrants. My conflict with him is that they should not have retrenched the salaries of present employees. I have often wondered, Sir, what the legal members of these Retrenchment Committees would have done if a Government had issued an ordinance retrenching their incomes by limiting their legal fees to Rs. 50 a case or per diem. I feel sure they would have been up in arms at once, boycotted law courts and raised their voices in loud protest even as I am doing today. What I cannot understand, Sir, is why the Finance Member ever consented to the creation of these retrenchment monsters

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

and further why he has been a party to the ruthless application of their retrenchment axe. He asked for these Committees and he is now faced with their impossible demands, some of which are impossible of acceptance, while others, if accepted, will be against the ordinary canons of justice and vested rights and interests. Does he not realise, or is he blind to the hand writing on the wall that by this ruthless retrenchment he was creating a very serious labour unrest all over the country? Surely the Railway Department, surely the Finance Member and surely the members of these Retrenchment Committees are not absolutely blind to what is happening among labourers in India today? Again surely it does not need any great persuasion from me to show Government that the Railways are today seething with discontent and unrest and by this ruthless application of the retrenchment axe they are simply driving them to open revolt. Does Government desire to extend this unrest to other Departments as the Telegraphs and Customs? I would be the last man to countenance or encourage any such policy on the part of any employee or association or union protecting their interests. But there is a limit to the hardships these employees can stand, and surely Government is not blind to that fact. The Finance Member has made a definite statement that this 10 per cent. cut will be restored on a certain date next year. I only hope this promise will be carried out. Sir, I said just now that I agreed with what my friend Mr. Das said that these Retrenchment Committees would have served a more useful purpose if they had devoted their energies to establishing new rates of pay for new entrants and even creating new grades and new Departments for future employees instead of cutting down the salaries of subordinates. Certainly have new rates of pay for new entrants but why harm those who are already serving you, and serving you well and faithfully. I warn the Government to stop this policy before it is too late. Sir, in this epidemic of retrenchment which has infected these various Retrenchment Committees, both the Government and these Committees have forgotten one very important point and that is this. Broadly speaking, one can divide all forms of labour into two categories. The first category includes the labourer who gets a substantive or grade pay with nothing else or may be a few minor allowances as house allowance. He may work for 4 or 6 or 8 hours; still he gets his full pay and no allowance or very few. If he works overtime or undertime he gets nothing more nor less than this pay. These employees are to be found in the Government of India and Provincial Government offices and other such ministerial appointments. In the second category are those employees who receive a basic pay but a basic pay which is calculated or which is assessed according to the nature of work and the hours of work performed. Anything over that contracted period is called overtime and this is variously calculated and valued according to mileage or over hours spent on labour which is generally obtained at the sweat of a man's brow and by depriving him of hours of rest or leisure. That, Sir, is called "overtime". These are the two different classes of labourers. I ask Government and I ask the Retrenchment Sub-Committees, can they or should they treat these two classes of employees alike in their retrenchments? They cannot and yet this is exactly what they are doing with the result that such employees as overtime workers on Railways, Customs, Telegraphs, etc., are being more seriously retrenched than other employees. By working overtime Government is saved the employment of additional

staff at a higher cost. But what have these Retrenchment Committee's done? Those employees who have a lower basic pay and who depend for a decent wage on their extra pay earned by overtime at the expense of their health are the very men who have been most retrenched and suffer the severest. Sir, in previous speeches I dealt at length with the Railways. I do not propose again to refer to them except to say I entirely agree with my Honourable friends, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad and Mr. Das, in that strategic Railways should be debited to military estimates and not to general railways.

I desire now to deal with one or two of the many departments referred to by the Mover. The Opposition Benches have accused me of having a very large heart. I admit quite frankly, Sir, that I have got a very large heart for the oppressed and retrenched workmen; and however much my Honourable friends, Mr. Mitra and Mr. Das, may point the finger of scorn and ridicule and even attempt to ridicule that loyal and patriotic little band of Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European workmen who have for centuries served India so well, for that scorn, for that satire and for that ingratitude I return a smile and say—I thank you for nothing but I am happy in the conviction that I have served India well, may be better than the Honourable Member, but I desire to tell him

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member has got into the habit of addressing the Opposition instead of addressing the Chair.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I beg your pardon, Sir, but I was endeavouring to address it through you.

Certain remarks have been made about the Telegraphs. The Telegraphs certainly deeply concern the community which I represent here and I do think the Telegraphs have been very hard hit. I may inform my Honourable friends that the hardest hit employees in the Telegraphs are certainly members of the Anglo-Indian community who as a result of years of hard, honest and efficient labour are today in appointments drawing fairly high salaries most of which appointments the Posts and Telegraph Retrenchment Sub-Committee has axed. I need hardly refer to the serious prejudicial effect the recent competitive entrance examination into this Department has already had on Anglo-Indian recruitment. But I am not crying over that. I will leave the Telegraphs alone and deal with the Customs.

I regret to note that my Honourable friend Mr. Mitra never refers to any retrenchment measures without thickly tincturing his remarks with some sarcasm aimed directly to the community I have the honour to represent. I cannot understand why he does this and why he should always refer to the Anglo-Indian community in these biting and bitter terms. To him, the word "Anglo-Indian" is an anathema. But, Sir, let me tell this House that till a few years ago the entire Customs Preventive Service was exclusively manned by Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans who by their loyalty, honesty and devotion to their service have so developed the Department that today it annually supplies to the Government Treasury from 30 to 40 crores of rupees—almost the cost of the Army in India and certainly more than the cost of maintaining the entire Government administrative staff. Sir, that is the Department whose interests I am trying to defend and protect in this House against the

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

Retrenchment demands made. Sir, certain charges have been made by previous speakers against Government, and if you remember, Sir, when I spoke on the Railways I also made certain charges against Railway administrations. I then absolved the Railway Board from any blame, but I did blame the Railway administrations. I think every Member of this House will agree with me when I say that the Court of Inquiry report now in our hands has substantiated those charges. It has proved beyond doubt that the Railway administrations do not carry out the instructions of the Railway Board. I levy the same charges against the Heads of certain other Departments of the Government of India. I will take up only one out of many points raised by the Mover—"Superannuation". Sir, superannuation as it is put in Government's order of priority of retrenchment takes the last place. Superannuation as it is put into practice takes no place. There are many instances today of Government servants who have served far beyond the superannuation age but who for varying reasons are being kept on. The Customs is one of the Departments that is guilty of this disobedience of Government instructions. Why even today in the Calcutta Customs servants are being kept on beyond 55 years of age, while young men are being retrenched.

Mr. B. V. Jadhav: Do they belong to any particular community?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: The Customs today, as the House will no doubt be aware, is being recruited on very liberal lines, two Indians to one non-Indian recruit and there is no communal preference shown at all—Sir, I think that answers my friend's question. But the Customs Department in recent years has had additional responsibility thrown on their shoulders. Take the port of Calcutta for instance. It has recently been very much enlarged. Again one of the chief duties of Customs preventive officers is to prevent the smuggling of arms and drugs—a very responsible duty indeed—one which cannot be adequately assessed in terms of Rs. as pies. Another duty that has been imposed on them is heavy work associated with the constant changes of rates and tariffs. Now my friend, Mr. Mitra, reading from the report of the General Purposes Retrenchment Sub-Committee regarding the Customs Department, said that these Preventive Officers were overpaid; and in support of the retrenchment recommended of 50 per cent. of the overtime, said that formerly these Officers were originally recruited from the Police Department and as the Police of Calcutta were not in receipt of such liberal overtime he saw no reason why the Customs should get it. I am surprised at that line of argument. To argue that because the Calcutta Police have no overtime the Customs must today be deprived of a vested right it has enjoyed for years is to say the least, *reductio-ad-absurdum*. Does the Retrenchment Committee realise that this is a vested right of this Department, that the money is earned at the sweat of the brow and loss of rest and injury to health, that these employees have been engaged on the terms that they will receive overtime and to deprive them of this right would be a break of contract? Does it not realise that while the Customs is a revenue-earning Department, the Police is a money-spending Department? Did the Retrenchment Sub-Committee forget the indisputable fact that of all Departments of Government the Customs is the one that supplies the major part of its revenue? To come nearer home it is the means of giving each one of us our halting allowance of Rs. 20 a day and the

1 3/5 first class travelling allowances we get to attend this House. The Customs Department is the bank which supplies the finances of the present Government and the new Federal Government to be. Deprive the Government of this source of revenue and where are you? In the sea. Ruin this Department and the finances of your new Federal Government will be killed. And yet the Customs is the one Department that has been so hotly attacked by the Mover and the Retrenchment Committee. This is surely killing the goose that lays the golden egg and cutting one's nose to spite one's face. I call this suicidal retrenchment—not beneficial and I cannot find strong enough language with which to condemn it wholesale. Sir, let me tell this House a few home truths about this overtime on which the Retrenchment Committee is remarkably silent. Owing to world wide trade depression and from 1927-28 this overtime has considerably reduced, till today it is 44 per cent. of what it was before. I ask members of the General Purposes Retrenchment Committee to remember this fact and I challenge them to deny it. In addition these officers have suffered 10 per cent. of their pay as also 10 per cent. reduction of the staff. I now want to ask where does the overtime come from? It comes from the merchants of the port of Calcutta. Who receives this overtime? The answer is it is shared between Government and these Customs officers.

Sir Abdur Rahim (Calcutta and Suburbs: Muhammadan Urban): No Government do not get anything.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I am open to correction, but I will take the correction from the official Benches—not from you, Sir, as Chairman of the General Purposes Sub-Committee.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Take your lead and inspiration also from there.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, I refuse that invitation for I should then be misled. I do not want to weary the House with figures—which prove that whereas in the year 1927-28 the total overtime earned by this Service—and which I again say subject to correction is shared between the men and the Government—was Rs. 3,46,123, in 1931-32 it amounts to Rs. 1,89,266—a reduction of 44 per cent. What has been the result? The result is that the men have been deprived of nearly half their overtime. Furthermore a staff depleted by 10 per cent. is called upon to work over hours. May be all night at a return of 44 per cent. overtime less than normal times and less 10 per cent. in salary and on the top of this the Retrenchment Committee demands a further 50 per cent. less overtime. And what is happening today in this Department? These underpaid men, overburdened with the high cost of living and education of their children, as also a reduction in uniform allowance and increased income-tax are today flocking for financial help from the mutual help association, co-operative society, etc., and so are sinking deeper and deeper in debt. Sir, I submit if you attack the chief revenue-earning department of the Government of India with this severe measure of retrenchment, you will not only throw open the door to corruption, but what is more serious, reduce the morale of the Department. Does the House desire this? Do Government court this? In my opinion if there is one Department in the Government of India that should not have been touched by the retrenchment axe it is the Customs Department. May I also tell the

[Sir Henry Gidney.]

House that there is no difference in pay between the various communities employed in this Department. They are all on the same basic pay. And so I am not appealing on behalf of my community only. I am speaking for a Department that today recruits two Indians to one Anglo-Indian. One word more before I sit down. What are the advantages of this system of paying overtime to these officers. Let me tell you. By the merchants paying these men overtime Government is saved the expense of engaging additional larger staff which would otherwise be necessary. Again the fees that are received from merchants have saved this expense to Government, otherwise Government would have had to pay them and finally this overtime is earned at a loss of rest and leisure to the workmen.

Sir, when I began my speech I said I was a whole-hogger. I will end by saying that I hope I have proved myself a super-wholehogger. Sir, I am absolutely against any retrenchments whatever. I am certainly in favour of reducing expenditure by forming a Committee to initiate new grades and new rates of pay for new entrants. I certainly do think there are a number of appointments which are in receipt of high salaries. Retrench those. I am also in favour of setting up a Committee to consider retrenchment of even the Lee concessions. I do not care what else you do; but I do state this, that this House is wrong in indulging in a campaign of ruthless retrenchment of its public servants and so saving the public. There are one or two other points to which I shall refer before I sit down.

My friend Mr. Mitra talked about the Indian Medical Service. May I tell members of that Retrenchment Committee that the question of health before wealth is a very good motto for them to practise and follow. The retrenchment suggested in the field of medicine and public health is to my mind almost impossible. For after all, surely members of that Committee have noticed that for the last ten years the expenditure on medicine and sanitation has been reduced to a dangerous degree in India. No Government and no country that desires to advance on scientific lines and to improve the country's health, especially the prevention of spreading epidemic diseases, can work without an efficient medical and health department and this means adequate money or hands off by the Retrenchment Committee.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: But it is a transferred provincial subject.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I do not desire to refer to any department. My friend Mr. Mitra has done that. My one desire has been to defend the Customs Preventive Service against the cruel, unjust and inhuman retrenchments recommended by the General Purposes Sub-Committee. I hope I have proved my points to this House and that the Government will not bow to these retrenchment demands. Sir, I oppose this Motion.

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain (Member for Education, Health and Lands.): Sir, there has been such a great deal of talk about retrenchment that it is worth the while of the House to hear an aspect of this problem which, so far as I know, has not been presented to the House up till now. We who have to administer the various departments of the Government have been a long-suffering people. One of our colleagues, the gentleman on my left, has long been known as the

watch-dog of the State finances. Since the financial stringency, he has developed into a wolf, and we really have a real bad time with him. Our only protection against his wolf-like habits was the threat we held out to him, "Here are the non-official Members of the House; they want to know what we are doing in the interests of the beneficent departments". What we are doing to keep the status of India high up in the civilized world? Sir, as luck would have it, Honourable Members of the House agreed to the Honourable the Finance Member's suggestion of forming themselves into a Committee. I never thought last year that that Committee would bring so much trouble to us. (Laughter.) I do not know whether the House is familiar with one of the numerous Committees this Committee divided itself into, but there was one that I came across very often, and that was the General Purposes Sub-Committee. What its purposes were, I do not know, except that it has left hardly any work for me to do. I seldom opened a pamphlet published by this Committee,—and it issued very many,—without seeing that some activity or other was curtailed. I wonder whether any Retrenchment Committee will be functioning next year to see to what extent money has been spent by this Committee, but I assure you there is hardly any activity of the Government of India's beneficent departments which has not been most ruthlessly attacked by my own people, the non-official Members of the House. And I have no protection now—enemies to my left—enemies to my right. (*An Honourable Member*: "Not in front?") Now, take a very simple thing, a thing that did not cost very much. I will give the House by way of illustration the department which came into being only recently, the Department of Archaeology. That is the one Department, Sir, in which India in the East and even in the civilized world including the West can hold its own and contribute to the knowledge of the past. Now, what did the Retrenchment Committee say? They said, "We do not want any exploration, we do not want any work whatsoever to be done". Not only that, they said, "You must stop the work that has already been done and not let the work already done be made available to the Indian public and the civilized world". Now, Sir, knowing the futility of one Member standing against his own, a colleague on one side and his own constituents so to speak on the other, I had no option but to bow my head to this decision of the General Purposes Committee. If my own colleague was a wolf, there was a band of wolves much more bloodthirsty (Laughter), but I put a limit to it when they said that not only that no work should go on but that the work already done should not be written in order to be presented to India and made available to the world. That is the one charge that has been brought against me this morning. Why did I not, so to speak, throw into the waste-paper basket all the knowledge collected during the last 20 years by its officer who is retiring, and why did I dare to say that that man should record and publish those things? Well, Sir, it took me some days to meet him even in that matter. I assure the House that those were not pleasant negotiations into which I entered with the officer who was preparing that material and with whom, on behalf of this House and the Government, we had entered into a contract. It will perhaps satisfy the House, whatever it may have cost me, to know that a part of the payment has been deferred till such time as those books which he produces are sold and the Royalty obtained which goes to liquidate his claim against Government. I trust the General Purposes Committee or any other purposes committee that may be constituted, Sir, in the future will not be so hard on the departments which really do something towards raising the dignity and status of this country in the civilized world.

[Sir Fazl-i-Husain.]

Then, Sir, there was research work being conducted in India in the Forest Department, in the Medical Department and in the Public Health Department. The General Purposes Committee does not believe in the purposes of research at all. (Laughter.) It is a luxury which must be given up because we are hard up, nor have they spared research in agriculture. Grants under all heads have been practically withdrawn or reduced to a figure extremely low. Well, there again it only shows how the same thing can be looked at from different aspects or from different points of view. Those of us who place before themselves retrenchment as a sort of God or Goddess, whatever you may like to call it, lose all balance of mind in the matter of what is right and what is wrong. We have on this side of the House heard a great deal from Honourable Members opposite who consider that every order passed by us for expenditure incurred by us is nothing else but sheer extravagance indulged in with the sole object of squandering the treasures of the country. Well, Sir, it would perhaps be equally correct for me to say that every axe struck at the root of this department had but one object, and that was to kill the beneficent activities that this Government has been carrying on. I trust Honourable Members will forgive me if I speak with some feeling on the subject, but having entered under the reforms the British Government in a province with the sole object of doing what I could in the matter of beneficent departments, I could not but resent these activities of the General Purposes Committee when I had accidentally found myself to be a victim of their fanaticism.

Then, Sir, not only researches have been more or less successfully killed for the time being, but other departments like the Survey of India have been reduced to very nearly half in point of expenditure, and what is more, today I understand a more serious charge has been brought against my Department that while they thought that this cut would get rid of people of all communities, by some device I have kept the English and the Anglo-Indians and only done away with the Indians. Well, Sir, I confess I had not seen the figures till now, because I thought that this sort of criticism was the peculiar preserve of communal vernacular newspapers. But since on the floor of this House this very serious charge has been made, I assure the House that it is not well founded. On the other hand, only this morning I got a representation from an officer, who from his name appears to be certainly neither Hindu nor Muslim, so presumably either he was a European or an Anglo-Indian, saying that he has been unlawfully axed by my department. The statistics which I have been able to get within the last few hours show that retrenchment has by no means been limited to Indians. In the higher grades only Europeans—and it is only in the higher grades that they generally are—have been retrenched. That was due to the fact that there were no Indians in higher grades, but it is enough to refer to this fact to assure the House that the allegation made on this subject is not well founded.

Then, amongst other recommendations, one was to the effect that there should be no Council of Agricultural Research Secretariat, that as a separate department it should cease to exist, and that it should be combined with the Department of Education, Health and Lands, as was the case before. I will not enter into the merits or demerits of that controversy, but I will appeal to the House to remember that the department was not of my creation, and therefore there is not the very human tendency

of supporting what one has done, but it was the result of the recommendations of another Committee like the General Purposes Committee, called by a different name—the Royal Commission on Agriculture. It also worked for a long time and also produced as many big volumes as the General Purposes Committee have produced small ones. But I trust that Honourable Members will not think that the Royal Commission on Agriculture, whose recommendation on the subject was accepted by the Government of the day, and I believe was generally approved by the House—that when this department was a baby of about three years standing I should be called on to slaughter that infant without having given it a chance to show what it could do, I trust that in not having committed infanticide, I have not done anything of which the House disapproves. (Applause.)

Sir Abdur Rahim: The Honourable Member who spoke last has complained of the wolves in his own Government and of the wolves on this side of the House. Sir, if he only bore in mind under what circumstances we took up this task, he would have realised who are the real wolves and the real victims. The victims are the people of the country, and we wanted to save the people of the country from absolute ruin. The Government of India, or any Government which has control of the revenues of a country, has to be economical in the expenditure on themselves. My Honourable friend has been away from India for some time, and I am not sure that he is quite up to date in his information. I think he has been misled, if he will allow me to say so, as regards some of the points which he wanted to make before us. The General Purposes Sub-Committee had to deal with a very large number of subjects, including the subjects in the charge of the Honourable Member. If the Honourable Member had carefully read the Report and had the time to do so, he would have found that throughout our deliberations we have been most anxious not to cripple in any way the activities of the scientific or educational departments. This is expressly laid down in our Report in the very introduction, and we stuck to that throughout. If there have in fact been retrenchments in education or research beyond our Report, then in that case it is not the General Purposes Sub-Committee that ought to be taken to task. One point specially I ought to mention, and that is the Council of Agricultural Research. We never recommended that that Council should be done away with. On the other hand, we had to resist a great deal of pressure put upon us to abolish that Council. We recommended that the Council should be retained and should be allowed to carry on its work according to the Report of the Royal Commission. I do not know who gave information to a contrary effect to the Honourable Member, but that is the fact. I think the Honourable Member was mixing up the Council of Agricultural Research with the Agricultural Department. That is a different story. It is not the Council of

The Honourable Khan Bahadur Mian Sir Fazl-i-Husain: I quite understand.

Sir Abdur Rahim: It is not the Council of Agricultural Research that we wanted in any way to abolish or whose operation we wanted to curtail. On the other hand, we give it our fullest support. All that we wanted to see was that there was no reduplication of work and that there was no employment of unnecessary staff simply because they are called experts. When the Honourable Member in charge of the department has at his command a number of experts in the provinces, for instance in Pusa, when he has got under his disposal, to give

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

him advice, a large number of experts, a well paid and highly qualified staff, we thought that under the circumstances it was not necessary, when the finances of the country were in such straits, to have an unnecessary staff again at the headquarters. Then, as regards medical and health, we have been extremely anxious, quite as anxious as the Honourable Member for Education, that any legitimate activity of Government in the cause of sanitation and health should not suffer. But we found that at the headquarters we have an unnecessarily large staff, which could not be justified in these hard times. For instance, we know that the Indian Medical Service is primarily recruited for the Army, and in the Army itself we have officer who, among his other duties, has the supervision of the medical services. This is what the department itself admits :

"It will be seen that as stated by the Department of Education, Health and Lands 'only a portion of the Director General's work is done for the civil authorities'."

We say in our Report :

"The I. M. S. and I. M. D. are essentially military services. The expenditure on the Medical Store Depots and their profits are found among the Army Estimates. The principal minor administrations (e.g., North-West Frontier Province, Baluchistan, Ajmer-Merwara) have their own Chief Medical Officers. The State Railways have just reorganised their own medical arrangements."

We therefore came to the conclusion, which was amply justified by the evidence and the facts that we had before us, that it was unnecessary to retain such a highly paid staff at the headquarters of the civil department, when you have a fully organised department in the Army as well. But at the same time we were careful to lay down that the Government of India should have at their command competent medical advice on questions of sanitation and the like. We simply wanted to reduce unnecessary expenditure. Now, as regards the Medical Research Fund, evidence was given before us that no less than 50 lakhs was there in the Fund for promoting research, and we had evidence from which we drew the conclusion that under those circumstances it was not necessary during these times of stringency for the Government to make any annual contribution. Then as regards Archæology, the chief complaint of my Honourable friend opposite seems to be that we have recommended the abolition of the post of Sir John Marshall whose services have been requisitioned after he had retired in order to write a book on certain explorations. Sir John Marshall had been in the service of the Government of India for a very long time, 28 years, and it was expected that during this long term of office he would have been in a position to publish the results of his own work and the work of his department. We were also satisfied that, whatever publication was necessary in order to give information to the world as regards the archæological finds in India, the department was not without men in order to carry out such duties. Again, the terms on which Sir John Marshall had been re-engaged were extremely onerous, and we thought that in the interests of economy the requisitioning of his service after his time had expired was not justified. As I began by saying, we hesitated a great deal in making recommendations which would in any way impair the beneficent activities of the Government, for we have always been champions of the cause of such activities and if the colleagues of my Honourable friend have gone beyond our recommendations we cannot be blamed for that and I am sure Sir George Schuster will be able to reply to any such criticism.

Now, I come to something that was said by Sir Henry Gidney regarding the Customs. He said, "Touch whatever department you like but do not touch the Customs".

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhamadan): Because there are Anglo-Indians there?

Sir Abdur Rahim: The Honourable Member did not say so, and I am not going to impute any such motive, though what the peculiarity of the Customs Department is in this respect it is difficult to understand. All that he said was that it earns revenue. Therefore am I to take it that you can overstaff the department as much as you like? After all if that department is earning revenue, it is from the public and for the public. It is not for themselves. If there is overstaffing of the Customs Department and if the men are overpaid, it was the duty of this Committee, as a Committee of this House, to investigate the matter and make such recommendations as might seem proper. He was specially excited over the question of overtime allowances. We affirm our conviction that these allowances, which amount to no less a sum than 12 lakhs of rupees, could not be justified. The position as regards overtime allowances is this. These gentlemen are employed in the Customs Department for clearing cargoes and duties of that kind. They are wholtime servants of Government just as much as policemen, Magistrates and Judges and Members of the Executive Council.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Do they work 24 hours?

Sir Abdur Rahim: There are many officials who have to work much more than their allotted official hours and they do not claim any extra remuneration for that. I do not know how this system of overtime payments came in. I could quite understand the case for overtime allowances if the contract with these men was that they were to work only certain limited hours and no more. If as a matter of fact these overtime allowances were justified by a special contract with these men, the Committee would have applied to them the general principle which they had laid down, namely, that the terms of any contract should not be affected. 12 lakhs of rupees is a very large sum in these days, and to make a present of this sum to a certain class of Government servants, we thought, would not be justified. But having regard to the fact that the practice has been prevalent for some little time, we recommended that 50 per cent. should be deducted. One Honourable Member, Mr. Ramsay Scott, a Member of this Committee, thought that 25 per cent. would be a proper retrenchment to begin with but the Government have accepted only 10 per cent. We are still of the opinion that these overtime payments, which amount to such a heavy charge, are not justified. (*Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:* "Then do you propose to stop them for the railways too? Just try this".)

Sir, as regards the Posts and Telegraphs, I am not in a position to say anything. Those Members of the House who have dealt with the subject will be in a position to deal with that Department. I am afraid, Sir, I have already taken more time than I had intended in order to deal with the general principles on which we have based our recommendations. One thing we must make clear to the House. We have felt, and felt very

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

keenly, as keenly as the Honourable the Finance Member himself, that the financial position to which this country has been reduced from various causes is such that the expense of the "government" should be reduced to the minimum for carrying out its duties compatibly with reasonable efficiency; and we felt that if that could be done, the difficulty of balancing the Budget would be far less than it is at present. If the expenses of the Government of India could be reduced to that minimum, then in that case there would be less of that crushing burden of taxation which at present is interfering with the industrial development of the country and cutting at the very root of the economic resources of India. Sir, we further felt, and felt very keenly, as keenly as Sir Henry Gidney, that many men would have to be thrown out of employment. We felt that. As a matter of fact not only men of his community but many more men of the Indian community, we fully expected, would be thrown out of employment. That was a hardship which from the very beginning we had in mind, and we laid it down that our recommendations must be subject to giving the men that have to be thrown out of employment, through no fault of their own, ample compensation so that there might be as little hardship as possible. Sir, we are not satisfied that in the case of such men sufficient compensation has been given, and we would press the matter on the attention of the Government so that they may receive proper compensation.

Now, Sir, there are one or two more matters which I wish to mention, and one of them is this. I find that even the recommendations of our second Report have not been fully considered by the Government. As regards the third Report rather our recommendation as to the third batch of the Demands which we had to deal with, the Report could not be got ready in time, but we gave the Honourable the Finance Member, as he desired, a summary of our recommendations, with a brief statement of the reasons in support of the more important recommendations. That was all that we could within the time at our disposal do, and Mr. Nixon, who was the representative of the Finance on our Sub-Committee, was present throughout the discussions and we were in fact satisfied from what he said that he would supply the Honourable the Finance Member with all the information that was necessary in order to make our recommendations intelligible. Sir, we consider that there is much room for retrenchment in the higher staff of the Government of India; none of us have any doubt on that point; I shall give one instance here—the case, for instance, of the President of the Council of State. We had evidence which showed that the duties required of that office are of such a character that the Government were not justified in incurring the charge of the payment of a high salary throughout the year. (*Mr. C. C. Biswas*: "Rs. 50,000 for less than 50 hours!") Yes, that I believe accurately represents the position. May I ask the Government if a state of things like that can be justified when the finances of an extremely poor country like India are in this difficult and precarious plight? Now we have made that recommendation, and we also suggested an alternative, a perfectly reasonable alternative, according to which, if accepted by the Government, the duties of the office of President of the Council of State can be discharged without any extra cost whatever to the Government. That is still under consideration we believe and I do hope the Honourable the Finance Member and his colleagues will see their way to giving proper effect to our recommendation in this respect

Now, take another case,—that of the Public Services Commission. The Members of that Commission are a very well-paid body of men, each Member getting Rs. 3,500 a month, the President getting Rs. 5,000 a month—and we had unanimous evidence from them in reply to our questionnaire, showing that 3 members, which was our suggestion, would be quite adequate for discharging the duties entrusted to that Commission. We therefore made a strong recommendation to that effect. (*Mr. C. C. Biswas*: “It is an asylum for infirm children’’) But so far that matter also has not been disposed of. We thought, having regard to the evidence given by Sir Ross Barker before us and the unanimous report of the Commission itself, that there would be no difficulty on the part of Government in accepting our recommendation; and we hope no further time will be lost by Government in giving effect to the recommendation we made in this connection. Sir, the small volumes or big volumes which we had to write in the discharge of our duties as members of this Committee have been circulated to Honourable Members of this House, and I presume they have had the time to go through them. The Government have also circulated a summary of the results of the retrenchment operations in the civil and the military departments, and Honourable Members will see for themselves how far effect has been given to our recommendations. So far as the recommendations of the General Purposes Sub-Committee are concerned, Government up to now have I believe been able to give effect to our recommendations to the extent of about 50 per cent. or so; I believe I am correct. We recommended that the expenditure of the departments should be reduced by Rs. 4 crores 23 lakhs, and so far as I gather from the information supplied to us, Government have accepted about Rs. 2 crores 40 lakhs of retrenchment. I am not taking the other civil departments but confining myself to the field covered by the General Purposes Committee. I think it amounts to about that. We are satisfied that the Honourable the Finance Member will do all that he can to see that the recommendations which these Sub-Committees have made should be carried out as closely as possible.

I wish to say, Sir, one word more, and that is with regard to the question that has been raised as to the dismissal or discharge of the employees of different communities. We bore this fact in mind as it is one of the most important questions that is troubling the country and the Government and we therefore in the very beginning made our recommendation that in carrying out retrenchment Government should bear in mind the principles which they have laid down regarding the composition of the services. That is to say, we have recommended that the policy of Indianisation should not be effected in any way so far as it can be helped and, further, we laid down that the policy which the Government have enunciated as regards the redressing of communal inequalities should also be observed as far as possible. We recognised also that it must be left entirely to the Government in carrying out their policy of retrenchment to give effect to these principles. It was not possible for the Retrenchment Committee to make any specific recommendations with regard to the members of particular communities to which certain employees in the Government belonged. If any injustice has resulted from the actual operations in the departments which had to deal with the carrying out of retrenchment then in that case we cannot in any way be asked to bear the blame. Sir, we know what the financial position is even now, it is a very serious position and we must still press therefore upon the Government that they should

[Sir Abdur Rahim.]

go on with the policy of retrenchment till sufficient economies have been effected to enable the Honourable the Finance Member to balance his budget without resorting to taxation which the country can no longer bear. It is quite clear that with the opportunities that we have had we could not go into many details which we would have liked to do. But we did our best under the circumstances and I should like to ask the House to take up the attitude that the Committees appointed from this House have done their best in order to carry out the duties entrusted to them. We have made recommendations for economy which are all set out in these Reports and I should ask the Honourable Members, including the Members of the European Group, who, I know, are equally anxious to effect economies in the administration, to give all the support they can to these Reports.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

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

The motion was adopted.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Sir, I think that the House may perhaps be grateful to me for one thing in connection with this debate and that is that I gave them an opportunity of looking behind the scenes and seeing what has been going on behind the scenes on our side in connection with this matter. I was fortunate in being able to get my Honourable colleague, the Member for Education, Health and Lands, to present his side of the picture to the House. Perhaps he was in a sense indiscreet, but I was grateful to him for his indiscretion in revealing to the House the sort of difficulties and even differences that exist on our side on this very difficult question of retrenchment. I wanted the House to appreciate that, and that actual position does, of course, make my task in replying to this debate a somewhat embarrassing one. To a certain extent, it is almost true to say that I, as a Finance Member, must find myself almost more in sympathy with those who have moved and spoken for this Resolution than I am with the Government if it takes up the attitude of resisting the demands for retrenchment. Therefore I wish to make nothing in the way of a debating speech to-day. I wish to make it clear that our attitude is one of listening to suggestions; our attitude is one of anxiety to carry this matter as far as it possibly can be carried consistently with the public interest. And the last condition is really the key to the whole difficulty. Retrenchment unfortunately has two sides to it. If you look at it from the point of view of reducing the expenditure and relieving the burden on the tax-payer's back, then it is a very desirable object. But unfortunately when you come to see it translated into action, it has undesirable and often almost tragic results. The difference which exists between my Honourable colleague, in his anxiety to protect the services for which he is responsible, and myself as responsible for the finances of the country, reveals the real difficulty of the situation. In fact, "You cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs" and the process of breaking eggs in the particular case is a very unpleasant one. It is in that connection that I want to say something about what fell from my learned friend the Leader of the Independent Party. He resented, or professed to resent, some of the things which Sir Fazl-i-Husain in his speech had said and he protested

and said that his own Sub-Committee in their recommendations had always been most careful to make it clear that they wanted to do nothing to interfere with the activities of the scientific departments or the beneficent activities of Government. That may, indeed, have been their desire; but unfortunately their recommendations had a very different effect, and it was of their recommendations that my Honourable colleague tried to give the House some account. I would like to refer just to one particular example, the case of the grant for Agricultural Research under Demand No. 60, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. There, it is true that the economies accepted by the Government are shown as Rs. 5,96,000 as against Rs. 4,22,000 recommended by the General Purposes Sub-Committee. But the big item in the Rs. 5,86,700 which we have accepted is the temporary suspension of the annual grants of five lakhs. We suggested and we have agreed to suspend the whole of that five lakhs, whereas the Sub-Committee only recommended a suspension of 2½ lakhs. We felt that the whole of the five lakhs could be suspended because that would not mean, in this particular year, any reduction in the sums available for expenditure, inasmuch as the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has a large endowment fund on which they can still draw. If you deduct that item, the recommendations of the General Purposes Sub-Committee for cutting down the activities under this head come to Rs. 1,72,000 as against our recommendation of Rs. 86,700. Therefore, they recommended almost double the economy in that particular form of activity which the Government have accepted, and as an example of what they have done, I may say they have recommended the abolition of both the posts of scientific experts attached to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. We felt that if both those experts were to go, the Imperial Agricultural Council would be left unable to perform the most useful part of its functions. I quote that as an example for the purpose of showing that when my Honourable colleague spoke of the recommendations of the General Purposes Sub-Committee as in some respects having gone so far as almost to kill the activities of the scientific departments, he was not speaking beyond the truth, he was not exaggerating the picture. In a debate of this kind, it is always difficult to avoid the danger of being led into too much detail. One is in danger of "failing to see the wood for the trees". I sympathise very much with the Honourable the Mover of the motion in the difficulty of the task which he put upon himself this morning. He tried to take the House through the whole of the various heads, or all the most important heads, and, having had some experience myself of trying to go through a large number of figures, one after the other, before this House, I felt a good deal of sympathy with him in the difficulty of the task which he had undertaken. In some respects, if he will excuse my saying so, he was right in trying to deal with this matter in this way, because it is only when you come down to practical details that you can really test what has been done. At the same time, it would obviously be impossible for me to attempt to follow him in that detailed task of counting the trees, and I would ask the House to allow me to stand back for some time from the picture and try to convey some idea of the wood of which those trees are the constituent parts. If we consider the position from that point of view, what does it really amount to? If I try to look back to the position in this Assembly about a year ago, or a little less than a year ago when the question of the appointment of these retrenchment committees came up, I remember that I, being anxious that we should have some form of co-operation in this work, wooed the Opposition Parties very assiduously.

[Sir George Schuster.]

They required a very great deal of wooing. To start with, they recoiled from my advances, and at one time I thought I was going to have no success at all. However, in the end, "protesting that they would ne'er consent", they did in fact consent to join us in this work of retrenchment. On our side—and as differences on our side have already been revealed to the House, I need not be afraid of going up a little further and revealing still further the differences on our side,—there was a great deal of anxiety as to what this scheme of mine might lead to. Many people felt that to have the administrative departments of the Government reviewed by Committees of this Assembly who were in no way experts on administration, or who, perhaps with very few exceptions, could not claim that designation,—many people felt that that was a very dangerous experiment indeed. In fact, Sir, looking back on the prospects of a year ago, it is hard to imagine any marriage which on the opinions expressed at the time was less likely to be successful than the one which I attempted to promote. Nevertheless, I think if we stand back from the picture,—and I ask my Honourable friends on the Opposite side not to be unfair in this matter,—if we stand and look back and consider how we have worked together during these past twelve months, I think we may, on both sides, congratulate ourselves on the measure of success which we have achieved. I gave the House certain figures in my speech last Monday in which I put the position in this way: that out of the total recommendations of the various Retrenchment Sub-Committees on the civil side amounting to 499 lakhs, we have actually accepted economies amounting to 433 lakhs; that is to say, economies to the extent of 87 per cent. of the recommendations. My Honourable friend the Leader of the Independent Party has put the position in a somewhat different way, and working on the figures, as he had them, he said that we had, as regards his own Committee, only accepted his recommendations to the extent of 50 per cent. I think that that is not quite a fair statement of the position. The position, as regards his own Committee, according to my figures is as follows: his Committee's total recommendations, excluding the 15 lakhs about which the Honourable the Mover spoke arising out of the Lee concessions, and which I treat as rather a separate matter, his Committee's recommendations amounted to 410 lakhs. Now, included in that 410 lakhs is a sum of 30 lakhs involved in the total abolition of the Ecclesiastical Department and, as I pointed out when we were debating this subject last November, it really is hardly fair to treat that as an ordinary retrenchment. As a matter of policy, you may say, "Abolish that Department" or as a matter of justice, you may say "This is a burden which ought not to fall on the Indian revenues", but it cannot be treated as an ordinary measure of retrenchment, nor could it be added to the total on which we have to show our results. Therefore, if I deduct that 30 lakhs, the total manageable retrenchment recommended by my Honourable friend's Sub-Committee comes down to 380 lakhs. Now, as against that, we have, as part of the measures of the retrenchment recommended by the Sub-Committee accepted measures producing economies of 249½ lakhs or say, 250 lakhs out of 380 lakhs. But that is not the whole picture. Honourable Members, who have studied this Summary which we circulated, will find on page 6, where all the figures are summarised, that in addition to the actual measures which represent the acceptance of recommendations of the various Sub-Committees, we have got the departments to accept economies this year totalling Rs. 87,81,000. Now, those savings are not in all cases permanent economies

but we can regard them as savings which will be effected this year, and which, in a sense, will hold the position until perhaps we have a chance of building up more permanent economies behind them. They must certainly be added to the total of our achievement and I quite justifiably included them in the total when I gave to the House the figure of 4,33 lakhs as the savings against the recommendations of all the Sub-Committees on civil expenditure. If I add a proportionate part of those 87 lakhs odd of additional economies to the 2,50 that we have achieved against the General Purposes Sub-Committee's recommendations, I get something like 3,20 lakhs against 3,80 which I call the sum of their effective recommendations. And that, I venture to put to the House, is a very effective response to the recommendations which they have made, especially when it is considered that in certain respects we have not yet had time to go fully into their recommendations, particularly under those headings which will be covered by their third Report, a Report which we have not yet received. That, Sir, I venture to put to the House, is the general picture. Economies of about 4,30 lakhs against recommendations of about 5 crores on the civil side, and on the military side total savings for the next Budget of 5½ crores, against recommendations as regards permanent economies which did not so far amount to quite 3 crores. I think we can say that if last year anybody had known that we were going to come before this House with results of that kind, I think it is fair to say that 90 per cent. of the Members of this House would have refused to believe that it was possible; and I do feel, as I have already said, that looking back on the broad picture of our achievement, that is something on which both sides of the House may congratulate themselves.

Now, Sir, among those who have criticised us, I think one may divide their criticisms under two heads. There is what I call the generally phrased criticism, which bases itself rather on well-known clichés such as "fat salaries at the top" and "top-heavy administration" and that sort of thing; and on the other side we have the very detailed criticisms such as some of those which my friend the Leader of the Independent Party made in the speech to which I am just replying. He for instance took two small examples, the case of the President of the Council of State and the case of the Public Services Commission. Well, I freely admit that these are both cases on which it is possible for an impartial observer to make very easy criticisms. On the face of it, there obviously is room for economy under these two heads, and I may tell the House that we are seriously considering means for reducing expenditure under these heads. But the steps in order to effect that reduction cannot be taken immediately, and in any case cannot be taken until there is some change in the tenure of the posts which are affected under the two heads. But the point which I really want to put to the House is that although these may be telling examples, they do not, in relation to the total of Government expenditure, amount to appreciable sums. And I think what I have said there applies really to most of the particular criticisms that have been made in the course of this debate. But I would turn back from these two small examples to the more general type of criticism, which is of the other kind which I described. Well, Sir, in that connection I fully agree with what has fallen from several speakers, both on this side and the other side of the House, as to the necessity with which the country is faced for a general reduction, if present economic conditions continue, in the scales of pay throughout the services. But when we are accused of not having effected sufficient economy at the top, or for

[Sir George Schuster.]

not having made sufficient cuts in the higher salaries, I do wish to remind the House of the figures which I gave them in the course of the last debates as to the amount which is involved in those higher salaries. I would remind the House that in the case of salaries of over Rs. 1,800 a month, the total bill of the Government on the civil side, including Posts and Telegraphs, is only 1,15 lakhs; and if you go down to Rs. 1,000 a month, the total bill again on the civil side, including Posts and Telegraphs, is only 1,95 lakhs. It is quite obvious from these figures that, however drastically you cut the salaries above those levels, it is not going to have a major effect on the Government's financial position. It is not going to make any appreciable difference in the burden of taxation as it has to be borne to-day. Then again when we are told, as my Honourable friend Mr. Das told us, that we have only scratched the surface, I would reply to him, what about the Retrenchment Committees? The various Retrenchment Committees working for a year and having a completely free hand, in spite of what anybody says, to look into every matter that came before them, have on the civil side only produced economy recommendations of 4,99 lakhs and we have met them by effecting actual economies of 4,33 lakhs. Even if we admit that the whole difference of 66 lakhs between these two figures might have been accepted by the Government, that again is not a sum on a scale which would appreciably have affected the present financial position. It would not have appreciably altered what we have to ask for in the way of new taxation and in fact no one would have felt any difference at all. I do think it is important that the proportion of figures about which we are talking should be realised.

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend who moved this motion raised a very great number of points into which I cannot possibly enter this evening. He made some particular criticisms about the way in which the retrenchment policy had been carried out and levelled some charges on those who were responsible for departmental action, which I very much regret to have heard coming from him. He told us that the system of classification, the system of the order in which we arranged that retirements should be effected, gave room for a great deal of variation and a great deal of jobbery and unfair discrimination. But if he has any charges to make in that respect, I would like him to come to me with them and let me have a chance of going into them. I can assure him that the matter has been very carefully attended to in each department. Each department had its selection committee to go into the matter; and as far as I know, one consideration and one consideration only has influenced a final decision, and that is to achieve the maximum economy consistent with efficiency. There has been no sort of influence of personal considerations, and as regards communal considerations the House already knows from the answers which I have given to repeated questions in the course of this session, that our orders have been that the communal proportion should be exactly preserved. If my friend has cases,—and he read out a large number and list of names—I hope he will give us an opportunity of going into them, because I do not like charges of that kind being made; and I am perfectly confident that if the cases are gone into, I can convince my Honourable friend that there has been nothing of the nature which he suspects in the selection of individuals for retirement.

Then, Sir, he raised the question of the terms of compensation to retrenched officials and there also my Honourable friend the Leader of the Independent Party had something to say. I do not wish to weary the House now with a full comparison of the terms of compensation which are being paid now and those which prevailed at the time of the Inchcape Committee. I only want to make two remarks. One of them is that if you have adequate compensation, adequate, that is to say, to satisfy all those who feel sentimental sympathy,—and it is very difficult to avoid feeling that sympathy for those whose posts are abolished,—if you are going to have compensation adequate in this sense, then you will get no retrenchment. You cannot, as I said before, “make omelettes without breaking eggs”. The other thing I want to say is this, that in the case of the Inchcape retrenchments, there was in fact surprisingly little retrenchment of personnel. Honourable Members, who care to study the effect of the Inchcape economies, will find that practically the whole of it was effected in the Army, and that as regards civil personnel, the numbers of personnel retrenched were very small. In that case there were given in certain cases terms more favourable than those which we are giving to-day, but those favourable terms applied only to staff in the Secretariat; and we came to the conclusion that that was an entirely unfair discrimination which ought not to be repeated in the present circumstances, where very much greater numbers of personnel are affected. I have already arranged, as I promised last week, to circulate to the House full particulars of the terms which are being offered. As I have had no detailed criticisms on those terms but merely a general complaint was made that they were less favourable than those recommended after the Inchcape retrenchments, I would invite Honourable Members to study those terms, and I think we may stand on them and feel that we have made out our case.

A good deal has been said this evening about the position in the Customs Department, and particularly as regards the payment of overtime fees. I do not know whether the House appreciated that these overtime fees, about which we have heard so much, actually cost the Government nothing. They are fees which the Government recover from the shipping interests for working overtime, and it has been the custom ever since the Customs Department was organised on its present lines, that men who were called upon to work overtime are entitled to a certain share of the benefit from those overtime fees: a certain share went to increase the pay of the staff and another part went to support beneficent institutions for the welfare of seamen. Now I think it is somewhat unreasonable to claim that a particular class of Government servants may be called upon not merely to put in their regular nine hours' work a day, but to hold themselves in readiness to be called upon to work at any time during the whole 24 hours. It is unreasonable to claim that they should be subjected to that sort of addition to their obligations without getting some financial compensation for it. I think it is also most unreasonable to say that when you have recruited a service on certain well understood terms, you should select that service and that service alone for a discriminating measure of retrenchment. We felt when we went into the case that it had become a recognised part of the terms on which the Customs service were engaged that they should be entitled to overtime fees on the scale which had become customary, and that the furthest we could go was to subject their benefits under that head to

[Sir George Schuster.]

the same cut as we were applying to the ordinary remuneration of Government servants. Whatever any one may think about the justice of instituting the original practice, it is quite certain that those men who are now serving had a legitimate expectation of those benefits, and we had to treat it as part of their ordinary conditions of service and refuse to discriminate against that particular form of remuneration. The whole of this question, as regards future entrants, is receiving very careful consideration, and we may be able to make some change in the conditions, but we have always got to remember this, that the conditions must be sufficiently attractive to attract the type of men that we want, and to guard the service, as has been most pertinently pointed out by my Honourable and gallant friend on my right, against the danger of corruption which might arise if the scale of remuneration was inadequate.

That brings me to one other important point, that is the question which has been raised as to what is to be done as regards the permanent scales of pay in the future. On that, I will say that the matter has been receiving the most careful attention of the Government, and I do not want to say more now than that I hope to be able to call a meeting of the main Retrenchment Committee some time before the end of this week, when the procedure for the further consideration of this question can be put before them. The matter certainly has not been ignored and no time has been wasted in conducting inquiries and in the consultation with the various interests concerned—departments, branches and Provincial Governments—which is necessary in order to deal with that question. In the meanwhile I would remind the House of what I told them the other day, that we are not prejudicing the future, for, since the 1st of July last year, all officers have been taken on on the distinct understanding that the terms are provisional and that they are not acquiring rights for the future on the existing scales of pay.

I think that I have taken sufficient time of the House in dealing with the more important points which I have selected. I should have liked if it had been possible to go through some of the points made by the Honourable the Mover and also to answer certain of the arguments which fell from my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmed, particularly as regards the Army expenditure. There is only one remark which I would make to him in conclusion, and as I have said little yet about Army expenditure, I may permit myself the time for doing so. My Honourable friend read to us some extracts from the Inchcape Committee's Report, and he said that what they wrote then is equally true to-day. He read extracts to the effect that the country cannot stand the burden of a Military Budget at the level which was referred to in that Report. But I would remind my Honourable friend of this, that when the Inchcape Committee reported, the military expenditure was something like 67½ crores, whereas to-day it has gone down to just over 46½ crores; and I think it is a little unfair to apply to that reduced expenditure the arguments which held good when the expenditure was more than 50 per cent. higher than it is to-day. I would also remind my Honourable friend, if he takes his stand on what the Inchcape Committee said, that the Inchcape Committee held out, as an ideal to be aimed at, a reduction of Army expenditure to something like 50 crores; and that whatever may happen in the future, we have at least in the next year got the expenditure down to 3½ crores below that figure. I think . . .

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: May I just point out

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I think my Honourable friend will excuse me if I do not give way; the time is short and the point is a simple one and I should like to finish. I do not say that if prices get lower than they are to-day, that it will not be necessary to seek still further economies. But I do say this; that we have at least done more than the Incheape Committee recommended and that, short of substantial reductions in troops, we can claim that Army expenditure has been cut down now to the minimum which is possible. My Honourable friend referred to expenditure before the war, and he made great play with the uselessness of non-effective charges; but unfortunately those non-effective charges, being charges for war pensions and ordinary pensions, are just the very charges which no man can reduce. The Government cannot avoid them, and it is very largely the increase of those charges which has increased Army expenditure since before the war.

In conclusion I must return to the main point which I have made, that if we look at the general picture, I think we may congratulate ourselves on the achievement of this year. But I would be the last person to say that we may rest content with that achievement, or that we should turn a deaf ear to the expressions of public opinion which we have heard in the course of this debate emphasising the urgent need for further reduction in public expenditure and the urgent need that we should not relax our efforts in attempting to get equilibrium on those lines.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: Sir, I have hardly time to reply to the weighty remarks of the Honourable the Finance Member. My main contention was that there was no other way except by retrenchment, by which we could attain our object of balancing the Budget or meeting the situation. I think the suggestion first came from the European Group; a year or two ago they first pressed for more retrenchment. In my speech I went through the details in order to show that there is enough room for further and more retrenchment, and now I shall only refer to a few points to reply to some of the points made by the speakers.

The Honourable Sir Fazli-i-Husain took us to task and said that the General Purposes Retrenchment Committee recommended that these scientific departments should be retrenched to the utmost possible limit. Here I will merely quote just a line from our Report to show the attitude that was taken by the representative of the Finance Department on our Committee to our proposals. On page 38 of our first Report it is stated—“Our official colleague, Mr. Nixon, holds that its expenditure should be reduced so as to cost not more than 9½ lakhs in all, but he has given no details of the scheme he has in view”.

Then I shall read from page 29 of the same Report to show that at every point it was the representative of the Finance Department who pressed for really killing these scientific departments. On the Geological Survey, this is what is stated in the Report: “Our official colleague, Mr. Nixon, however, urges that on grounds of financial necessity it should be closed down altogether for a term of years”.

Then again at page 43, in connection with other scientific departments, it will be seen that “Mr. Nixon, however, holds that this group of institutions should also be subjected to retrenchment in common with the departments of Government,” although we suggested that these scientific departments should not be touched. So, Sir, it is not so much the fault of

[Mr. S. C. Mitra.]

the General Purposes Committee as the pressure that was brought to bear upon the Committee's deliberations by the representative of the Finance Department that led us to suggest these large reductions in Scientific Departments.

As regards the point raised by my friend Sir Henry Gidney, I can only say that if really you would like to give more money to these people, why don't you in these days of unemployment recruit fresh men? Even men from his own community will be helped. Why should you give extra emoluments to whole-time servants for overwork? Then again if you work them overtime and make them also work at nights, certainly they will not be able to maintain their efficiency on the following day. It is certainly wrong on principle for Government to allow their officers to work over night.

Then as regards compensation to the retrenched officials, I think I showed that the Inchcape Committee's suggestion was that there should be an additional 20 per cent. enhanced pensions for the lower paid people, and of course it was given effect to. As regards compensation, even the Honourable Member himself in his first estimate made an allowance for roughly 20 per cent. for this purpose, but we find that it is now actually even less than 10 per cent.; that shows what was first considered as necessary compensation has been subsequently very much reduced.

Sir, with these remarks I close this debate, but I press my main point
5 P.M. for more retrenchment, and I think the House will agree with me and also vote for my motion.

Mr. President: The question I have to put is:

"That the Demand under the head 'Executive Council' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—47.

Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Abdur Rahim, Sir.
Aggarwal, Mr. Jagan Nath.
Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Bagla, Lala Rameshwar Prasad.
Bhuput Sing, Mr.
Biswas, Mr. C. C.
Chandi Mal Gola, Bhagat.
Chinoy, Mr. Rahimtoola M.
Das, Mr. A.
Das, Mr. B.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Ghuznavi, Mr. A. H.
Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
Gurjal, Mr. N. R.
Harbans Singh Brar, Sirdar.
Hari Raj Swarup, Lala.
Ibrahim Ali Khan, Lt Nawab
Muhammad.
Ismail Ali Khan. Kunwar Hajee.
Jadhav, Mr. B. V.
Jog, Mr. S. G.
Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Misra, Mr. B. N.
Mitra, Mr. S. C.

Mody, Mr. H. P.
Munshi, Mr. Jehangir K.
Murtuza Saheb Bahadur, Maulvi
Sayyid.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Pandit, Rao Bahadur S. R.
Patil, Rao Bahadur B. L.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Reddi, Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna.
Sadiq Hasan, Shaikh.
Sarda, Diwan Bahadur Harbilas.
Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Sen, Mr. S. C.
Sen, Pandit Satyendra Nath.
Singh, Mr. Goya Prasad.
Sitaramaraju, Mr. B.
Sohan Singh, Sirdar.
Suhrawardy, Sir Abdullah.
Sukhraj Rai, Rai Bahadur.
Thampan, Mr. K. P.
Uppi Saheb Bahadur, Mr.
Wilavatullah, Khan Bahadur H. M.
Yamin Khan, Mr. Muhammad.
Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—46.

Acott, Mr. A. S. V.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Allah Baksh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Malik.
 Allison, Mr. F. W.
 Anklesaria, Mr. N. N.
 Azizuddin Ahmad Bilgrami, Qazi.
 Bajpai, Mr. R. S.
 Banerji, Mr. Rajnarayan.
 Brown, Mr. R. R.
 Clow, Mr. A. G.
 Cocke, Sir Hugh.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crerar, The Honourable Sir James.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.
 Fox, Mr. H. B.
 French, Mr. J. C.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.
 Gwynne, Mr. C. W.
 Heathcote, Mr. L. V.
 Howell, Sir Evelyn.
 Ishwarsingji, Nawab Naharsingji.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar.

Lal Chand, Hony. Captain Rao
 Bahadur Chaudhri.
 Macqueen, Mr. P.
 Moore, Mr. Arthur.
 Morgan, Mr. G.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur S. C.
 Nixon, Mr. J. C.
 Noyce, Sir Frank.
 Rafiuddin Ahmad, Khan Bahadur
 Maulvi.
 Rainy, The Honourable Sir George.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rama Rao, Diwan Bahadur U.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Ryan, Mr. T.
 Sahi, Mr. Ram Prashad Narayan.
 Schuster, The Honourable Sir George.
 Seaman, Mr. C. K.
 Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar,
 Captain.
 Studd, Mr. E.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tait, Mr. John.
 Wood, Sir Edgar.
 Young, Mr. G. M.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 16th March, 1932.