

Monday, 7th November, 1932

**THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

VOLUME VI, 1932

(7th November to 28th November, 1932)

FOURTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,

1932



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1933

Est. B. L. A. N. H.

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.

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

MR. G. MORGAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, C.I.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. G. MORGAN, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. C. S. RANGA IYER, M.L.A.

SIR ABDULLA-AL-MAMUN SUHRAWARDY, KT., M.L.A.

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

CONTENTS.

VOLUME VI.—7th November to 28th November, 1932.

	PAGES.
MONDAY, 7TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Members Sworn	1677
Questions and Answers	1677—1718
Short Notice Question and Answer	1719—22
Death of Sir Ali Imam	1722—26
Governor General's Assent to Bills	1726
Statements laid on the Table	1727—31
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Presentation of the Report • of the Select Committee	1731
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion not concluded	1731—62
TUESDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	1763—1803
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion not concluded	1803—45
WEDNESDAY, 9TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Member Sworn	1847
Questions and Answers	1847—89
Statements laid on the Table	1890—96
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion not concluded	1896—1938
THURSDAY, 10TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Discussion postponed	1939—70
Statement of Business	1970
MONDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER, 1932—	
Questions and Answers	1971—2020
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2020—29
Statements laid on the Table	2029—33
The Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill—Presenta- tion of the Report of the Select Committee	2033
The Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages (Supplementary) Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider adjourned	2033—48
Appendix	2049

TUESDAY, 15TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2051—87
The Bengal Suppression of Terrorist Outrages (Supplementary) Bill—Consideration postponed	2087—90
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2090—2101, 2102—32
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa	2101—02

WEDNESDAY, 16TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2133—67
Presentation of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee	2167—83
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2184—99, 2200—30
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa	2200

MONDAY, 21ST NOVEMBER, 1932—

Members Sworn	2231
Questions and Answers	2231—74
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2275—82
Statements laid on the Table	2282—85
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Time for submission of Report extended	2286
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Motion to consider adopted	2286—2321
Appendix	2322

TUESDAY, 22ND NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2323—53
Short Notice Questions and Answers	2353—59
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2359—2401

WEDNESDAY, 23RD NOVEMBER, 1932—

Questions and Answers	2403—12
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2412—62
Committee on Petitions	2432

THURSDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Short Notice Question and Answer	2463—68
Statements laid on the Table	2468—77
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2478—2528

MONDAY, 28TH NOVEMBER, 1932—

Member Sworn	2529
Questions and Answers	2529—64
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2564—66
Statements laid on the Table	2566—67
The Criminal Law Amendment Bill— <i>Continued</i>	2568—2610
Resolution <i>re</i> Trade Agreement signed at Ottawa—Presenta- tion of the Report of the Special Committee	2610

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 7th November, 1932.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber of the Council House in New Delhi at Eleven of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola) in the Chair.

MEMBERS SWORN.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore, K.C.I.E., C.B.E. (Member for Commerce and Railways); Mr. Arthur Moore, M.B.E., M.L.A. (Bengal: European); Mr. E. H. M. Bower, I.S.O., M.L.A. (Nominated Non-Official); Mr. David Burnett Meek, C.B.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official); Mr. Bryce Chudleigh Burt, C.I.E., M.B.E., M.L.A. (Government of India: Nominated Official); Mr. Guru Saday Dutt, M.L.A. (Bengal: Nominated Official); Khan Bahadur Abul Hasnat Muhammad Abdul Hye, M.L.A. (Bengal: Nominated Official); Mr. Pradyumana Prashad Singh, M.L.A. (Bihar and Orissa: Nominated Official); and Mr. Charles William Dunn, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Burma: Nominated Official).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

INDIANISATION RECOMMENDED BY THE LEE COMMISSION ON THE COMPANY-MANAGED RAILWAYS.

852. *Mr. Uppl Sahab Bahadur: Are Government prepared to take immediate steps to enforce the policy of Indianisation to the full extent recommended by the Lee Commission on all the Company-managed Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Government have, from time to time, drawn the attention of the Company-managed Railways to the undertaking given to carry out the policy of Indianisation, and the question of taking further measures in this direction will be considered again on receipt of a special report on the subject expected in December next.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to say how far effect has been given to the Lee Commission's recommendations with regard to the State Railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I believe effect was given to the Lee Commission's recommendations in 1924.

REDUCTION OF THE CLERICAL STAFF OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

853. ***Mr. S. G. Jog** (on behalf of Mr. Bhuput Sing): (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the strength of the clerical staff of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee has been reduced as a measure of economy?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the strength of the clerical staff on the 31st March, 1932, and the present strength, and the composition by communities and provinces in each case?

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

(b) The strength of the clerical staff on 31st March, 1932, was seven, of whom six were Hindus and one Muhammadan. This staff consisted of five men from Madras and one each from Bengal and the Punjab. Since 1st April, 1932, the number of permanent staff has been reduced to three, all being Hindus from Madras.

REMOVAL OF THE OFFICE OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE FROM CALCUTTA TO VIZAGAPATAM.

854. ***Mr. S. G. Jog** (on behalf of Mr. Bhuput Sing): (a) Is it a fact that the office of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee was transferred in April last from Calcutta to Vizagapatam, the native place of Sir B. N. Sarma, the President? If so, why?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, why has the change not yet been notified to the public?

(c) Why was the change of headquarters effected?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a), (b) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to Mr. Thampan's question No. 648 on the 22nd September, 1932.

POST OF THE CHIEF CLERK OF THE RAILWAY RATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

855. ***Mr. S. G. Jog** (on behalf of Mr. Bhuput Sing): (a) Is it a fact that Mr. A. Natesan, the present Chief Clerk of the Railway Rates Advisory Committee, is the holder of a permanent pensionable post under the Government of Madras?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, what are the reasons for keeping this man?

(c) Are Government prepared to take steps to select for this post a suitable and qualified person from amongst those discharged from the Railway Board's office and the different railways as a measure of retrenchment and to revert Mr. A. Natesan to his permanent post under the Government of Madras?

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

(b) and (c). I am informed that he has been kept on in the interests of work as particularly experienced and useful.

ALLOCATION OF SEATS IN THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES APPENDED TO THE COMMUNAL AWARD.

856. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Will Government be pleased to state the population of the classes and communities, whose voters will elect in each province the members shown in the column "General" of the statement of allocation of seats in the provincial legislatures appended to the communal decision?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given by Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar to part (a) of Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's unstarred question No. 57 on the 19th September, 1932.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state why the word "General" is used instead of using the expressions, "Hindus", etc.?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: That is the expression which His Majesty's Government chose.

MUSLIM POPULATION OF ASSAM.

857. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Will Government be pleased to state the population of Muslims in Assam, and their proportion to the total population?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: The Muslim population of Assam is 2,755,914 or approximately 30 per cent. of the total population.

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF THE CONSTITUENCY CALLED "LABOUR SPECIAL" IN EACH PROVINCE.

858. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Will Government give the communal composition of the constituency called "Labour Special" in each province?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to the third part of Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's unstarred question No. 57 on the 19th September, 1932.

COMPOSITION OF THE CONSTITUENCY OF "COMMERCE, INDUSTRY AND MINING" IN BENGAL.

859. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Will Government be pleased to state how the constituency of "Commerce, Industry and Mining" in Bengal is composed, and what is the proportion of European voters in these constituencies in Bengal?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to the fourth part of Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's unstarred question No. 57 on the 19th September, 1932.

NON-RESERVATION OF SPECIAL SEATS FOR THE DEPRESSED CLASSES IN THE PUNJAB.

860. *Bhai Parma Nand: (a) Are the Depressed Classes in the Punjab included among the Hindu population of that province?

(b) If not, why is it that no special seats are reserved for them in the Legislature?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: (a) The majority of the Depressed Classes in the Punjab were returned as Hindu, the balance being returned as Ad-Dharmi.

(b) Under the Poona Agreement which has been accepted by His Majesty's Government, the Depressed Classes have been allotted eight seats in the Punjab Legislative Council.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: Will the Honourable Member kindly give us his definition of Depressed Classes?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: It is impossible to define Depressed Classes without going into the matter province by province.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: To whose decision will that classification be left?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: The Local Government.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Will members of the Depressed Classes continue to belong to the category of Depressed Classes when they are converted to Christianity?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I should think not.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Why not?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: Because Indian Christians have been classified separately.

Dr. F. X. DeSouza: Is there any justification for not giving them their economic status as Depressed Classes and giving them the privileges appertaining to the Depressed Classes, simply because they have adopted Christianity?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: The Depressed Classes are regarded for the purposes of His Majesty's Government's decision as part of the Hindu community. As to who should be regarded as Depressed Classes in any particular province is a matter which will be decided by the Provincial Government.

Mr. K. Ahmed: In view of the fact that the Honourable the Law Member has failed to define the Depressed Classes to distinguish them from the Hindus, do Government, particularly the Government of India, realise that it is incumbent on them before the separation is caused to define these people?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I could not follow the question.

Mr. K. Ahmed: For the benefit of the Law Member, I repeat the question, Sir. In view of the fact that it is they who have separated one class from another and in view of the fact that the separation is admitted by the Honourable Member himself, cannot they define and classify one class of people from the other?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I should have thought the question had better be put to the signatories to the Poona Agreement.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Are Government aware that the Franchise Committee has mentioned *Halalkhor*, which is a part of the Muslim community, amongst the Depressed Classes?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: At the moment I confess it is not present to my mind. I do not remember what the Franchise Committee said on that particular point.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Will the Honourable Member please see the reports of the Franchise Committee?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I shall.

Mr. K. Ahmed: In view of the fact that the Honourable the Law Member has not clearly and accurately answered the question on the definition of the Depressed Classes and in view of the fact that somebody else in Whitehall or in the British Cabinet have divided these people, do I understand that the Government of India are unable to realise the fate of these people who have been separated from each other?

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: By whom are these people depressed and how?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: By the Caste Hindus, by caste rules.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: Are the Muhammadans mentioned by my friend, Mr. Maswood Ahmad, depressed by the caste Hindus?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: I have already answered in reply to Mr. Maswood that I do not remember what has been said by the Franchise Committee. Therefore I cannot answer these questions.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: There are no Depressed Classes among the Mussalmans and the Franchise Committee have not included any Mussalman in the category of the Depressed Classes.

Bhai Parma Nand: Are Government aware that there is some discontent among the lower classes among Sikhs and Mussalmans and even Christians, because they have not been given separate representation in the Punjab?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: Government are not aware of it.

**RETRENCHMENT OF HINDU CLERKS BY THE CHIEF ACCOUNTS OFFICER,
NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.**

861. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) Is it a fact that 26 Hindu clerks were retrenched on the 15th August by the Chief Accounts Officer, North Western Railway, Lahore?

(b) Is it a fact that some of the retrenched clerks held permanent posts and had been taken after they had passed proper competitive tests?

(c) Is it a fact that some of them had held permanent posts in other Government offices and were given pensionable appointments, their service having been treated as transferred from one department to another?

(d) Is it a fact that their juniors of other communities have been kept on?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) 16 clerks were originally retrenched, but it has been found possible to reinstate them since.

(b) Yes.

(c) I understand one held a permanent post in another Government Office.

(d) Does not arise, in view of my reply to part (a).

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Is it a fact that prior to the 15th August many clerks of other communities were retrenched, and still Muslims are very poorly represented in that Department?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I must ask for notice.

INQUIRY INTO THE HIGH EXPENDITURE ON THE KANGRA VALLEY RAILWAY.

962. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** Will Government please state:

(a) the original estimated cost of the Kangra Valley Railway,

(b) the actual expenditure incurred on the construction of this railway,

(c) whether any committee was appointed in 1980 with Mr. M. L. Brayshay and others, to enquire into the unexpected high expenditure thus incurred,

(d) if so, with what result,

(e) whether Government will please lay a copy of this report on the table of this House,

(f) whether this committee examined any non-official and private witnesses, or examined any contractors who had done work on this construction,

(g) whether the examination was limited to Railway and other officials only, and

(h) the method of enquiry?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) 184 lakhs.

(b) The latest estimate is about 295 lakhs.

(c) Yes. The committee consisted of Mr. M. W. Brayshay as Chairman, Dr. W. R. Horn, Mr. A. N. J. Harrison and Mr. C. Tedman as Members.

(d) and (e). A copy of their report is in the Library.

(f) No.

(g) Yes.

(h) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to paragraph 3 of the Report.

DISPUTES OVER ARREAR PAYMENTS, ETC., BETWEEN THE CONTRACTORS AND THE KANGRA VALLEY RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION.

863. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government please state:

(a) whether there were, or are, any disputes on the point of arrear payments or work done, between any contractors and the Kangra Valley Railway authorities;

(b) if so, how many cases, with their nature and names of contractors;

(c) how many and which of these cases have been settled by the Railway authorities (i) out of court, and (ii) in the court;

(d) how many of them are still pending and at what stages, giving names of contractors;

(e) what allegations were made by these contractors when putting forth their claims; and

(f) how much money has already been spent by the Railway on these litigations, and how much more they expect to spend to settle these cases?

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

(b) Three-Durrell and Company, Rai Bahadur Panna Lal and Balwant Singh.

(c) None have yet been settled either in or out of Court.

(d) The first two are, I understand, pending in the Court of the Senior Sub-Judge, Dharamsala, and the third which was before another Sub-Judge is under reference to the High Court.

(e) As the cases are before the Courts at present, Government are unable to make any statement on the facts.

(f) The amount spent already is Rs. 4,000. I am unable to say at present how much more it will cost.

CLAIMS PUT FORWARD BY CONTRACTORS AGAINST THE KANGRA VALLEY RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION.

864. *Bhai Parma Nand: (a) Are Government aware that on account of the facts that unusually high expenditure has been incurred on the construction of the Kangra Valley Railway, and that a number of claims

have been put forward by some contractors against them, a good deal of bad impression and public scandal about the Railway administration have been created?

(b) Will Government please state whether there are any objections to the Railway administration getting these cases of claims by the contractors settled by compromise through arbitration as suggested by paragraph 45 of the North Western Railway Hand Book, 1924 edition?

(c) Will Government please state what has been the result of one such case of claim against the Kangra Valley Railway that has recently been decided in the court of the Senior Sub-Judge at Lahore?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) No.

(b) The contract agreements entered into with these contractors contain a clause admitting of Arbitration on certain conditions; but the contractors, I am informed, now wish to depart from these conditions and the North Western Railway Administration have been advised that, to protect their interests, the claims should be dealt with in a Court of law.

(c) It is under appeal.

CALLING OF TENDERS FOR THE AUCTION OF OLD SLEEPERS BY THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

865. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government please state:

- (a) whether the North Western Railway authorities called for this year tenders for the auction at different stations of old sleepers and timber scrap for the period 1932-1934;
- (b) whether it is a fact that K. B. Adamjee Mamoojee of Rawalpindi had been doing this auction work for the last many years;
- (c) whether it is a fact that the above firm tendered this year a rate of Re. 0-10-0 per cent. for miscellaneous stores, and Re. 0-12-0 per cent. for sleepers;
- (d) whether it is a fact that another firm, named R. B. Seth Chadi Ram Devi Sahai Jain of Ferozepur Cantonment tendered a rate of Re. 0-11-0 per cent.;
- (e) whether it is a fact that a third firm, named Messrs. Jamsatjee's Sons, of Lahore, had tendered a rate of Rs. 2-0-0 per cent., which is the highest rate of all the tenders;
- (f) whether it is a fact that the railway authorities accepted this highest rate and rejected the lowest one, mentioned in part (e) above, and others that were lower than the highest rate;
- (g) whether there were any special considerations in accepting the dearest rate of a comparatively new tenderer and rejecting the cheapest rate of an old contractor of the department; and
- (h) if so, what those reasons or considerations were?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have called for certain further information and on receipt will lay it on the table in due course.

CONTRACTORS FOR SELLING ICE AND SODA AT DIFFERENT STATIONS AND IN RUNNING TRAINS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

866. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government please state:

- (a) the names of the firms who have contracts for selling ice and soda at different stations and in running trains on the North Western Railway;
- (b) whether any owners of ice factories sent in their tenders giving their names;
- (c) if so, what are the reasons for which their tenders were not accepted;
- (d) how many of the present contractors are factory owners; and
- (e) the reasons why owners of factories situated on their line are not given contracts?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) The Central Aerated Gas Company, Lahore; the Ganga Ice Factory, Lahore Cantonment; Messrs. Manohar Lal & Bros., Ambala; Messrs. Bliss & Co., Karachi.

(b), (c) and (e). A licensee is appointed for each of the four areas into which the North Western Railway system is divided for the purpose of selling ice and aerated waters at stations and on running trains during the hot weather months. At the end of this period, all complaints received against the licensees are examined, and if it is found that the work of a licensee has been unsatisfactory, applications are invited from aerated water manufacturers for the next season by advertisements. No applications were invited for the 1932 season, as the work of the licensees during the 1931 season was satisfactory.

(d) All.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Who examines the complaints that are made? Is it an officer or any committee consisting of Indians and merchants?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I believe the complaints must be examined by somebody on behalf of the administration. If the Honourable Member wants precise information on the point, I should ask him to put down a question.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I should like to know it.

FACTORIES MANUFACTURING HOLLOW GLASSWARE SITUATED ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

867. *Bhai Parma Nand: Will Government please state:

- (a) the names of factories manufacturing hollow glassware situated on the North Western Railway;
- (b) whether any glassware is purchased from these factories;
- (c) if so, what is the percentage of quantities so purchased and the names of factories;
- (d) whether whole quantities of a particular item, required by the department, are purchased from these factories, or only a portion;

- (e) if only a portion is purchased, the reasons for taking this step;
- (f) whether the Railway Department was satisfied with the supplies made by any of these factories;
- (g) if so, whether the department took any steps to encourage these factories and thus help the growth of the glass industry in India;
- (h) whether the department uses glass cells and battery jars;
- (i) if so, whether these articles are purchased from these factories or imported from abroad;
- (j) if they are purchased from abroad, the reasons why orders for these articles are not placed with these factories; and
- (k) whether they are prepared to consider the question of purchasing these articles from Indian factories?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The following factories situated on the North Western Railway are registered on the books of the Indian Stores Department for the supply of hollow glassware:

- (1) The Upper India Glass Works, Ambala City.
- (2) The Amritsar Glass Works, Amritsar.

(b) Yes. Glass for Pine Moon and Washington Lamps are purchased from the Upper India Glass Works by the North Western Railway.

(c) and (d). The full requirements of Pine Moon Chimneys and Globes for Washington Lamps for the 1932-33 have been purchased by the North Western Railway from the Upper India Glass Works.

(e) The North Western Railway requirements of clear glass globes were accepted from other manufacturers on the basis of price.

(f) Yes.

(g) Yes.

(h) Yes.

(i) Glass cells and battery jars purchased by the Indian Stores Department are almost entirely of Indian manufacture. Imported cells and jars are purchased only when suitable substitutes of indigenous manufacture are not available.

(j) and (k). Do not arise.

PURCHASE OF GLASS CELLS AND BATTERY JARS FOR THE TELEGRAPH AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

865. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** Will Government please state:

- (a) whether glass cells and battery jars, used in large quantities by the Telegraph and other departments, are purchased from factories in India or imported from abroad;
- (b) if they are imported from abroad, why these articles cannot be purchased from Indian manufacturers; and
- (c) whether they are prepared to consider the question of placing orders in future with glass factories in India?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) and (b). The battery jars and glass cells required for primary batteries purchased for the Posts and Telegraphs Department are entirely of Indian manufacture. Glass cells for secondary batteries

are ordinarily purchased as parts of complete batteries. Very few glass boxes are required for replacement and these are not manufactured in India owing to the demand being limited. I have not complete particulars for other departments, but the orders entrusted by them to the Stores Department have all been placed with Indian manufacturers.

(c) Does not arise.

DUMPING OF HOLLOW AND OTHER GLASSWARES INTO INDIA.

869. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Are Government aware:

- (a) that large quantities of hollow and other glasswares are being dumped into India, owing to the depreciation of the Japanese *yen* in relation to the Indian rupee; and
- (b) that this alarming state of affairs is seriously affecting the very existence of the glass industry in this country?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: (a) and (b). There has been some increase in the imports of glass and glassware from Japan during recent months, but I am not prepared to say that it is either alarming or seriously affecting the existence of the glass industry in India.

REPORT OF THE TARIFF BOARD ON THE GLASS INDUSTRY.

870. ***Bhai Parma Nand**: Will Government please state:

- (a) whether the report of the Tariff Board on the glass industry has been published for the information of the public;
- (b) whether any action has already been taken by Government on this report of the Tariff Board; and
- (c) whether, in view of the alarming situation created by the depreciation of the Japanese *yen*, Government propose to consider the advisability, by way of emergency measure, of referring the report back to the Tariff Board, to allow the Board to amend their views and recommendations in the light of this new situation that has arisen unexpectedly since they submitted their report to Government?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given to his question No. 310 on the 16th September, 1932, and to which I have nothing to add.

INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION OF MUSLIMS IN THE INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT, PUNJAB.

871. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): (a) Is it a fact that in the Punjab, Mussalmans are very inadequately represented in the Income-tax Department and specially so in the higher grades?

(b) Is it a fact that as a result of the repeated representations of the Punjab Mussalmans and by way of reply to several questions on the floor of this House, Government have, on more than one occasion, promised to redress the grave communal inequalities in the Income-tax Department?

(c) If so, what steps have Government taken in this particular? Will Government be pleased to place before this House a statement of the result of their endeavours?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: (a) I lay on the table a statement showing the present composition of the staff,

(b) Assurances have, I think, been given that the regular policy of Government in regard to the selection of new recruits would be followed.

(c) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply, laid on the table, to starred question No. 1025 asked by Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin on the 29th March, 1932.

Communal composition of the gasetted and non-gasetted staff of the Income-tax Department, Punjab, on the 31st December, 1931.

	Total number of posts.	Number held by Muslims.
Assistant Commissioners	*3	..
Income-tax Officers	30	6
Inspectors	34	10
Clerks	161	46

*The three Assistant Commissioners are for the Punjab, North-West Frontier and Delhi Provinces.

MUSLIM PERCENTAGE OF THE PERMANENT INCOME-TAX OFFICERS AND ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS IN THE PUNJAB.

872. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): What is the Muslim percentage of the permanent Income-tax Officers and Assistant Commissioners in the Punjab? How far does that percentage fall short of their population ratio?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: A statement giving the required information is laid on the table.

Statement showing the communal composition of Income-tax Officers and Assistant Commissioners in the Punjab Income-tax Department on 31st December, 1931.

	Total number of posts.	Number held by Muslims.	Per-centage.	Per-centage of Muslims to total popula-tion.	Deficiency on a comparison of (3) and (4).
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Assistant Commissioners of In-come-tax.	3*	56.5	56.5%
Income-tax Officers	30	6	20%	56.5	36.5%

*The three Assistant Commissioners are for Punjab, North-West Frontier and Delhi Provinces.

MUSLIM INCOME-TAX OFFICERS IN THE PUNJAB.

873. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): What is the number of Income-tax Officers in the Punjab appointed by direct recruitment and by departmental promotions since 1927 and how many of them in each category are Mussalmans?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: By direct recruitment, none of any community. By promotion, three; none of these was a Muslim.

APPOINTMENT OF MUSLIM ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INCOME-TAX IN THE PUNJAB.

874. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): (a) Since its organisation as a separate department, is there any one instance of the appointment of a Muslim Assistant Commissioner in the Income-tax Department of the Punjab?

(b) If so, how long has any such held office? If not, what reasons have Government to advance for such treatment?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: (a) No.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to question No. 702 by Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah.

APPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS OF INCOME-TAX IN THE AMALGAMATED CADRE OF THE PUNJAB, NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE AND DELHI.

875. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Mr. Muhammad Muazzam Sahib Bahadur): (a) Is it a fact that at present all the three appointments of Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax in the amalgamated cadre of the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province and Delhi are held one by a Hindu, another by a Sikh and the third by a Christian to the complete exclusion of the Mussalmans?

(b) If so, are Government prepared to take early and effective action to appoint a Muslim as an Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: (a) Yes.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I gave to part (b) of question No. 702 by Khan Bahadur Makhdum Syed Rajan Bakhsh Shah.

ORDERS FOR SUSPENSION OF PROMOTIONS, APPOINTMENTS, ETC., IN THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

876. ***Shalkh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Will Government please state if any orders were issued in 1930 to suspend all sorts of promotions, appointments, etc., in the Railway Department, and orders were also issued for making reference to the Employment Officer, Lahore when such vacancies occur? If so, were these orders strictly observed by all the officers on the North Western Railway, especially in the Multan Division?

(b) Is it a fact that the Agent's Office took no action when recommendations for confirming certain clerks were sent by the Divisional Superintendent, Multan Division, but on the other hand his action was confirmed? Will Government please state reasons for the disregard of the Railway Board's orders?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I presume my Honourable friend is referring to the orders issued by the Agent, North Western Railway, in 1980, to his subordinate offices that no vacancies should be filled by recruitment of outsiders unless absolutely necessary and that all permanent vacancies should be referred to the Employment Officer who would endeavour to meet any demands for staff from a waiting list of staff previously discharged. Orders were also issued in 1981, in order to employ every method to save discharges, that all vacancies should be filled by surplus staff wherever available in the grade or class in which they occurred before promotions could be permitted. Government have no reason to think that the instructions issued by the Agent were not followed by his subordinate offices.

(b) In the absence of information as to the particular case referred to, the Agent has not been able to give a definite reply to this question.

EMPLOYMENT OF TWO BROTHERS IN THE DIVISIONAL OFFICE, MULTAN, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

877. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Will Government please state if the rules regarding non-employment of two brothers in one office are applicable in the Railway Department; if not, why not?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government state whether men bearing such relationship are employed in the Divisional Office at Multan? If so, why?

(c) Is it a fact that this matter was represented by an employee in 1981 and the then Divisional Personnel Officer passed orders that this matter be referred to the Agent, but as the officer who passed these orders was transferred a few days after, his successor Mr. A. C. Chatterji, Officiating Divisional Personnel Officer, cancelled the orders stating that it was an unnecessary reference?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I am not aware of any rule forbidding such employment,

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

CANCELLATION OF THE ORDERS OF PROMOTION OF BABU SHANKAR DASS BY THE OFFICIATING DIVISIONAL PERSONNEL OFFICER, MULTAN DIVISION, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

878. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** Will Government please state if Divisional Personnel Officers on the North Western Railway are authorised to cancel orders of the Divisional Superintendent without the latter's approval? If the reply be in the negative, will the Honourable Member please ask for remarks from the Divisional Personnel Officer, Multan Division, why the orders of promotion of Babu Shankar Dass, once approved by the Divisional Superintendent, were cancelled by Mr. A. C. Chatterji, Officiating Divisional Personnel Officer, without the approval of the Divisional Superintendent?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. As regards the second part, orders of promotion of B. Shankar Dass were issued by Mr. A. C. Chatterjee's predecessor with the concurrence of the Divisional Superintendent. On a further representation being made to Mr. Chatterjee these orders were reversed by him. This action was upheld later by the Divisional Superintendent, but Mr. Chatterjee was informed that the original orders, having been approved by the Divisional Superintendent should not have been altered without his prior approval.

REMOVAL OF THE MUSLIM HEAD CLERK, STAFF A, FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE, LAHORE, BEFORE COMPLETION OF HIS USUAL TERM.

879. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Is it a fact that head clerks in the Post Master General's Office, Lahore, are changed after every three years?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the present Muslim head clerk was removed before the completion of the term of three years?

Mr. T. Ryan: With your permission, Sir, I propose to deal with question Nos. 879, 880 and 881 together.

These questions relate to the filling of particular clerical appointments in the office of the Postmaster General, Punjab. This is a matter within the competence of the Postmaster General, Punjab, to whom a copy of the Honourable Member's question is being sent.

Government have no information on the subject.

REMOVAL OF THE MUSLIM HEAD CLERK, STAFF A, FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE, LAHORE, BEFORE COMPLETION OF HIS USUAL TERM.

†880. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Is it a fact that after the amalgamation of the traffic section with the staff A section in the Postmaster General's Office, Lahore, the head clerks of staff A have never been traffic men?

(b) Is it a fact that there is no rule, regulation or office order binding upon the head clerk staff A to be a traffic man?

(c) Is it a fact that the Muslim head clerk staff A had been replaced by a Hindu head clerk of traffic branch on the plea that the Assistant Postmaster General in charge did not know traffic work?

(d) If the replies to the above be in the affirmative, will Government please state what was the necessity for removing the Muslim head clerk before the completion of his term of three years?

REMOVAL OF THE MUSLIM HEAD CLERK, STAFF A, FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE, LAHORE, BEFORE COMPLETION OF HIS USUAL TERM.

†881. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Is it a fact that the Engineering Branch work has also been amalgamated with the staff A section in the Postmaster General's Office, Lahore, and that both the present Assistant Postmaster General and the present head clerk have no experience of that work?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government kindly state fully the reasons and the circumstances which necessitated the removal of a Muslim head clerk?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 879

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF PERSONS HOLDING SELECTION GRADE POSTS IN
KASHMIR AND MULTAN POSTAL DIVISIONS.

882. *Shaikh Sadiq Hasan: Will Government please intimate how many selection grade posts in the Kashmir and Multan Postal Divisions are sanctioned, and how many of them are held by Muslims and non-Muslims separately?

Mr. T. Ryan: Seven selection grade posts are sanctioned for Kashmir Division and nine for the Multan Division. One such post in each Division is held by a Muslim, one is vacant in the Multan Division and the remainder are held by non-Muslims. Appointments to such posts are made by promotion to which the rule regarding communal representation does not apply.

PAUCITY OF MUSLIM HEAD CLERKS IN THE CIRCLE OFFICE, LAHORE.

883. *Shaikh Sadiq Hasan: (a) Will Government state how many posts of head clerks are held by Hindus and Muslims in the Circle Office, Lahore?

(b) What are the reasons for the paucity of Muslims in these posts and what do Government propose to do to redress the grievances of Muslims with respect to these posts?

Mr. T. Ryan: (a) Of fourteen such posts including the post of Assistant Manager, Stock Depot, two are (or will shortly be) held by Muslims, the rest are held by Hindus.

(b) These head clerkships are selection grade posts, promotion to which is not made on communal grounds.

PAY OF STOREMEN IN THE INDIAN ARMY ORDNANCE CORPS.

884. *Shaikh Sadiq Hasan: (a) Is it a fact that on appointment as Storemen in the Indian Army Ordnance Corps the permanent routine division clerks have been granted lower rates of pay than the extra temporary clerks and other temporary men of the department?

(b) Is it correct that the temporary men were holding an "extra temporary" status, terminable by a formal discharge each year and that they could not qualify in the departmental examination held every year and thus remained unqualified for years, working mostly in one group and thereby acquiring knowledge of the items particular to that group?

(c) Is it a fact that the permanent routine division clerks were holding permanent status and that they qualified by passing the departmental examination and remained serving in different groups and branches at different stations, thereby acquiring a wider knowledge than the temporary men?

(d) Is it a fact that the error of fixing lower rates of pay for the routine division clerk was referred to the Director of Ordnance Services (head of the department) by more than five establishments, and each of the establishments represented even more than four times?

(e) Is it a fact that the Government of India did not grant the equality of rates of pay on the grounds that on appointment as storemen the status of the routine division clerks has been improved, and that they have also

chances of future promotion to the post of Assistant Storekeeper and to pensionary benefits?

(f) Is it not a fact that the status of temporary men has been much more improved on appointment as storemen and have they not been granted also chances of promotion to Assistant Storekeeper and pensionary benefits? If so, why have they been granted higher rates of pay than the routine division clerks?

(g) Why have the temporary men been granted better prospects and higher rates of pay than the route division clerks?

(h) Is it a fact that temporary men with four years extra temporary service have been appointed on Rs. 66 per mensem and that routine division clerks with four years permanent service plus even temporary service have been granted Rs. 50 per mensem? If so, why?

(i) Is it a fact that the temporary men with four years temporary service shall have to serve four years and that a permanent routine division clerk with four years permanent service 12 years, towards reaching the qualifying rates of pay for promotion to Assistant Storekeeper (*viz.*, Rs. 80)?

(j) In basing the seniority roll of storemen, did not the Director of Ordnance Services take into account the permanent service of the routine division clerks towards seniority? If not, why not? Is it a fact that the period of service is the criterion of seniority among clerks in the Indian Army Ordnance Corps and other sister establishments, and, if so, why have temporary men been placed senior to the permanent men?

(k) Why were the temporary men given antedated appointments from 8th November, 1930? Is it a fact that they were not actually appointed before 1st December, 1930 (the date when the appointment letter reached the arsenals), and why have the routine division clerks been disallowed to avail themselves of the above concession?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) On appointment as storemen, permanent routine division clerks and temporary men of the department are both admitted to the same grade of pay, namely, Rs. 50—4—90. Most of the temporary men are not clerks, but generally perform duties similar to those of storemen.

(b) The pay of temporary men is met from a grant commonly called the "extra temporary" grant controlled by the Director of Ordnance Services. Like temporary men in other departments under Government, they are liable to discharge after due notice. They are not required to pass any departmental examination.

(c) The position is as stated, but I can not agree with the Honourable Member that permanent routine division clerks necessarily possess a wider knowledge than temporary employees of the department. The work of a routine division clerk is generally not such as to qualify him to perform the duties of a storeman.

(d) to (j). Representations have been received, but, as I have already stated, the grade of pay for both classes on appointment as storemen is the same. It is possible that by virtue of his temporary service a temporary man may receive an initial rate of pay higher than that of a routine division

clerk promoted storeman. The rate of increment and maximum pay, however, remain the same for both classes. Government do not consider that any change in the existing rules is necessary.

(k) Because temporary men were actually performing the duties of storemen on the 8th November, 1930, whereas the routine division clerks were not.

INTRODUCTION OF MERIT ROLL FOR STOREMEN IN THE INDIAN ARMY ORDNANCE CORPS.

885. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: Has the merit roll been abolished in the case of the Indian Army Ordnance Corps clerks? If so, where was the necessity of its introduction among the storemen? Did it prove a failure for clerks? Have Government considered that the promotion should run according to the respective seniority? If not, why not?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. No merit roll has been introduced for storemen.

FILLING UP OF VACANCIES SINCE THE INTRODUCTION OF THE STOREMEN SCHEME IN THE INDIAN ARMY ORDNANCE CORPS.

886. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: (a) Is it a fact that certain vacancies are reserved by the Director of Ordnance Services, Indian Army Ordnance Corps, for outsiders and some for graduate storemen? If so, will any vacancy be left for those who have spent years in serving the department, and has any vacancy been given to the non-graduate storemen since the introduction of the scheme?

(b) Is it right that 25 per cent. of the vacancies of British non-commissioned officers will be filled by civilian assistant storekeepers? If so, how many assistant storekeepers have been appointed from 31st March, 1928 to 31st March, 1932, and also how many vacancies have been given to the outsiders since the introduction of the storemen scheme?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a) I presume that the Honourable Member is referring to vacancies in the cadre of Assistant Storekeepers. Vacancies are at present reserved for outsiders and graduate storemen, but in future it is proposed to make these appointments only by promotion from the storeman grade. No non-graduate storeman has so far been appointed as an Assistant Storekeeper.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the affirmative. 22 Civilians have been appointed Assistant Storekeepers during the period referred to by the Honourable Member. Three outsiders have been appointed Assistant Storekeepers since the introduction of the Storeman Scheme in 1930.

APPOINTMENT OF HINDUS AND MUSLIMS AS STOREMEN IN THE INDIAN ARMY ORDNANCE CORPS.

887. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: How many Muslims and Hindus have been appointed storemen from amongst, (1) outsiders, (2) departmental men (excluding routine division clerks) and (3) permanent routine division clerks in the Indian Army Ordnance Corps?

- Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (1) 53 Hindus and 19 Muslims.
 (2) 42 Hindus and 14 Muslims.
 (3) 18 Hindus and 8 Muslims.

GRIEVANCES OF BRITISH INDIAN FAMILIES SETTLED IN NEW ZEALAND.

888. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Are the Government of India aware that a large number of British Indian families are settled in the various towns of New Zealand?

(b) Do the Government of India know that there are serious complaints against the harsh treatment which the Indian settlers are receiving at the hands of the white people of New Zealand?

(c) Is it a fact that in New Zealand, and particularly in Pukekohe, Indians are not allowed into the cinemas?

(d) Are Government aware that the "White New Zealand League" is persistently carrying on a vehement propaganda of anti-Asiatic movement in New Zealand?

(e) Are Government aware that in pursuance of the said anti-Asiatic movement hand-bills and pamphlets are published in New Zealand to preach complete boycott of Asiatics in general and Indians in particular?

(f) Do the Government of India know that one Abraham Walley Mohammed Salamanan, Indian Herbalist, carrying on his business in Auckland and Plymouth, was ruthlessly persecuted and numerous cases for damages and man-slaughter were brought against him in rapid succession in some of which he was sentenced to imprisonment and was disabled to continue his business?

(g) If the answer to any of the above question be in the affirmative, are the Government of India prepared to take proper steps to ameliorate the position of Indian settlers in New Zealand?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) So far as Government are aware, the total Indian population of New Zealand was 1,166 on the 31st March, 1931.

(b) If the Honourable Member specifies the nature of the complaints, enquiries will be made.

(c) to (e) Government have no information, but propose to make enquiries.

(f) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in this House on the 23rd March, 1927, to Raja Ghazanfar Ali Khan's question No. 1147, on the same subject.

(g) Does not arise. I have already indicated to the Honourable Member the action that the Government are prepared to take.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Have the Government of India got a local representative in New Zealand to take care of the Indians there or, in the alternative, to keep in touch with Indians who receive such rude and objectionable treatment as is specified by the questioner?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The Government of India maintain no representatives in New Zealand and, as I have already mentioned, the Government have no information that either rude or objectionable treatment is accorded to Indians.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Do Government propose, for the benefit of the country and of the people of this part of the world going to New Zealand, to take care of the Indians who are there?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I may remind the Honourable Member that there are no Indians going to New Zealand, and that the Indians already there are pretty well off.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: In view of the fact that the Government do not know of such complaints, will they make inquiries to find out the facts so as to help those who have these complaints?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As I have already stated, if any Honourable Member would specify the nature of the complaints that he has received, Government will make inquiries.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: The Government should realize that it may not be one complaint, and we ourselves may not be knowing the specific complaints; general complaints are made, and when that is so, it is I submit very necessary that the Government should make inquiries.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I may remind the Honourable Member that the Government of India actually sent a representative, Mr. Sastri, to New Zealand in 1922 and I happened to be associated with Mr. Sastri at the time. We did not find from those whom we met in New Zealand that there were any complaints against the Administration at all. Therefore, the onus of proving that there are complaints from Indians in New Zealand lies on those who say that such complaints exist.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: That is too old a question. 1922 is a long way backwards. At present there are complaints that are being made. Honourable Members are bringing these to the notice of Government, and is it not up to the Government to make inquiries and find out whether the statements reported are correct or wrong?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir. Government do not think that merely on the existence of general impressions whether ill-founded or well-founded there is justification for making inquiries.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: There are actual complaints which are not made in a vague manner. The complaints are coming from Honourable Members and I do not think Government should have any reasons to refuse the reasonable demand.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Sir, the only complaint to which reference is made in this question was dealt with in an answer given here in 1927. And I may mention for the information of the House that the complaint was that a gentleman who was a specialist in aniline dyes had taken to treating

human beings. Because of that he had been punished and perhaps rightly punished by the court of inquiry.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: But the complaint is not restricted to that complaint only?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: There is no other specific complaint which has been mentioned by any Honourable Member or which is before the Government.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: A complaint may not be specifically mentioned but the general wish of the Members who put these questions is that an inquiry should be made to find the facts of the case and a positive answer given that there is no complaint.

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am quite sure that the House on reflection will agree with me that unless there is a reasonable ground for thinking that there are complaints in New Zealand, there is no point in making an inquiry.

(Mr. Lalchand Navalrai wanted to put another supplementary question, but Mr. President called him to order.)

Mr. B. Das: Do I take it, Sir, that in the opinion of the Honourable Member, an Indian has got an equal right of citizenship in New Zealand?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Not only is it, Sir, a question of opinion, but I am prepared to prove it to the Honourable Member by reference to the relative electoral law that an Indian in New Zealand has exactly the same rights as anybody else.

Mr. K. Ahmed: In view of the fact that the Honourable Member has not specifically denied it *seriatim* in his reply to all the clauses of the question, and also in view of the fact that it is implied from the answer given that in New Zealand they are preaching a complete boycott of Asiatics in general and of Indians in particular, do I take it that these matters have not been brought to the notice of the Government and am I to understand that Government are determined not to take steps to give relief to the Indian people? Is that the reason why the Honourable Member, the Secretary of the Department, is giving his answers in this manner and refuses to take notice of the complaints brought forward by Honourable Members that there has been a mal-treatment of Asiatics and particularly of Indians?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am afraid it is not always easy to follow my Honourable friend's *impromptu* incoherences, but I have already stated that if any Honourable Member in the House will tell me that there is some specific grievance either of an individual Indian or of more than one individual, Government will make inquiries.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to answer if it is a fact that Indians are not allowed to enter New Zealand?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I have already mentioned myself that since 1918 the Government of India themselves had agreed that there shall be no further emigration from India into New Zealand.

ABOLITION OF THE TRAFFIC AUDIT BRANCHES OF RAILWAY AUDIT OFFICES.

889. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: (a) Will Government be pleased to state what proposals for retrenchment in the Railway Audit Department are under the contemplation of the authorities?

(b) Is it a fact that the Traffic Audit Branches of all Railway Audit Offices will be abolished?

(c) If so, by what other statutory audit do Government propose to watch the interests of the rate-payers in regard to railway earnings?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: The whole subject of limitation of audit and of retrenchment in the Railway Audit Department is at present under consideration.

IMPROVEMENTS EFFECTED IN THE ACCOUNTS OR ADMINISTRATION OF DIFFERENT RAILWAYS AT THE INSTANCE OF THE AUDIT DEPARTMENT.

890. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: (a) Will Government please state the number and money value of the objections raised by the different Traffic Audit Branches for 1930-31? How many of these were admitted and how many were rejected together with their money value?

(b) Amongst the above are there any savings of a recurring nature effected at the instance of the audit department; if so, what is their amount?

(c) What improvements have been effected in the accounts or administration of different railways at the instance of the audit department?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: (a) 28,186 objections of a money value of Rs. 5,67,543 were raised during 1930-31 by the different Traffic Audit Offices. Of these, 22,171 objections of money value amounting to Rs. 4,69,173 were admitted, and the remaining objections have either been rejected or are still the subject of correspondence. These figures represent the total objections and include both undercharges and overcharges.

(b) The information is not available. The Railway Audit Department estimates, however, that the total recurring savings effected during the past two years amount to nearly Rs. three lakhs per annum.

(c) Minor improvements have been effected at the instance of audit, but I have not got the details.

ACCOUNTS OF STATIONS AUDITED BY THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY STATUTORY TRAFFIC AUDIT.

891. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: Is it a fact that the accounts of only 15 stations out of 1,100 are audited by the North Western Railway Statutory Traffic Audit?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: Yes. The accounts of five major and ten minor stations selected at random are at present audited every month.

AMALGAMATION OF THE AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENTS IN THE RAILWAYS.

892. ***Shalikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Will Government kindly state the increase in expenditure on account of the separation of audit from accounts?

(b) Is it a fact that this increase in expenditure would have been considerably more, if lower scales of pay had not been introduced in the Accounts Department?

(c) Are Government prepared to consider the question of the re-amalgamation of these two departments and the introduction of the lower scales of pay introduced in the Accounts Department in the joint Audit and Accounts Department?

(d) In view of the present financial stringency, are Government prepared to re-consider the question of abolishing the separation of audit and accounts departments in the railways?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I would refer my Honourable friend to the answer given by my predecessor to a similar question by Mr. Gunjal on the 4th March.

(b) I readily agree that if higher scales of pay had been allowed for the Accounts Department, the cost would have been greater.

(c) and (d). The question of amalgamation has recently come under the careful consideration of Government, and it has been decided to continue the present system of having an organisation for accounting and internal check as an integral part of the Railway Administration with a separate independent audit under the Auditor General, but to take all possible steps to reduce expenditure in both the departments.

PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

893. ***Shalikh Sadiq Hasan:** (a) Will Government please state how many men are working as P. W. Is. in the North Western Railway?

(b) Out of them how many are Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and others?

(c) Are Government aware of the fact that some of the S. I. Ws. after passing their plate layers' examination, were sent to the Walton Training School for P. W. I. examination?

(d) Will Government be pleased to state how many out of the above mentioned successful candidates have been appointed P. W. Is.?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) 124.

(b) Government regret they are unable to supplement the information given in the annual administration report of Indian railways regarding the communal composition of railway staff by details regarding individual offices or classes of staff.

(c) It is presumed that these questions refer to S. W. Is. (Sub Way Inspectors) who are way subordinates employed on Permanent Way maintenance and are now called Assistant Way Inspectors, Grade I, and not to S. I. Ws. (Sub Inspectors of Works) who are works subordinates. If so, the reply is in the affirmative.

(d) No Assistant Way Inspector, referred to in paragraph (c) above, who qualified in the School, has been permanently promoted as Permanent Way Inspector as no permanent promotions to that grade have been made since 1981; but four such qualified Assistant Way Inspectors are officiating as Permanent Way Inspectors against leave vacancies.

PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

894. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: Are Government aware that the apprentice P. W. Is. on the North Western Railway, after passing examinations, have been made second grade A. W. Is., but those S. I. Ws. who, beside their long experience, have passed their P. W. I. examination from the Walton Training School, have been deprived of the above-mentioned promotion so far? Will Government give reasons for this distinction?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I understand that Apprentice Permanent Way Inspectors, after the successful completion of their training, are recruited on 12 months' probation against vacancies of the Assistant Way Inspectors, Grade II, S. W. Is. (now called A. W. Is., Grade I) are recruited from the rank of mates, mistries and time-keepers; in view of the difference in the standard of education of the apprentice class and the promoted man, the latter are not promoted as A. W. Is., Grade II.

APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

895. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: Is there any fixed proportion on the North Western Railway for appointments to P. W. I. posts between apprentice P. W. Is. and S. I. Ws. who have passed the P. W. I. examination? If not, do Government propose to fix a ratio?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I understand the proportion of promotions from the two grades are roughly as follows: 8 from Grade II and 1 from Grade I.

APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

896. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: Are Government prepared to consider the question of promoting A. W. Is., Grade I on the North Western Railway—who have qualified in the duties of P. W. I. first locally and then from the Walton Training School and who have also worked for one year as P. W. Is.—to A. W. I. second grade like the apprentice P. W. Is. who are getting this grade?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I understand that promotion from Grade I to Grade II Assistant Way Inspector is not usual, the reason being that Mates, Mistries and Time Keepers do not pass the same examination as that taken by Apprentice Permanent Way Inspectors at the end of their apprenticeship. The Agent, North Western Railway, has been asked to re-examine the matter.

OFFICIATING CHANCES OF PERMANENT WAY INSPECTORS FOR MUSLIMS IN LAHORE DIVISION OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

897. ***Shaikh Sadiq Hasan**: Is it a fact that in the Lahore Division, North Western Railway, the officiating chances of P. W. Is. are not being given now-a-days to Muslims, while non-Muslims who are juniors get such chances?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The Agent reports that arrangements are made from qualified men in order of seniority based on the whole line and subject to the proportions given in the reply to question 895 above, except for short vacancies up to two months, which Divisions are permitted to fill by the most convenient local arrangements. I have brought this question to his notice in order that he may see that no grounds for such an allegation are allowed to exist.

(Mr. S. G. Jog rose to put question No. 898 standing in the name of Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order; this question cannot be asked.

Mr. S. G. Jog: I would like to raise a point of order, Sir. When the notice of the question was given, the Honourable Member who gave notice of it was a Member of the House and, in the Simla Session, in order to suit the convenience of other important work, these questions were held over. Fortunately or unfortunately, the Member who had put the question has gone to the Round Table Conference and I would like to point out that it will mean a great hardship if this question is not answered. In view of these special circumstances, I may be allowed to put it.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order, If the Honourable Member feels so strongly on the subject, he can give notice of that question himself. The Honourable Member who gave notice of that question has ceased to be a Member of the Assembly and has, therefore, lost the right of interpellating Government.

†898. *

USE OF ONIONS IN JAIL DIET.

899. ***Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen**: (a) Is it a fact that the onion forms an important part in the preparation of food of jail prisoners in the centrally administered areas?

(b) Are Government aware that the onion is forbidden for high caste Hindus by their *Shastras*?

(c) Are Government prepared to discontinue the use of the onion in jail diets for high caste Hindus or allow any prisoner who has objection to the taking of onions to cook his own food?

† This question was not answered as the Honourable Member (Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney) has since resigned.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) The onion is of antiscorbutic value and is, therefore, generally included in the prescribed scale of dietary for prisoners, but it is not supplied in all Jails in the centrally administered areas.

(b) I do not wish to question the authority of the Honourable Member in matters relating to the *Shastras*.

(c) I am not aware that objections have been taken to the use of onions in jail dietary. Indeed I am informed that the Bengali prisoners who have been sent to the Andamans have specially asked for them.

**EXEMPTION OF POLITICAL PRISONERS FROM CALLING OUT
"SARKAR SALAAM".**

900. ***Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) Are Government aware that even the most docile of political prisoners generally has strong objection to "Sarkar Salaam"?

(b) Is it a fact that insistence on the above by the jail authorities has often given rise to a fracas within jails?

(c) If so, do Government propose to revise the jail code so as to exempt the political prisoners from the above formality?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) No.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

**FUNCTIONS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR
RAILWAYS.**

901. ***Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen:** (a) What is the exact function of a member of the Central Advisory Committee for Railways?

(b) How many times does that committee generally meet during a year?

(c) Is a member of the said committee allowed to travel free on the various Railways to collect first-hand information relating to them?

(d) If not, do Government propose to make such arrangements in order to give the members better facilities for inspection and advice?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) To advise on such important questions of policy as may be placed before it by the Member in charge of railways.

(b) It depends on the business before it.

(c) and (d). No.

ADMISSION OF MOPLAHS IN THE ARMY.

902. ***Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether there is any ban against the admission of Moplahs in the army; if so, why?

(b) If not, why is admission refused to them in the Territorial Force?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: (a) Moplahs are not recruited for the Indian Army. They were given a trial in the regular Army before the War and the experiment was not a success.

(b) Moplahs have not been recruited for the Indian Territorial Force owing to objections on the part of the Local Government.

Mr. K. Ahmed: In view of the fact that the Honourable Member's Department did not object to the wholesale release of the Moplah prisoners and in view of the fact that the riots in which they took part occurred more than 12 years ago, do the Government realise that the Moplahs of the present day are quite a different people from the Moplahs of the days of the riots, and will the Government change their policy and recruit these poor people to the Army?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I am quite prepared to address the Local Government on the subject and ask whether they still adhere to their former objections or whether they would now be prepared to withdraw them.

Mr. Uppi Sahab Bahadur: What are the reasons for excluding the Moplahs even from the Territorial Force? What are the reasons given by the Local Government?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The Honourable Member should be able to guess the reasons for himself.

†903.*

PERFORMANCES STAGED BY THE V. J. BHARAT THEATRICAL COMPANY OF BOMBAY IN DELHI.

904. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that a theatrical company by name "The V. J. Bharat Theatrical Company of Bombay" has staged performances in a local theatre at Ajmeri Gate, Delhi, on 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th July, 1932, "India now and then"; and on 19th, 20th and 21st August, 1932, "Dukhia Bharat"? If so, who are the authors?

(b) Are Government aware that Government servants were obliged to purchase tickets and to see the performances?

(c) Is it a fact that Sardar Mehtab Singh, Industrial Surveyor, has managed these performances, and that most of the actors were Government servants?

(d) Is it a fact that arrangements were made for this Company by the district authorities to tour in the rural areas of Delhi; and are Government aware that certain prostitutes were forced to take part with a view to making the shows more attractive?

(e) Is it a fact that licence to sell liquor was temporarily sanctioned by the local authorities?

(f) Is it a fact that Sheikh Abdul Samad, City Magistrate, Delhi, was on duty at the time of the performances?

(g) Is it a fact that these performances were picketed by the Congress volunteers? If so, how many have been arrested and convicted; and under what emergency powers was this picketing declared unlawful?

† This question has already been answered; see page 1485 of L. A. Debates, dated 28th September, 1932.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) "India Now and Then" was staged by the Lakshmi Kanta Theatrical Company on the 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th July and "Dukhia Bharat" was staged by the Vijay Bharat Theatrical Company on the 19th, 20th, 21st and 22nd August. The name of the author is Sayed Jaffar Husain, a professional dramatist.

(b) No. This was not the case.

(c) No.

(d) No arrangements have been made by the District authorities beyond those relating to adequate police protection for which requests were made by the companies. There is no truth in the statement made in the second part of this question.

(e) The manager of one of the companies applied for the grant of a temporary liquor license for two days which was sanctioned, but was not utilised.

(f) No.

(g) I would refer the Honourable Member to my reply given on the 16th September to his question No. 278.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: With regard to the answer to part (e), may I know why sanction for the sale of liquor was granted?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I imagine there was no objection to that. What objection does the Honourable Member suggest?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Does the Honourable Member realise that the selling of liquor would inevitably result in encouraging people to take liquor? (Laughter.)

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I should not be prepared to deny the suggestion of the Honourable Member.

BONUS PAID BY MR. HAYMAN TO CHARITABLE BODIES FROM THE INCOME OF THE HAYMAN-MOHINDRA PUNCHING MACHINES.

905. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad** (on behalf of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad): (a) With reference to the statement made by Government in reply to a supplementary question to question No. 119 answered on the 8th September, 1932, will Government be pleased to state the names of the charitable bodies to which Mr. Hayman gave his bonus from the Hayman-Mohindra punch together with the amount and date of payment?

(b) What is the total purchase value of the Hayman-Mohindra punches, which Government have so far paid?

(c) What is Mr. Hayman's share in the bonus?

(d) Who fixed the price of this punch?

(e) Who is Mohindra whose name is associated with the punch?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) When I stated in reply to the supplementary question that Mr. Hayman had offered to devote his share of the royalty received by him when he was a Member of the Railway Board, to

charitable purposes, I was speaking from my memory. I have since looked into the files and I can give somewhat more detailed information. I find that in March, 1929, Mr. Hayman stated that he did not wish to receive his share of royalty on any sales of the machine to railways, the property of the State, during the time he was Member of the Railway Board, and if for technical reasons payment was required to be made to him as otherwise it would be paid to Mr. Mohindra, he would receive the payment and would either refund it to Government or pay it over to the Indian Railways Athletic Association. Government noted this proposal of his, but did not make it a condition on which he was permitted to receive his share of the royalty. Government did not, therefore, think it necessary to obtain information as to how exactly Mr. Hayman dealt with the amount received by him; but Mr. Hayman has asked me to make it clear that he has taken no personal gain from the sale of the punches and none were purchased after he became a Member of the Railway Board and he has received no royalties thereafter. The royalties received by him on purchases made before his appointment as Member of the Railway Board amounted to a little over Rs. 10,000. Of this, he has made a payment of Rs. 2,600 to the Indian Railways Athletic Association and the Indian Hockey Tour Fund. The balance has been utilised in helping railway employees in distress.

(b) The total purchase price is, including punches, refills, date box, etc., as I have already explained, Rs. 2,43,632-18-0.

(c) In December, 1928, when asking the Government's permission to retain his share of the royalty of 15 per cent. of the orders placed by railways for the above punches, Mr. Hayman stated that the arrangements between him and his partner were that of the royalty the first 10,000 rupees were to be paid to Mr. Mohindra to cover preliminary expenses and the balance was to be divided equally between himself and Mr. Mohindra.

(d) The price of the punch must have been fixed by the Agent, East Indian Railway, by negotiation with Messrs. Martin & Company.

(e) Mr. Mohindra was, as I have already explained, an Engineer in the service of Messrs. Martin & Company at the time.

TENURE OF OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, RAILWAY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

906. *Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad (on behalf of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad): Is the President of the Railway Advisory Committee appointed permanently, or is he appointed for a limited period? If permanently, is there any age limit for appointment and retirement?

Mr. P. B. Rau: The Committee is itself on a temporary footing and, naturally, so is the President.

NUMBER OF BENGALIS DETAINED UNDER BENGAL REGULATION III OF 1818.

907. *Mr. S. O. Mitra: Will Government be pleased to state the total number of men belonging to the province of Bengal detained without trial under Bengal Regulation III of 1818?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: 21.

†908.*—916.*

**APPOINTMENT OF LILLOOAH *ex*-APPRENTICES AS WARD KEEPERS, ETC.,
ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

917. ***Mr. S. G. Mitra:** (a) Will Government please state whether the *ex*-apprentices (mechanical) of the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, are qualified for the posts of Ward Keepers and Assistant Ward Keepers under the Controller of Stores, East Indian Railway, and whether they have been taken in as such? If so, what is the number of Europeans, Anglo-Indians, and Indians taken in as such?

(b) Is it a fact that two European or Anglo-Indian *ex*-apprentices of Lillooah Workshop, who failed in the Technical School, have been taken in as Ward Keeper and Assistant Ward Keeper, while no Indians have been appointed? Is it a fact that better qualified Indian *ex*-apprentices of 1980 were available?

(c) If the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reasons for not selecting any successful Indian *ex*-apprentices of 1980 and what were the grounds for selecting the two unsuccessful Europeans or Anglo-Indians? Are Government prepared to take steps to replace them by successful *ex*-apprentices who are waiting? If not, why not?

(d) Do Government propose to take in such apprentices as Ward Keepers and Assistant Ward Keepers in all future cases and issue orders to the Controller of Stores to this effect? If not, why not?

Mr. P. E. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I will reply to questions Nos. 917—924 together. I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table, in due course.

APPOINTMENT OF APPRENTICES OF THE LILLOOAH WORKSHOPS.

†918. ***Mr. S. G. Mitra:** (a) With reference to the answer to my starred question No. 468 of 5th March, 1980, will Government please state the number of vacancies which occurred in Lucknow and Tatanagar Workshops since 1980, and what is the number of European, Anglo-Indian and Indian *ex*-apprentices of Lillooah Workshop who have been taken in as such?

(b) Is it a fact that one European or Anglo-Indian *ex*-apprentice of Lillooah Workshop of 1980, who failed in the Technical School, has been appointed in Tatanagar Workshop in 1980? Is it a fact that better qualified Indians were available?

(c) If the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reasons for not selecting any successful Indians of the 1980 batch and what were the grounds for selecting the unsuccessful European or Anglo-Indian for the post?

(d) Do Government propose to keep a waiting list of the *ex*-apprentices with the Chief Mechanical Engineer so that they may be called to fill the vacancies in the workshops under him? If not, why not?

† These questions were withdrawn by the questioner.

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 917.

WAITING LIST OF MECHANICAL APPRENTICES TRAINED AT THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY WORKSHOP, LILLOOAH.

†1919. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please lay on the table a copy of the waiting list of the mechanical apprentices who completed their training from the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, since 1930?

APPOINTMENT OF APPRENTICES IN THE PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT OF THE LILLOOAH WORKSHOPS.

†1920. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) With reference to the answer to my starred question No. 424 (b) of 16th September, 1961, will Government please state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that one *ex*-apprentice of 1931, who passed in the second division, has been appointed in the Production Department?
- (b) whether it is a fact that one *ex*-apprentice of 1930, who passed in the first division, worked in the Production Department for a longer period than all other apprentices;
- (c) whether it is a fact that the Mechanics and Chargemen who are working in the Production Department had no training in that Department;
- (d) if the answers to parts (a) and (b) above be in the affirmative, the reasons for selecting the *ex*-apprentice of 1931, in preference to the *ex*-apprentice of 1930; whether Government are prepared to appoint the latter when the next vacancy occurs; if not, why not?
- (e) if the answer to part (c) be in the negative, whether Government will please lay on the table the names of the Mechanics and Chargemen who are working in the Production Department with the particulars of their training and service?

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE APPOINTMENT OF APPRENTICES IN THE LILLOOAH WORKSHOPS.

†1921 ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that one Anglo-Indian who completed his apprenticeship training from the East Indian Railway Electrical Department (Power House), Lillooah, has been appointed as a mechanic in the Train Lighting shop in the Carriage and Wagon Department, Lillooah?

(b) Is it a fact that two Europeans or Anglo-Indians were first appointed as apprentice Train Examiners in the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, and on the merit of their training for a few months only they were taken in, after the abolition of that system, as mechanics in Millwright and Forge and Smithy Shops?

(c) If the answer to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reasons for not selecting any mechanical hands and the grounds for selecting those Europeans or Anglo-Indians for the posts who had no mechanical training?

(d) Do Government propose to take steps without further delay to replace them by mechanical hands who completed five years' course under them and who are waiting? If not, why not?

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 917.

MECHANICAL APPRENTICES IN THE PRODUCTION DEPARTMENT OF THE LILLOOAH WORKSHOPS.

†922. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government please lay on the table the names of all the mechanical apprentices who worked under the Production Engineer in the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah, with their period of training and result (percentage of marks) in the Technical School?

(b) Is it a fact that all Mechanical Apprentices work in the Production Department in the East Indian Railway Workshop, Lillooah? Is any mechanical work done by them there?

(c) If the answer to the latter portion of part (b) be in the negative, do Government propose to stop such practice without further delay? If not, why not?

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION IN THE APPOINTMENT OF APPRENTICES IN THE LILLOOAH WORKSHOPS.

†923. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Is it a fact that in spite of the assurance given in reply to my starred question No. 424 (d) of 16th September, 1931, arrangements have been made to appoint two Anglo-Indians (one of whom failed in the Technical School), ignoring the claims of better qualified Indian *ex*-apprentices who are waiting?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to appoint the successful *ex*-apprentices who are waiting? If not, why not?

MECHANICS, CHARGEMEN, JOURNEYMEN AND DRAUGHTSMEN APPOINTED IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY WORKSHOPS AT LILLOOAH AND JAMALPORE.

†924. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please lay on the table the names of the Mechanics, Chargemen, Journeymen and Draughtsmen who were appointed in the East Indian Railway Workshops at Lillooah and Jamalpore with their dates of appointments, starting salaries and technical education?

†925.

POSTING OF BATTALIONS IN THE BENGAL PRESIDENCY.

926. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** With reference to the communiqué issued by the Government of India with regard to the posting of some battalions in Bengal Province to meet the terrorist movement there, will Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Bengal have requisitioned the assistance of such additional forces for Bengal;

(b) whether any public body or organisation or any public men of Bengal have asked for such military assistance for the province; and

† For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 917.

‡ This question was withdrawn by the questioner.

- (c) whether the Government of India have resolved upon the posting of the battalions on realising that the provincial police and military forces are not sufficient to cope with the terrorist menace in the province?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) The military forces are not intended to carry out the duties of the police. They have been sent in order to encourage Government servants and the large body of well disposed citizens, and to demonstrate to the terrorists that Government have ample forces at their disposal.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE COLLECTION OF INCOME-TAX IN CALCUTTA ON INCOMES BELOW Rs. 2,000.

927. ***Mr. S. O. Mitra:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) in what proportion the number of the income-tax assessees in Calcutta has increased since the minimum taxable income has been lowered to Rs. 1,000 per annum;
- (b) what steps they have taken to cope with the increased collections in Calcutta;
- (c) what additions they have made to the Treasury staff at Charnock Place to cope with the rush of daily payers at the counters; and
- (d) whether representations from the public have reached them complaining about the inconveniences and delays experienced by them when making payments?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: (a) There has been an increase of about 60 per cent. in the number of assessees in Calcutta owing to the lowering of the minimum taxable limit.

(b) The extra staff appointed to cope with the extra work includes 16 Income-tax Officers, 3 Examiners, 81 clerks and 19 inferior servants.

(c) The Government of Bengal propose to appoint four clerks in the Calcutta Treasury to cope with the increased work.

(d) No.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Is there any likelihood that this standard of assessing which has been lowered will be done away with?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: The Honourable Member must not ask me to prophesy.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: The Honourable Member must be knowing how much expenditure is incurred in collecting the tax and whether it is profitable to continue this low standard of assessment and also whether there is any necessity to retain this.

(No answer.)

PAYMENTS ON HALF PORTIONS OF CURRENCY NOTES.

928. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) With reference to the recent Press Communiqué issued by the Controller of Currency, Calcutta, that half value only will be paid on the half note which bears the complete undivided serial letter and number with effect from 1st November, 1982, will Government be pleased to state whether no payments will be made on the other half of the currency note which has been mutilated or destroyed?

(b) Is it a fact that the half-note will be current in the market for half-value just as any full note?

(c) Are Government aware that the communiqué has created a panic and a misapprehension in the minds of the public and the business men? If so, do they propose to remove the same? If not, why not?

(d) Is there any reason for the rigid and stricter enforcement of the rules regarding refund of cut notes and is it proposed to consider certain cases as special cases for refunds? If so, in what cases?

(e) Is it proposed to issue a fresh communiqué regarding the refund of cut notes stating the rules more clearly and precisely? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Alan Parsons: (a) This is correct.

(b) No.

(c) No.

(d) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to Finance Department Resolution No. F.-20-XI-F. of the 15th October, 1925, which explains in detail the object of the rules. The rules have not been altered. The object of the recent Press Communiqué was merely to give ample warning that certain discrepancies in their administration in different currency offices would be discontinued. Special cases will of course be considered in accordance with the rules.

(e) No, the Government of India consider that the purport of the rules is quite clear.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS ACCORDING TO THE COMMUNAL AWARD.

929. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) what the percentage of population of Hindus and Muhammadans is in the different provinces of India;

(b) what the percentage of seats allotted to Hindus and Muhammadans is in the different provinces according to the recent Communal Award; and

(c) what was the recommendation of the various Provincial Governments and of the Government of India regarding the distribution of seats to these communities?

The Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter: (a) The Honourable Member is referred to Table D of the Census Tables published with the Home Department Resolution No. F.-45/18/81-Public, dated the 18th April, 1982, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the decision itself.

(c) The decision was one of His Majesty's Government and I am not in a position to supply the Honourable Member with any information in this respect.

REMOVAL OF LALA JUGAL KISHORE KHANNA FROM THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE DELHI MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE.

980. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Lala Jugal Kishore Khanna, Advocate, has been removed from the membership of the Delhi Municipal Committee (to which he was elected by the suffrage of the electors) for being convicted under section 17 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act?

(b) Is it a fact that, in reply to the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi who had called upon him to explain why he should not be removed from the Municipal Committee, Mr. Khanna stated that he was summarily convicted on the charge that he was a member of the Delhi Congress Committee which association was a part of the Indian National Congress which has not yet been declared an unlawful body and that "at the worst the District Congress Committee had adopted a method of political protest which it honestly believed was warranted by the inherent constitutional rights of the subjects but which the Government regarded as an interference with law and order"? If so, is it a fact that for the above reply he was removed from the Municipal Commissionership of Delhi?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) *Yes. Lala Jugal Kishore Khanna was removed from membership of the Municipal Committee by the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, under the concluding portion of section 16 (1) (a) of the Punjab Municipal Act, 1911.

GRIEVANCES OF THE RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

931. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether there has been any correspondence recently between the Railway Board and the Railwaymen's Federation regarding certain grievances of the Railway employees?

(b) If so, what are their demands and which of them have been accepted by the Railway Board?

(c) Is it a fact that the Federation has given an ultimatum that if all the demands are not accepted, there is no alternative but to strike?

(d) Are Government aware that a strike in the present economic depression will be disastrous to the best interests of the country?

(e) Are Government aware that a general meeting of the Federation was held at the end of August to take stock of the preparations for the strike?

(f) What step or steps are being proposed to be taken to meet their grievances?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (c). I would refer the Honourable Member to the statement summarising the discussions between the Railway Board and the All-India Railwaymen's Federation held on the 13th and 14th June, 1932, and the Railway Board's letter No. 381-L., dated 2nd August, 1932, and containing the decisions of the Government of India on suggestions made by the Railwaymen's Federation, copies of which will be found in the Library of the House.

(b) and (f). The main alternatives to the method of discharge of surplus staff that were proposed by the Federation were:

(i) the grant of compulsory leave without pay and

(ii) borrowing from the Depreciation Fund. These suggestions had as their object not only the avoidance of further discharges but the reinstatement of employees discharged last year. The Government of India were unable to consider any suggestions made with the object of reinstating employees discharged last year. They were also unable to accept the proposition that money should be borrowed from the Depreciation Fund in order to avoid discharging staff surplus to requirements, which would, in their opinion, amount to the grant of an un-employment dole from public revenues for the sole benefit of railway servants.

With regard to the proposal to avoid further discharges by the adoption of a method of compulsory leave by rotation, they consulted railway administrations who were generally not in favour of adopting this procedure in order to avoid discharging staff permanently in excess of requirements, though certain administrations were prepared to consider its adoption when staff were temporarily in excess of requirements and when their services were likely to be required again before long. The Government of India did not consider that it would be justifiable to ask staff who were in no danger of being retrenched and who were already subject to the emergency cut in pay to agree to the further wage cut entailed by compulsory leave by rotation. While, however, they were unable to accept this suggestion of the Federation as a general alternative to discharge, they have authorised such railway administrations as wished to do so to adopt the method as an alternative in definite categories when the financial effects of both the methods were approximately the same. They have also agreed, at the request of the Federation to voluntary retirements being permitted on special terms up to the 31st October, 1952, from units in which there was no surplus but where there was a waiting list of men discharged with the object of facilitating the re-employment of the latter. Finally they have asked railway administrations, to make allowance for normal wastage and to adopt other suitable expedients to minimise discharges as far as may be reasonably possible. These, with the special terms that have been offered to induce voluntary retirements, have resulted in the anticipated number of persons to be discharged in the course of the present retrenchment being very materially reduced. While the surplus staff including those likely to become surplus in the near future was estimated in January last to be 11,959 employees the total number of employees it has so far been decided to discharge is only about 1,900. This however does not include a surplus of nearly 1,000 employees on the Bengal Nagpur Railway and 700 in the Engineering Department of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, but it is expected that the staff to be discharged out of these surpluses will be reduced by voluntary retirements and transfers to other suitable posts, so that the total of the staff to be discharged will not, it is anticipated, exceed 3,000 employees and may be less.

(d) Government concur with the Honourable Member as regards the deplorable effects that are likely to result from a strike.

(e) Government have seen such a statement in the Press.

Mr. B. Das: Is it not a fact that there is a strike on one of the Railways in Madras? What is the cause of that strike, and has it been settled?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The strike has not yet been settled. As regards the causes of the strike, I would refer the Honourable Member to the statements that have appeared in the Press both on behalf of the strikers and on behalf of the Railway Administration.

Mr. B. Das: Have the Railway Board taken any steps to settle that strike or are they going to lock the people out?

Mr. P. R. Rau: We have not declared a lock-out; it is the strikers who started it.

Mr. B. Das: Is it going to be a fight to the finish?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am afraid I cannot add anything to the information at present available to Honourable Members.

†932.*

FRACAS BETWEEN THE MILITARY POLICE AND THE WARDERS OF THE PATNA CAMP JAIL.

933. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether there was a serious fracas between the Military Police and the Warders of the Patna Camp Jail as a result of which more than 15 persons were more or less injured on both sides?

(b) If so, why and how did the fight take place?

(c) Were there ill-feelings for some time before or did the quarrel take place on the spur of the moment?

(d) Had it any concern with the political prisoners lodged in the jail?

(e) What steps, if any, were taken to check the fracas by the Superintendent in charge of the camp jail?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) There was a fracas in which about ten persons were injured.

(b) The fracas started at the entrance to the jail owing to the refusal of a warder, not in uniform, to stop when challenged by the sentry. This led to an altercation in which other warders and police guards joined.

† This question was withdrawn by the questioner.

(c) It is believed that there was some previous ill-feeling between some of the warders and some of the police guards.

(d) The fracas had no connection with the prisoners nor were any of the prisoners concerned in it.

(e) The Superintendent, with the assistance of the Deputy Superintendent and the Sergeant Major, stopped the fracas promptly.

† 984.*

OCCUPATION OF A FIRST CLASS COMPARTMENT ON THE KARACHI MAIL TRAIN BY ONE MR. VISHWA NADHAN, A RAILWAY EMPLOYEE.

985. *Mr. S. C. Mitra: (a) Are Government aware that Mr. Vishwa Nadhan, a Railway employee, was occupying the whole and only one available four-berth first class compartment on the Karachi mail train travelling from Lahore to Karachi on the 19th August?

(b) Was Mr. Vishwa Nadhan on duty?

(c) If the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, will Government please state how many railway first class passes he was holding to entitle him to occupy all the four berths in the only one four-berth compartment available on that train?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the negative, will Government please state how and why this railway employee was allowed to occupy the whole and only one available first class four-berth compartment?

(e) Are Government aware that three first class passengers having paid three first class fares were greatly inconvenienced due to Mr. Vishwa Nadhan's occupying the whole and only one available first class four-berth compartment?

(f) Are Government aware that Mr. Vishwa Nadhan was travelling with a lady and a child below three years old?

(g) If the answer to part (f) be in the affirmative, will Government please state if they are Mr. Vishwa Nadhan's dependants?

(h) If the answer to part (f) be in the affirmative, will Government please state if the fares for the three first class berths will be recovered from Mr. Vishwa Nadhan?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Mr. Vishwa Nadhan, who is a Railway employee, was occupying a four-berth first class compartment which was not, however, the only four-berth first class compartment on the train.

(b) (f) and (g). Yes.

(c) He held a metal pass which entitled him to travel with his family. The Agent, North Western Railway, reports that only two berths in the compartment were occupied by Mr. Vishwa Nadhan.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) No. As already stated there were other first class compartments.

(h) Does not arise, in view of my reply to part (c).

† This question was withdrawn by the questioner.

Mr. Lalchand Navalsri: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state if there is a rule that in respect of occupation preference should be given by pass-holders to passengers who actually pay the fares?

Mr. P. B. Rau: There is such a rule, but it applies only to the starting station.

Mr. S. G. Jog: Is it not a fact that railway servants take unfair advantage of the privilege granted to them as a result of which ordinary passengers who pay their fares are put to inconvenience?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I am not aware of that.

Mr. S. G. Jog: Will the Honourable Member kindly inquire whether this practice does exist, for instance, if there is one berth they occupy the whole compartment?

Mr. P. B. Rau: If my Honourable friend will bring to my notice any specific instances of such cases, I will certainly inquire into them.

Mr. S. G. Jog: It is a thing which is of daily occurrence and if the Honourable Member will care to go and see things for himself at the station, he will find that there are plenty of instances every day.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: Does the Honourable Member know that even this rule that preference will be given at the starting station is not followed and generally pass-holders are given preference over the paying passengers?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I am not aware of that, but my offer to investigate any specific cases that are brought to my notice will apply to this case also.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: Will the Honourable Member take it from me that the gentleman I have named was occupying the whole compartment and did not allow others to get in?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I have been informed by the Agent of the North Western Railway that he occupied two berths only.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: Is not this information based on the statement of a person who is greatly interested in making such a statement to save himself?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I do not know what steps the North Western Railway took to get this information, but that is the information I have.

Mr. S. O. Mitra: Will the Honourable Member kindly ask the Agent of the North Western Railway to ascertain from Mr. Vishwa Nadhan whether he prevented first class passengers from entering that particular compartment on that particular day?

Mr. P. B. Rau: I will make that inquiry.

RULES FOR THE GRANT OF PASSES TO RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

936. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please state the rules governing the allowance of passes to railway employees on duty?

Mr. P. R. Rau: Railway employees travelling on duty are given passes in all cases without exception.

RULES FOR THE GRANT OF PASSES TO RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

937. ***Mr. S. C. Mitra:** Will Government please state the rules for allowance of passes to railway employees when they do not travel on duty but they travel to go home on leave, or when they travel for pleasure?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The rules governing the issue of passes to railway employees, when on leave, vary on the different State-managed railways except as regards gazetted officers who are allowed on all these railways first class passes irrespective of any limit. As regards other staff, broadly stated, the position is as follows:

Second class passes are issued to staff on salaries in excess of a figure varying from Rs. 100 to Rs. 125 per mensem.

Inter class passes are issued to staff on salaries varying from Rs. 50 to Rs. 125 per mensem.

Third class passes are issued to staff on less than Rs. 50 per mensem.

The number of single journey passes admissible to other than gazetted officers also varies. It is higher on some railways than on others, but the general limit may be taken as about eight single journey passes each year.

RETRENCHMENT OF INDIANS IN THE IMPERIAL SERVICES.

938. ***Mr. B. Das** (on behalf of Sardar Sant Singh): (a) How much did Government spend for the training of every Indian in England for each of the Imperial Services since 1926?

(b) Is it a fact that instead of retiring those who have almost completed their service, young Indians who happen to be junior officers are being retrenched? If so, how many have been retrenched from each of the All-India Services and from each province?

(c) Will Government please give the names of those gentlemen who have been ear-marked for retrenchment as inefficient in each of these Services?

(d) In view of the necessity for economy, do Government propose to see that the Indian officers, for whose training they have spent huge sums, are not turned out in the place of those who have put in almost full service?

(e) Is it a fact that there are quite a good number of officers belonging to the All-India Services in each province who have almost completed their service and will soon be retiring?

(f) If the reply to part (e) be in the affirmative, is it not a fact that Government will then have to spend again for the training of new men and thus burden the Indian Exchequer?

(g) In view of the great financial stringency, do Government propose to consider the desirability of absorbing the retrenched officers belonging to each of these Services in the future vacancies before any sums are spent for the training of fresh Indian candidates? If not, why not?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: (a) I am unable to supply the information required by the Honourable Member, as its collection would involve undue expenditure of public time.

(b) to (g). I am making enquiries and hope to be able to lay some general information on the table in due course, though I do not propose to go into the case of individual officers.

REMOVAL OF GRIEVANCES ABOUT PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS AND OLD CREWMEN OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

939. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim** (on behalf of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad): When do the Railway Board propose to remove the grievances about the pay and allowances of the Travelling Ticket Inspectors and old crewmen in the East Indian Railway and settle the question?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply given to parts (b) to (e) of his question No. 841 on the 26th September, 1932. I hope that a decision will be arrived at on this subject very shortly.

COLLIERIES OWNED BY THE STATE AND COMPANY RAILWAYS.

940. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim** (on behalf of Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi): (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table the names of the collieries owned by State Railways and of those owned by Company Railways, giving the dates on which they were purchased and the price paid for each colliery?

(b) Which of these collieries are under the direct control of Mr. Whitworth and which of them are managed by the Railways themselves?

(c) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing, year by year, what quantities of coals were raised from each of these collieries since their purchase, giving the cost of raising?

(d) Did Government ever call for public tenders for raising contracts, and, if so, when?

(e) Will Government state the names of persons or firms to whom raising contracts had been given since the collieries were purchased, stating the rates at which they were paid, and mentioning the period for which the contracts were given?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) and (c). The Honourable Member is referred to Appendix B (pages 228 and 229), Volume II of the Railway Board's annual reports on Indian Railways, copies of which are in the Library.

(b) The following State Railway collieries are under the direct control of the Chief Mining Engineer:

Kargali,

Bhurkunda,

The following State Railway collieries are under the control of the Agent, East Indian Railway, but the Chief Mining Engineer has control of output and distribution and also advises the Agent, East Indian Railway, on technical matters:

Giridih.

Joint Bokaro (East Indian and Bengal Nagpur Railways).

Joint Sawang (East Indian and Bengal Nagpur Railways).

Kedla.

The following Company-managed Railway collieries are under the control of the Chief Mining Engineer:

Joint Jarangdih (Bombay, Baroda and Central India and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways).

Talcher (Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway).

Kurasia (Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway).

The remainder are managed by railways themselves.

(d) No.

(e) Information is being collected about the names of contractors actually holding raising contracts at present and the rates paid to them. It will be laid on the table when ready. Government regret their inability to collect similar detailed information for the past.

REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HAJ BILL.

941. *Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: (a) Is it fact that a report has been submitted to Government by certain members of the Select Committee on the Haj Bill? If so, are Government in a position to place a copy on the table? If not, why not?

(b) Will Government kindly state the names of the Honourable Members who submitted the report?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: As my Honourable friend is aware, reports of Select Committees are submitted to this House. They are not submitted to Government. Government have not received any report from any member of the Select Committee on the Haj Bill.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: May I know if any such report was sent by any member or members of the Haj Committee to Government?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: That is a question which can be answered by members of the Haj Committee. I cannot answer that.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: My question was, have Government received any confidential report from any member or members of the Haj Committee?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Government have not received any report from any member or members of the Select Committee on the Haj Bill.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: My question was,—and I will repeat it again,—have Government received any report from any member or members of the Haj Committee?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Quite obviously, the members of the Haj Committee did submit a report.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

INTERVIEWS TO MR. GANDHI IN JAIL.

Mr. B. Das: Will Government be pleased to state what principles they are following in granting and refusing interviews to Mr. Gandhi, and whether they propose to relax the restrictions generally?
12 Noon.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: The normal restrictions on Mr. Gandhi as a State Prisoner were relaxed as stated in this House on September 19th, in order that he should be accorded full facilities for discussing the problem of the Depressed Classes and endeavouring to effect an agreement with them. When this object had been attained by the agreement that was entered into by the leaders of the caste Hindus and the Depressed Classes, and when the provisions in it relating to the communal award had been accepted by His Majesty's Government, the purpose for which the facilities were granted had been served, and the exceptional treatment given for an exceptional purpose was discontinued. Government, however, continued to give certain facilities for the discussion by Mr. Gandhi of problems connected with the removal of untouchability. Recently Mr. Gandhi represented that if he was to carry out the programme which he has set before himself in regard to the removal of untouchability, it is necessary that he should have greater freedom in regard to visitors and correspondence on matters strictly limited to this question. The Government do not wish to interpose obstacles to Mr. Gandhi's efforts in connection with the problem of untouchability, which, as Mr. Gandhi has pointed out, is a moral and religious reform, having nothing to do with civil disobedience. Government have, therefore, removed all restrictions on visitors, correspondence and publicity in regard to matters which are strictly limited to the removal of untouchability. Restrictions, however, in regard to interviews of a specifically political character stand on a totally different footing. The position in regard to these remains unchanged, as is clear from the recent reply given by the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Viceroy to Maulana Shaukat Ali.

Mr. B. Das: Is it not a fact that Maulana Shaukat Ali's request for an interview with Mahatma Gandhi was not connected with the civil disobedience movement, but to bring unity into the country?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: It was not connected with a matter like the removal of untouchability which stands entirely by itself as a social and moral issue. The Government cannot permit Mr. Gandhi to take part in the discussion of ordinary political questions.

Mr. S. G. Jog: The settlement of differences between the Hindus and Muhammadans—is it a part of the civil disobedience movement, so that facilities for interview should not be allowed to Mahatma Gandhi?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: No. I have just explained in answer to a previous question that so long as Mr. Gandhi remains a State Prisoner, he cannot expect and I cannot imagine that he would request that he should be allowed to take part in the discussion of ordinary political questions.

Mr. Lalchand Nayabai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state if there is a real and sincere desire on the part of the Government that the differences between the Hindus and Muhammadans should be settled? If that is so, is it not a fact that it is quite necessary that as Mahatma Gandhi is carrying on and has been allowed to carry further the settlement of the question about the Depressed Classes, he should also be allowed to go into this question of Hindus and Muslims?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: So far as that matter is concerned, if Mr. Gandhi feels that he is in a position to settle this very difficult question, he has only to dissociate himself from civil disobedience activities and there will be no further restrictions.

Mr. S. G. Jog: Is it not a fact that Maulana Shaukat Ali brought to the notice of His Excellency the Viceroy that the release of Mahatma Gandhi will considerably facilitate the settling of the differences between the Hindus and Muslims?

Sir Abdulla-al-Mámún Suhrawardy: What right had he to say that?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: That is perfectly true: it was no doubt the view of Maulana Shaukat Ali; but I would like to remind the Honourable Member that Mr. Gandhi was unable to effect any agreement between the Hindus and Muslims at the Round Table Conference.

Mr. S. G. Jog: Has not a long time passed between the Round Table Conference and today?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: Yes; but I am not sure that the elements of the problem have changed.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Is it not a fact that Mahatma Gandhi was not able to effect an agreement at the Round Table Conference between the Depressed Classes and the caste Hindus?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: It is perfectly true that Mr. Gandhi did not at the Round Table Conference adopt the policy of a fast.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Having given Mahatma Gandhi the opportunity of carrying on propaganda for the removal of untouchability and incidentally a diversion of attention of the country from the civil disobedience movement, will the Government not be pleased to give Mahatma Gandhi the opportunity of carrying on propaganda from within the prison to bring about communal amity and peace?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: No, Sir. As I have already explained, the question of the removal of untouchability stands entirely by itself.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Is not the question of communal unification as good as caste unification.

An Honourable Member: It is not to the interest of Government.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: It is an important political question but the other is a social and moral issue.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Is not the unification of the Hindu and the Muslim an important moral issue?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: No; I should say that it is essentially a political issue.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Does the Honourable Member say that it is not a moral issue, that it is not in the higher moral interests of the country to unify these two conflicting communities?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: That may be so; but I maintain that it is primarily and essentially a political issue.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Does the Honourable Member subscribe to the doctrine of divide and rule?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: No. Every opportunity is given to anybody who wishes to bring about an agreement between the communities; and as I have already explained, Mr. Gandhi is in a position, should he so desire, to bring his influence to bear if he is prepared to dissociate himself from civil disobedience.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: May I know in what sense a settlement between Hindus and Muslims is a political question, is it because it will bring about the downfall of the present system of Government?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I should have thought that it was one of the major political questions affecting the new constitution.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Is it a fact that opportunity was given to Mr. Gandhi in the case of the Depressed Classes to settle their differences with the caste Hindus, but the same facilities were not given to Mr. Gandhi at the time of the Hindu-Muslim Unity talk and Maulana Shaukat Ali's request was rejected which would have been helpful in coming to an agreement with the Hindus?

Sir Abdulla-al-Māmūn Suhrawardy: Maulana Shaukat Ali did not threaten a fast. A fast would have done him good.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to give a direct reply to my question whether Government have really a sincere desire that there should be an agreement between the Hindus and Muhammadans? I would like to have a direct reply.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: His Majesty's Government, owing to the unfortunate failure of the different communities to come to an agreement among themselves, were forced to give an award. They have always made it abundantly clear that they would be very glad to substitute for that award any agreement which is accepted by all the parties concerned.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Is it a fact that even an interview was refused to Maulana Shaukat Ali with Mahatma Gandhi?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: Yes, certainly, because interviews on political questions are not permitted.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to state, therefore, if the Government are prepared to give all facilities for the purpose of an agreement between the Hindus and Muslims? If that is so, why is it that Government do not allow Mahatma Gandhi and Maulana Shaukat Ali to bring about that compromise and get the award amended?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: Mr. Gandhi cannot expect, so long as he remains a State prisoner, to receive exactly the same treatment as he would if he were a free man.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: My point is whether Government are sincere that the Hindus and Muhammadans should come to an agreement or not?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I have already answered that question fully.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: By the removal of restrictions placed on Mahatma Gandhi, are we to understand that the Government indirectly identify themselves with the anti-untouchability campaign?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: The Government, as I think Mr. Gandhi himself stated in the communication that was published yesterday, stand on one side in this matter.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: Are Government aware that the anti-untouchability movement is inwardly directed against the basic principles of Hinduism?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: It is a matter in which the Government are not prepared to take an active part.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Is it not a fact that separate electorates for Depressed Classes was also a political question?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: That was a question which had an element of politics also in it.

Pandit Satyendra Nath Sen: In view of the expression of opinion made by the Honourable the Home Member, will the Government convene a meeting of orthodox Hindus from different provinces and elicit their opinion on this matter?

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig: I should prefer to leave that task to the Honourable Member himself.

DEATH OF SIR ALI IMAM.

The Honourable Sir Brijendra Mitter (Leader of the House): Before we proceed, Sir, to the business of the day, I should like to refer to a recent melancholy event for which India is today the poorer. Sir Ali Imam, to whose death, I allude, was never a Member of this Assembly, but the distinction and diversity of his record of public service fitly deserve an expression from this House of its sense of a truly national loss. This is not the place, Sir, to discuss Sir Ali Imam's eminence as an Advocate, great as it was. Here it would be more appropriate if I confine myself to the part which he played for five years as Law Member of the Executive Council of His Excellency the Governor General and to

his subsequent career as an administrator and statesman. It is no secret that as a colleague of Lord Hardinge, Sir Ali Imam had much to do with the three capital decisions of that administration, namely, the reversal of the partition of Bengal, the creation of the new province of Bihar and Orissa and the selection for the Government of India of a new Capital, namely, the historic city of Delhi. After relinquishing the office of Law Member of the Government of India, he returned to the Bar, but his legal career had frequently to be interrupted for other duties, such as Membership of the Executive Council of his own Province, Judgeship of the Patna High Court and Vice-Presidentship of the Executive Council of His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad. The variety and the number of the high positions to which he was called afford objective proof of his versatility and exceptional ability. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing him and working with him can testify to the sincerity, charm, dignity and the uprightness which made him universally popular and universally respected. Failing health had for some years past made it difficult for him to devote to our public life the steadying influence of his ripe experience and harmonising power, of his broadminded and catholic personality. When he was invited last year to participate in the second Round Table Conference, he proceeded to London in spite of the feeble state of his health, because he put the programme of a patriotic duty above personal comfort. A few weeks before his death, he had, at the earnest request of political associates and friends, set his hand to the task of organizing in Bihar and Orissa a party which would work the new constitution in a constructive and progressive spirit. The tragedy of his death at this juncture will be poignantly felt by all those who appreciate the need today in our public life of a sane and constructive liberalism. On behalf of Government and myself, I would request you to convey to the bereaved family our profound sorrow at his death.

Sir Hari Singh Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I did not think that it would fall to my lot to mourn on the floor of this House the untimely demise of my very old and esteemed friend, Ali Imam. Only the other day I was discussing with him questions of public moment, and little did I know that Ali Imam would depart from this life at the critical moment of Indian history where his mature judgment, ripe scholarship and broad sympathies with the people of India would have been an asset which it would be difficult to replace. Sir, we on this side of the House have always loved Ali Imam as an Indian first and Indian last. Both in his words and deeds, he was an Indian to the very core, and his effort throughout his life had been to live the life of an Indian. Those who know the efforts he made during the last few years to unify the Hindus and the Muslims would feel a poignant sorrow that, at this moment when the unification of the two great races of India seems to be in sight, his ripe judgment and influence should not be available to the peace makers who are sitting elsewhere discussing the *pros* and *cons* of a unified India. Ali Imam was lovable friend. As an official, he performed many and varied duties, and the Honourable the Leader of the House has recounted some of them, and though he remained an official, he was approachable to all, and his advice was available to high and low alike, and that is what made Ali Imam the popular favourite ever since the time he occupied the exalted place of Law Member in the Government of India, and whether he was Law Member or the Chief Minister of Hyderabad or a Judge of the High Court or a Member of the Executive Council of his own native province

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

or as a member of the Bar, Ali Imam did not lose that suavity of manners, that urbanity, that feeling of friendliness towards the people of India which made him a unique character in the history of this country. Sir, every one in this House mourns the loss of Ali Imam, and we on this side of the House associate ourselves with all that has fallen from the Leader of the House.

Sir Abdul Rahim (Calcutta and Suburbs: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, in associating myself with the feeling tributes that have been paid to the memory of the late Sir Ali Imam, I have to mourn the death of a very old and dear friend of mine.

Sir Ali Imam was undoubtedly a great Indian, a great patriot; at the same time he was a very good man. Those who knew him intimately as I did, know very well how generous, charitable and kind-hearted he was. Sir, the news of his sudden death came as a shock, as has been well stated by my Honourable friend, Sir Hari Singh Gour, to all his friends. It is no exaggeration or a mere compliment to the memory of the deceased to say that Sir Ali Imam's services to India were very valuable indeed. He was a staunch nationalist at heart and he never missed any opportunity to render any service he could to the cause of his motherland. I know as a fact that the large circle of friends and relatives that Sir Ali Imam has left behind will long miss him and every one that had the privilege of knowing him will realise what a great loss his death has been to us. I associate myself with the message that is to be conveyed to his bereaved family.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): I also wish to pay my humble quota of tribute to the memory of the late Sir Ali Imam. I came to know Sir Ali Imam about 34 years ago as a student at Aligarh. After the death of the late Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, when his great successor, the late Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, started the work of re-organising the Muslim community, the late Sir Ali Imam was one of those whom he selected as one of his co-operators and friends. In those days there was hardly any function at Aligarh when Sir Ali Imam did not pay a visit to that great institution, and his visit to Aligarh was always a source of great enthusiasm to the students with whom he was on very friendly and familiar terms. But more intimately I came to know him since 1906, when the Mussalmans first started their political movement in this country as a result of which the All-India Muslim League was founded, and Sir Ali Imam was one of the foundation members of the League. Since then, for a very long time we worked together on the same political platform, and I will always consider it a great honour to me that it was the late Sir Ali Imam who proposed me as the President of the All-India Muslim League sessions at Calcutta in 1927. It is no exaggeration to say that few Indians could compete with Sir Ali Imam in his love of our motherland, in his sound political judgment and his breadth of vision. The address which he delivered as the President of the All-India Muslim League at Amritsar in 1908 was a brilliant specimen of his political sagacity and acumen. He was the first Muslim Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and as such the part which he played in formulating the policy of the Government of India will be remembered for a long time, especially the part which he played in bringing about an amicable settlement about the unfortunate

incident of the Cawnpore Mosque. In his culture and polish of manners, Sir Ali Imam had no equals. He combined in himself the best of the eastern and western culture and virtues, and those who knew him intimately loved and worshipped him for that. It is really very unfortunate that, at this juncture in the history of our country, we have lost a man who commanded equal confidence both with the Hindus and the Mussalmans, and whose mature judgment was a source of strength to us. My heart goes forth in sympathy with his talented wife, Lady Ali Imam, his aged father, Nawab Imdad Imam, his equally distinguished and brilliant brother, Mr. Hasan Imam, and other members of the bereaved family. With these words I associate myself with the motion which has been so ably moved by, the late Sir Ali Imam's successor in office, the Honourable the Law Member.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): The late Sir Ali Imam's death is a national calamity and I associate myself with all that has been said by the Honourable the Law Member and the other Members of this House.

Mr. Arthur Moore (Bengal: European): The Members of the European Group would also like to be associated with the tribute to the memory of the late Sir Ali Imam which is embodied in the Honourable the Law Member's motion. He has reminded us of the great part that Sir Ali Imam played in the decisive events in India's history in Lord Hardinge's time. He shared, we remember, with our great Bengali statesman, Lord Sinha, the honour of being the first Indian Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and we remember that both those famous men have left their mark on Indian history. He was, of course, of his own community a very great ornament, but I think those of us who have followed his utterances in recent years will realise that he had also a tremendous sense of national unity, and we feel that in him India has lost one who could have been a wise counsellor in the days that are before us of constructive work under the new constitution.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I join with the Honourable the Leader of the House and the Leaders of Parties in the expression of their grief at the sad demise of the late Sir Ali Imam. Sir Ali Imam was a member of the Calcutta Bar when he was appointed a Member of the Executive Council after Lord Sinha. Sir, Sir Ali Imam, when practising with us in the Calcutta High Court, used to take his seat at the same table in that part of the Bar Library where I generally sit. I was not only a practitioner with him side by side but a great friend. Next to him, his younger brother, Mr. Hasan Imam, was also a member of the Calcutta Bar before he was elevated to the Bench. There was, next to them, Sir Richard Garth and there was next to him a member of the Nawab family of Murshidabad. There was Mr. Jacob and there was also Mr. Falkner who is now the Official Assignee. He was a popular figure, charming in his manners and amiable in his dealings with the members of the Bar. He was appearing on behalf of the Government in the historic Midnapore Damage suit in the year 1911 before he became a Law Member. His activity at the Bar was seen and appreciated by the people of Calcutta and the members of the Bar. He was a very courteous gentleman, coming from a family in a village known as Neora, not far from Dinapore, in the district of Patna. His family was full of lawyers. Take for instance his uncle, the late Mr. Justice Sarafuddin,

[Mr. K. Ahmed.]

who was also in the Bench of the Calcutta High Court. He was in the enviable position of having the confidence of his community. He was only 63 years old at the time of his death. He leaves behind him five sons, his wife and his brother, Mr. Hasan Imam, who is now a leader of the Patna Bar after he retired from the Calcutta High Court bench. Sir Ali Imam and his brother were very prominent. When any difficult questions came up for solution he used to take a leading part. Sir Ali Imam was a great hero during the difficult times in the days of Lord Hardinge and when with regard to the demolition of the Machli Bazaar mosque at Cawnpore the military were called and were dispersing the mob and were patrolling the streets all round, it was an anxious time of trial. The people found it very difficult to settle the dispute and the Government, just after the transfer of the seat of Capital from Calcutta to this deserted place, were in a fix. When the feelings of the people were aroused with regard to the destruction of portions of the mosque, Sir Ali Imam went to the Machli Bazaar mosque and appeased the people in the twinkling of an eye. His personality brought peace and he poured oil on troubled waters. In the year 1906, when in Dacca the Muslim League meeting was going on about the time of the partition agitation in Bengal, Sir Ali Imam brought the Hindus and Muhammadans together and he made a memorable speech on that occasion. Then, again

(Mr. K. Ahmed sat down without finishing his speech.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Chair wishes to associate itself with everything that has fallen from Honourable Members. The greatest tribute that can be paid to Sir Ali Imam is that on this mournful occasion the country has unanimously recognised how great his loss in the interests of India. It is such patriotic workers who are needed in the situation which exists in the country at present and it is lamentable that his career should have been brought to a close at a juncture like this. The Chair will communicate to the relatives of the deceased the feeling of sympathy and condolence of this House.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S ASSENT TO BILLS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): I have the honour to inform Honourable Members that the following Bills which were passed by both Chambers of the Indian Legislature during the Simla Session, 1932, have been assented to by His Excellency the Governor General under the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 68 of the Government of India Act:

1. The Indian Emigration (Amendment) Act, 1932;
2. The Cantonments (Amendment) Act, 1932;
3. The Ancient Monuments Preservation (Amendment) Act, 1932;
4. The Trade Disputes (Amendment) Act, 1932;
5. The Port Haj Committees Act, 1932;
6. The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act, 1932; and
7. The Tea Districts Emigrant Labour Act, 1932.

STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig (Home Member): I lay on the table:

- (i) the information promised in reply to part (a) of starred question No. 167 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 12th September, 1932;
- (ii) the information promised in reply to parts (b) and (c) of starred question No. 364 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 16th September, 1932;
- (iii) the information promised in reply to part (a) of unstarred question No. 156 asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 30th September, 1932;
- (iv) the information promised in reply to starred question No. 157, asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 8th September, 1932; and
- (v) the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 158, asked by Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad on the 30th September, 1932.

ARRESTS OF SIKHS IN THE BOMBAY PRESIDENCY FOR WEARING *KIRPANS*.

*167. (a) In 1931 two Sikhs were arrested for carrying *kirpans* with blades exceeding the authorised length: in 1932, 26 Sikhs have been arrested, the majority for disregarding police orders issued during the last Bombay riots. The only Sikh undergoing imprisonment was found guilty under section 337, Indian Penal Code, of causing hurt with his *kirpan*.

MOPLAHS CONVICTED DURING THE MALABAR REBELLION IN 1921.

*364. (b) and (c). The exact number is 369, of whom 221 are in Madras and 148 in the Andamans. There are also 221 whose releases have been sanctioned and who will be released as soon as they can be brought back from the Andamans.

CLAIMS OF A MUSLIM CLERK FOR THE POST OF CASHIER IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

156. (a) The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the facts are that when the cashier of the office of the Director General, Indian Medical Service, went on two months' leave the vacancy was filled by a clerk who had officiated as cashier on a previous occasion for a period of 4 months. This clerk has been assisting the Cash Branch for many years past. The Muslim clerk referred to by the Honourable Member had no experience of the work of a cashier and, as the vacancy was for only two months, the clerk who had experience of the work was appointed officiating cashier, on the understanding that the officiating appointment gave him no claim to permanent appointment in future. The Muslim clerk was not asked to furnish security or to forego his claims for promotion to the Assistant's grade, nor did he offer to do so.

REVOLUTIONARY CRIMES IN 1932.

*157. Sir, I lay on the table a statement which contains the information which was promised in reply to Sardar Sant Singh's starred question No. 157 regarding anarchist crimes committed or attempted during 1932. The information relates to the period 1st January to 30th July, 1932.

(1727) .

Statement of anarchy crimes, etc., during the period 1st January, 1932, to 31st July, 1932.

Province.	No. of anarchy crimes.	Total No. of arrests.	Total No. of persons tried.	Total No. detained without trial.	Total number convicted by trial court.	Total No. acquitted by Appellate Court.	Total number sentenced to death.	Total number transported for life.	Total number actually executed.	Remarks.
Assam	
Coorg	
C. P.	..	14	
Madras	9	5	All pending trial on 31st July, 1932.
Burma	..	2	..	2	
N. W. F.	3	3	2	..	2	..	1	..	1**	Pending execution (1 case pending trial).
Delhi	4	12	7	4	
U. P.	38	57†	28	..	18‡	† 14 pending enquiry. ‡ 9 pending in court.
Bombay	4	13	12	..	9	2	..	
Bengal	114	681	117	511	79	..	2	
Punjab	6	49	38	5	3	
Ajmer-Merwara	1	(a) 3	2	..	2	(a) One case pending in investigation.
B. & O. I.	5	23	21	..	16	1	2†	5	1	† On appeal one case committed to transportation for life.
Total	184	862	227	522	129	1	5	7	2	

N.B.—|| The entries in columns 3 to 10 in the case of B. & O. include certain cases of 1931 not completed till 1932.

**EXTENSIONS GRANTED TO OFFICERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENTS.**

158. I presume the Honourable Member refers to Gazetted Officers serving in the Departments of the Government of India. There are only two such officers, who have attained the age of 55 years and have been granted extensions of service. In this connection I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to clause (a) of Fundamental Rule 56 which indicates that extensions of service cannot be granted except on public grounds. In the case of Superintendents in the Government of India Secretariat, who are ministerial officers, clause (b) of Fundamental Rule 56 contemplates that they should normally be retained in service till they attain the age of 60 years.

Eight officers have completed 30 years service. As none of them has attained the age of 55 years, the question of granting them extensions of service does not arise.

—

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhole (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred question No. 1058, asked by Mr. B. Das in the Legislative Assembly on the 29th March, 1932, and the information promised in reply to part (b) of starred question No. 1059 asked by him in the Legislative Assembly on the 29th March, 1932.

—

**NON-ADMISSION OF INDIANS TO THE PRINCE OF WALES SEAMEN'S INSTITUTE.
BOMBAY.**

*1058. (a) and (b). The building was raised from public subscriptions. Government have no information as to the exact amounts subscribed but it is understood that while certain sums were received from private sources the majority of the subscriptions came from the Western India Turf Club, European firms and Europeans.

(c) Government have no information on the point.

(d) and (e). The Prince of Wales Seamen's Institute has ceased to exist as a separate institution. It has been amalgamated with the Bombay Sailors' Home Society, the two institutions being now known as the Royal Bombay Seamen's Society. The Society now admits Indian officers and cadets of European habits of life to the Institute.

—

**NON-ADMISSION OF INDIANS TO THE PRINCE OF WALES SEAMEN'S INSTITUTE.
BOMBAY.**

*1059. (b) Attention is invited to the final reply to parts (d) and (e) of the Honourable Member's starred question No. 1058.

—

Mr. T. Ryan (Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs): Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 666—669 inclusive asked by Shaikh Fazal Haq Piracha in the Legislative Assembly on the 23rd September, 1932.

—

**STRENGTH OF IRRIGATION EMPLOYEES IN BALUCHISTAN AND THE COMMUNITIES
TO WHICH THEY BELONG.**

*666. (a) The numbers are :—Hindus, 37; Muhammadans, 40; Others, 13.

(b) The numbers recruited in the last two years are :—Hindus, 6; Muhammadans, 10; Others, 4.

(c) The vacancies were not advertised as there was a large number of qualified candidates on the waiting list.

CONTRACTS FOR WORKS WITHOUT TENDERS IN BALUCHISTAN.

* 667. (a) No.

(b) No. Local contractors are given preference provided that they are qualified and that their tenders are sufficiently low.

**DEPRIVATION OF TWO PUNJABI SUB-DIVISIONAL OFFICERS OF THEIR
SUB-DIVISIONS IN BALUCHISTAN.**

* 668. No. There are only two sub-divisional charges in the Baluchistan Irrigation Department. Both are held by Punjabis.

**APPOINTMENT OF RETRENCHED MUSLIMS IN THE IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT,
BALUCHISTAN.**

* 669. (a) A list of candidates for ministerial appointments is maintained by the Revenue Commissioner in Baluchistan, but appointments in the Irrigation Department are not controlled by the Revenue Commissioner and are not filled by candidates from his list.

(b) No.

(c) In the Irrigation Department retrenched and discharged Muhammadans who apply for vacant posts and who are qualified are considered along with other applicants.

Mr. P. R. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways): Sir, I lay on the table the information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 58, asked by Mr. R. T. H. Mackenzie in the Legislative Assembly on the 27th September, 1932, regarding expenditure on Madura-Dhanushkodi Section of the South Indian Railway; and also information in reply to part (b) of unstarred question No. 135 asked by Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan in the Legislative Assembly on the 27th September, 1932.

**COST OF CONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF THE RAILWAY LINE BETWEEN MADURA AND
DHANUSHKODI.**

58. (a) Capital cost of construction of the line between Madura and Dhanushkodi including all bridges, etc., and the pier, exclusive of ferry steamers	Rs. 1,09,23,406
(b)	
(i) Capital cost of original ferry steamers	Rs. 20,97,173
(ii) Number	3
(iii) When purchased ?	1913
(iv) When discarded ?	1929
(v) Amounts, if any, realised by sale thereof	The sale has not been completed.
(vi) Capital cost of new ferry boats	The total cost is Rs. 17,67,677, of which the capital portion is Rs. 3,84,459 and the balance is debitable to revenue.
(vii) Number ?	2

(c) Amount spent in maintenance and upkeep of the line between Madura and Dhanushkodi for the last 6 financial years including all amounts expended to prevent, or as a result of, drifting sand, and also including all expenditure as a result of flood damage Ra. 7,06,132

(d) The traffic carried and the amount earned by :

- (i) the section of line between Madura and Dhanushkodi, and
 (ii) the section between Madura and Tuticorin during the past 6 years.

These figures are not now being recorded separately and are not therefore available.

NATURE OF WORKS DONE BY THE CENTRAL STANDARDS OFFICE.

135. (b) The amount realised on account of the sale of Indian Railway Standard Specifications during the period from 16th July 1931 to 24th September 1932 is Ra. 3,729.

THE CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Honourable Mr. H. G. Haig (Home Member): Sir, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to supplement the Criminal Law.

RESOLUTION *RE* TRADE AGREEMENT SIGNED AT OTTAWA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order, Before the Chair calls upon the Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore to move the Resolution of which he has given notice, it wishes to inform Honourable Members that in view of the fact that the subject which is now coming up for discussion is of such vital importance to the country, that the Chair has decided not to rigidly enforce the provisions of the Standing Order which limits the Mover to 30 minutes and all other Honourable Members to 15 minutes. (Applause.) The Chair proposes to allow reasonable latitude to Honourable Members, but in doing so wishes that in taking more time Honourable Members will not repeat themselves. (Hear, hear.) The time of the House is very valuable and the Chair trusts that the privilege which it has decided to extend to Honourable Members in giving them full opportunity to express their views will be used with discretion to ensure a fair debate on this important subject. (Loud Applause.)

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Commerce and Railways): (Loud Applause.) Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"This Assembly, accepting the Trade Agreement made by the Government of India with His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, which was signed at Ottawa on the 20th August, 1932, and the supplementary Agreement regarding iron and steel contained in the correspondence between Sir George Rainy and Sir Horace Wilson, dated the 22nd September, 1932, recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do introduce in the Indian Legislature at the earliest possible moment such legislative measures as may be necessary to give effect to the Agreements in question."

In this Resolution, Sir, I am submitting to the arbitrament of this House the results of the recent Imperial Economic Conference held at Ottawa so far as they concern this country. I ask from it a consideration of those

[Sir Joseph Bhowe.]

results, free of all passion and prejudice, and a final judgment unbiased by extraneous considerations. I make this appeal, Mr. President, because so long ago as last April a campaign of relentless opposition to any agreement, based entirely on political grounds, was initiated and has continued ever since, making calm and impartial consideration of the questions involved well-nigh impossible. The charge, that we and the members of our Delegation were coerced into this Agreement, is, I need hardly say, absolutely and wholly untrue. I can assure the House that in this matter we were complete masters of our fate. I can also assure the House that in all conversations and negotiations, with which the Government of India were concerned, they were dominated by one idea and one idea alone, namely, to place India and India's interests before everything else (Loud Applause); and, if that was true of us, it was equally true of our Delegation, whose loyalty to Indian interests was only equalled by the care and sagacity with which they strove, and, I submit, strove successfully, to guard those interests against possible invasion. (Loud Applause.) In the admirable report of the Delegation the House will find a presentation of the case for the Agreement, set out with an impartiality, a clarity of statement and a cogency of argument which, I hope, will not fail to carry conviction. I must of necessity re-traverse some at least of the ground covered by that report in my endeavour to satisfy the House that the Ottawa Agreement represents an arrangement which, as far as we can see at present, is advantageous to both sides and that its non-acceptance would be against the interests of this country. I do not profess, Sir, to speak with the authority or the knowledge of the tariff expert; the view I am putting before this House is rather that of the inebriate layman who has devoted some little time and care to the study of this subject and who honestly feels that he can wholeheartedly commend this Agreement for the acceptance of this House.

In order to focus my argument and not to weary the House with unnecessary detail at this stage, I have endeavoured to formulate three general questions which seem to me to cover the whole field and to which it will be my endeavour to give satisfactory replies. Those three questions are, firstly, why did we go to Ottawa and conclude the Agreement, secondly, what did we give and what did we get at Ottawa, and, thirdly, why we should accept the Agreement. The first of these questions seems to me to be of fundamental importance, and the answer to it will, I hope, furnish the fullest justification for the Trade Agreement which we have concluded with the United Kingdom. To enable me to answer this question, I must refer to the recent changes in British fiscal policy. Until the end of the year 1931, that policy may be said to have been founded on a basis of free trade. Certain duties, it is true, were being levied, but they were levied either for purposes of revenue on certain well-selected articles or in order to protect certain key industries or under the Safeguarding Act. The Import Duties Act of 1932 wrought a fundamental change in the fiscal policy of the United Kingdom and it placed the fiscal relations of the United Kingdom and the Empire countries on an entirely altered basis. Under that Act all articles, not dutiable under the existing enactments or included in the free list, became subject to a duty of customs of 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. Empire goods, other than goods from the non-self-governing

Colonies and Protectorates, which were indefinitely exempted, were exempted until the 15th November, 1932, when they would automatically become liable to the operation of the British Act, unless exempted by Order in Council. But the announcement, which was made in Parliament when the Bill was introduced, made it clear that exemption would be continued if the Dominions and India entered into reciprocal trade agreements with the United Kingdom. That, Sir, has now been done and, therefore, the 15th November is no longer a crucial date.

It is not within our province to criticise the new policy deliberately adopted by His Majesty's Government, to question its wisdom or to challenge its expediency. The one fact of importance for us is the new situation created by that change of policy. In plain language, the British Import Duties Act and the announcement made by His Majesty's Government clearly indicated that unless by the 15th November the Dominions and India entered into satisfactory reciprocal agreements with the United Kingdom, they must be prepared to see their goods subjected to the same rates of duty as the goods of foreign countries. Faced with that situation, Sir, we had two courses open to us. We might either have said to His Majesty's Government we are indifferent to the Import Duties Act or, at any rate, that we are quite prepared to see our goods subjected to the same rates of duty as goods from foreign countries and that we refuse to negotiate with you whatever the consequences to us. The alternative was honestly to face the possible consequences of the change in British fiscal policy and endeavour through negotiation to secure a satisfactory mutual arrangement between the United Kingdom and ourselves which might avert those consequences. We had no hesitation in choosing the latter course and I feel certain that the considered judgment of this House will endorse that action not merely as the best course to be adopted, but, as, in the circumstances, the only possible course we could have adopted if we had any regard for the interests of this country. I have seen it suggested in certain quarters that we might well have stood aside and allowed things to take their course. It is not denied that our export trade to the United Kingdom would, in consequence, have suffered diminution, but it is suggested somewhat lightly that that trade could have been diverted into alternative channels. Now, I want to say at once that I do not propose to embark on what I hold to be the impossible task of attempting to arrive at accurate mathematical figures of losses that might have accrued to us had we refused to negotiate with His Majesty's Government. As a matter of fact, the conditions of the problem do not admit of mathematical calculations of that sort being made at the present juncture. But I would like to make it perfectly clear to the House that, faced with that situation, we had absolutely no alternative but to take the course that we did. I have seen it suggested that our possible losses might have been in the neighbourhood of something like eight crores of rupees. That estimate was furnished by, I may justly call them, definitely hostile critics of the Agreement, and it was accompanied, as I said, with the light-hearted suggestion that alternative markets could easily have been found for that trade. Now, Sir, if those good gentlemen would disclose the secret of how to find such markets for trade of this magnitude, they would be laying this country under an eternal debt of gratitude. I only wonder why, if it was such an easy matter to find alternative markets for trade of this description, our trade should have suffered so grievously during

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

the past years of depression? Perhaps I ought not to take this suggestion seriously, but I did attempt to ascertain what were the grounds and what were the data upon which this estimate of eight crores was based? And I found, as was inevitable, that hypothesis and pure conjecture furnished the materials for this figure. I do not say this by way of criticism, for, as I have already said, the conditions of the problem do not admit of mathematical calculations of even approximate accuracy. I will, therefore, not attempt to suggest figures for I should in that case be equally laying myself open to the charge that I am indulging in conjecture. But what I will try to do is to satisfy the House by examining a few typical commodities to show how real and how substantial was the threat to our export trade offered by the new fiscal policy of England and how, in assessing that threat, hostile critics of the Agreement have failed to take into account vital considerations or have built upon a foundation of figures which have no basis in fact. Let me first, Sir, take the case of those commodities in which our chief competitors are the non-self-governing Colonies and the Protectorates—commodities like coir, coir mats, tobacco, hemp, groundnuts, spices, coffee. The value of our exports of these commodities in the year 1929-30 to the United Kingdom amounted to about five million sterling, while our competitors sent similar goods to the value of nearly twice that amount. In a free market and

1 P.M. under equal conditions, we ought to be able to hold our own, but competition is extremely keen and prices are cut very fine and, I think, it will appeal to businessmen when I point out that where prices are cut fine, even a preference of five per cent. may make all the difference in the trade. In this particular case, Sir, had we refused to enter into an agreement, our competitors would most certainly have got a preference of ten per cent. and, I think, the House will appreciate that a preference of ten per cent. against us in these commodities would have most grievously affected our trade, a trade, I may point out, of very considerable magnitude.

Next let me take the case of that class of commodities in which we have a monopoly position. Critic after critic has lightly assumed that a ten per cent. duty on such articles would have left us in almost exactly the same position as we were before its imposition. They have entirely overlooked the fact that such natural commodities, as for instance, lac and myrabolams, in which we have a virtual or actual monopoly, are open to keen competition from substitutes and that competition might very well have, had an import duty been imposed upon our goods, proved ruinous to our trade in these particular commodities. Take the case of lac. We send normally to the United Kingdom exports to the value of about £1½ millions. Had our exports been liable to a duty, it is almost certain, so keen is the competition of synthetic substitutes, that that trade would have suffered a most serious handicap. I have only to bring to the notice of the House that in 1980, the United Kingdom imported competing materials to the value of nearly £1 million and that synthetic substitutes have, if not actually wiped out, grievously affected our exports to the United States of America. Or, take the case of myrabolams. In this commodity, we have a practical monopoly, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned. But myrabolams are subject to the competition of natural substitutes, coming not only from foreign countries, but also from the Dominions and from the Colonies. If the latter had received

a preference and we had been subjected to a duty, it does not need much imagination to forecast the future of our myrabolam export trade. In the facile exclusion of these monopoly articles in calculating the effect of the British Import Duties Act, I submit, Sir, that hostile critics of the Agreement have been guilty of a most serious error.

Lastly, let me take the case of tea, which is the largest single item of our exports to the United Kingdom amounting, in the year 1929-30, to over £20 millions in value. Now, it is well-known, Sir, that this industry is in a very difficult position and that it is fighting hard to avoid disaster. The challenge from Java has assumed considerable proportions and it is still growing. Java has, during the last ten years, increased her production of tea by over 100 per cent., while the production of Indian tea has only increased by 18 per cent. and the production of tea from Java, Sumatra and Ceylon is now in excess of the production in India. It has been assumed without any foundation and in the face of all the facts that the production and the consumption of tea balance one another. As a matter of fact, the production is far in excess of the demand and this means the keenest possible competition. It was calculated that in 1931, the surplus production of tea was in the neighbourhood of no less than 57 million pounds. Even with the preference, we can barely cope with the competition from Java which has certain natural advantages in her favour, and we can only just compete on equal terms with Ceylon. The loss of that preference which would have followed our refusal to negotiate would have made recovery of the industry almost impossible in the face of unrestricted and unhampered competition from Java in regard to the lower qualities of tea and, on the other hand, a preference of two-pence per pound in favour of Ceylon in regard to the better qualities of tea. But I have heard it argued that since most of the capital invested in this industry is British, Great Britain would never, when it came to the pinch, have imposed any handicap upon it.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadian): Quite so.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: Well, Sir, what that amounts to is this. It amounts to saying that Great Britain has been bluffing you and that you have not had the perspicacity to call her bluff. If there is any validity in that argument, then it must equally apply to the Dominions which are inhabited very largely by people of British descent and which have been developed very largely by British capital. If it is suggested that His Majesty's Government would not have imposed any disability upon British planters in India, then equally they would not have imposed any disability upon British settlers in the Dominions. What it really, therefore, comes to is this, that the entire new fiscal policy of His Majesty's Government was one great game of bluff and the Dominions and India have fallen victims to that bluff. I have only to state the proposition in that form to expose its absurdity. It passes one's comprehension to understand how scientific economists and practical businessmen could base their case in regard to tea upon the assumption that whatever His Majesty's Government may have indicated, in their heart of hearts, they really do not mean to deprive the tea industry of this country of this preference, despite the fact which we know that that preference was actually removed for a number of years. But, Sir, whatever His Majesty's Government may or may not have done, whatever they may have intended to do or not to do, the Government of India could not possibly have taken a risk, which, had it materialised, would have set this industry on the road to irretrievable

{Sir Joseph Bhore.}

ruin. Be it remembered, Sir, that the amount of Indian capital involved is by no means insignificant. I understand that the capital of purely Indian-owned estates is in the neighbourhood of $3\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees and the capital of rupee tea companies is in the neighbourhood of 14 crores. Be it remembered, further, that in the event of trouble, the Indian planter, with his more slender reserves and his more restricted resources, would have been the first to go under. Remember, further, Sir, that close upon one million Indian labourers find employment in the tea gardens of India. It has been calculated that if a thousand acres of tea were closed down, the country would be losing something like 2 lakhs of rupees annually in wages, in salaries, in payments for transport and for local services and in the purchase of materials. I have with me here the statistics of four of the largest sterling tea companies and they show that no less than 72 per cent. of the gross earnings of these companies are spent in India. I hope, Sir, the House will realise from these figures that a question of great magnitude is involved. I hope it will appreciate the fact that the closing down of any large proportion of the three-fourth million acres of tea in India would have meant something little short of disaster for this country.

Now, Sir, I am afraid that the time at my disposal does not permit me to examine each single separate commodity, but I have said enough to satisfy the House that I am not drawing upon my imagination when I say that grave consequences would have resulted had we ignored the change in British fiscal policy and had we refused to enter into a trade agreement with the United Kingdom. Had we done so, I believe that those very people who now blame us for doing, what in their opinion should have been left undone, would have been the first to accuse us, and accuse us rightly, for neglecting the interests of this country. Whether the actual loss of trade was likely to amount to eight crores or ten crores, as hostile critics of the Agreement suggest, or, as I believe, to something infinitely more, we could not possibly have ignored it. Nor could we have refused, as those critics wish us to have done, to raise one little finger to save the agricultural and industrial classes from the consequences involved. I would only like to bring one further fact to the notice of this House and it is this that by the end of last month the British Import Duties Act and the prospective preferences had induced no less than 16 European countries including France, Germany, Holland, Belgium and the Argentine to do what? Not to retaliate, but to ask His Majesty's Government to enter into reciprocal trade agreements with them, a fact which, in my opinion, is clear evidence that the consequences of the British Import Duties Act and the fiscal policy of His Majesty's Government could not lightly have been ignored.

Now, Sir, I have endeavoured to answer the first question which I have set myself. I now turn to the second, what did we give and what did we get at Ottawa? I am afraid, Sir, I have taken a great deal of time, but, with your courtesy, I trust I may be allowed to proceed further.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member may go on. The Chair has already announced that the time limit will not be rigidly enforced.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore: I will endeavour, Sir, in as brief a compass as I possibly can, to show what it is that we have given to the United Kingdom. Firstly, we propose to give ten per cent. preferences

in respect of the articles included in Schedule F to the Agreement except in respect of motor vehicles and parts of mechanically propelled vehicles and accessories other than aircraft in respect of which the preferences will be only 7½ per cent. But, Sir, the grant of preferences under this Schedule is subject to certain important limitations which I must lay special emphasis upon, which I shall return to later and which I shall ask the House to note most carefully. Secondly, Sir, we propose to give preferences in accordance with Article 11 of the Agreement. It is important that I should read the terms of that Article. The Article runs as follows:

"The Government of India will consider in the light of the findings of the Tariff Board the protective duties to be imposed on goods of cotton and artificial silk according as they are made in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and will invite the Legislature to pass legislation by which, where protective duties are not imposed as a result of the recommendations of the Tariff Board upon United Kingdom goods of the kind specified in Schedule G., the margins of preference shown in that schedule will be extended to such goods."

That means, Sir, that we can take no action in regard to the preferences under this Article until we have received the report of the Tariff Board. Lastly, we propose to maintain the existing differential duties in regard to iron and steel except in regard to galvanised sheets on which the rates of duty proposed are, firstly, Rs. 30 on galvanised sheets rolled in the United Kingdom from Indian sheet bar; secondly, a duty of Rs. 53 on sheet rolled in the United Kingdom from other bar; and, thirdly, Rs. 83 on sheet not rolled in the United Kingdom. This arrangement, I may say, is in pursuance of an agreement arrived at between the iron and steel industry in the United Kingdom and the Tata Iron and Steel Company in this country; and it will be in force only until action is taken upon the report of the Tariff Board on the iron and steel industry, the statutory inquiry into which will take place in the coming year. Now, Sir, before I quit this particular subject, I should like to give the House a few figures which will enable it to place this question of preferences in its proper perspective. I have had figures compiled on the average of the three years ending with 1929-30, and I find that as much as 55 per cent. of our total imports into this country do not come into the preference scheme at all. Of the balance of 45 per cent., 22.4 per cent. are covered by differential duties in regard to which we are committed in no way under the Agreement and the future of which must be decided on the coming reports of the Tariff Board and decided on one principle and one principle alone, namely, the interests of this country. It is only, therefore, in regard to the balance, namely, 22.6 per cent. of our total imports, that preferences are given and, of this quantity, about half comes from the United Kingdom and the remainder from foreign countries. I shall probably have to return later, in the course of the debate, to these figures, but I would ask the House to ponder very carefully on their significance.

Then, Sir, let me turn to the other side of the picture and, in a few words, state what it is that we have for our part gained from the Agreement. And if here, in passing, I venture to comment in a few cases on the value of preferences to ourselves, it is because, even at this stage, I cannot allow grave misrepresentations in this matter to continue without refutation. In the first place, Sir, the articles described in Schedule A will now be subject to the rates of duty shown therein, but goods of these categories from India will be admitted free; that is to say, we will get a preference equal to the rate of duty shown in this

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

Schedule. And now, Sir, I will say just a few words in regard to certain articles in this Schedule.

It seems to me that two commodities are of very special importance, vegetable oil and linseed. To those whose cry is that we are only to be encouraged to export our raw material, it will, I think, come as something of a surprise and possibly a shock to find that as in the case of our iron and steel, our cotton, our coir and our jute manufactures, our undressed leather and our carpets and rugs, so also, in the case of our vegetable oils, we have secured preferences which definitely advantage our manufactures and our semi-manufactures. In fact, some of the largest preferences we have obtained are in respect of goods falling under this category. The 15 per cent. preference *ad valorem*, which we get in regard to our vegetable oils, is of very special importance to this country for three reasons: firstly, it will enable us to capture a market which is very largely supplied by the foreigner. In 1929-30, Great Britain took castor oil, linseed oil, coconut oil, groundnut oil, rape and sesamum oil from foreign sources to the extent of no less than £2½ millions. Now, except in the case of coconut oil, there is no reason why India should not supply the whole of this, and this is the point to be noted: she has no serious competitor within the empire in regard to these other oils. Secondly, this preference will give a definite impetus to our oil-expressing industry, and, thirdly, it will help us to do what friends of Indian agriculture have been clamouring for for years, namely, to keep oil cake in the country to the great and lasting benefit of agriculture. Next, let me turn to linseed. Here I think it is generally admitted that the preference will be of considerable value and that also for three reasons: firstly, there is an extremely large market to be captured from the foreigner of the order of something like Rs. 2½ crores. Secondly, we will share this preference with no other member of the empire; and, thirdly, it is possible for us to supply almost the whole of the United Kingdom's requirements without contracting our supplies to foreign countries having regard to our production twenty years ago. This preference will, I hope, result in bringing under more remunerative cultivation areas that are now being cultivated with less paying crops or may even have gone out of cultivation. In the year 1913-14, the area under linseed cultivation was something like five million acres. In 1930-31, it had contracted to three million acres. If, as a result of this preference, we are able to increase that area by only a million acres, and, if we count a modest extra profit of Rs. 10 an acre from the cultivation of linseed, this will be placing nearly a crore of rupees extra into the pockets of the Indian cultivator. I will only mention and it will generally, I hope, be recognised that the very heavy preference we are getting on rice, namely, 1*d.* a pound, will help us to materially increase our exports and to capture a large trade that is now in foreign hands. Secondly, we obtain now a preference of 9*s.* 4*d.* a cwt. on our coffee. Instead of that preference, had we been subjected to a duty, then we should have been in a hopeless position as against the coffee-producing areas of the empire which are our chief competitors in the grade of coffee which we produce. Thirdly, we are assured continuance of the rates of preference on the articles shown in Schedule C; that is to say, a minimum preference of ten per cent. and in some cases a very much higher preference, as for instance, tobacco. This assurance is accompanied by the promise that if the rate of preference

in respect of any of these articles is increased, so far as empire countries are concerned, that increased rate will also be extended to India. Now, I have heard it said that we are going to get no advantage from the preference on certain of our manufactures which are included in this Schedule, as for instance, jute manufactures and carpets and rugs. The value of our exports in these articles to the United Kingdom in the year 1929-30 was in the neighbourhood of $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores of rupees. It is a matter well known that in these commodities we are up against not merely British competition, but also foreign competition. People do not realise when they talk of preference being of no value or of little value, that the alternative was not between preference on the one hand and free entry on the other, but between preference on the one hand and possibly a very heavy duty on the other. Had we refused to enter into negotiations, instead of a preference in these cases, we may very well have had to face such a duty; and even a ten per cent. duty on the articles which I have referred to would most obviously have crippled us. I have pointed out that the trade in these articles to Great Britain amounted to something like Rs. $4\frac{1}{2}$ crores in the year 1929-30. If that is an unconsidered trifle, then I have only to say that such trifles in a number of cases soon assume in the aggregate proportions which not even Chambers of Commerce and Professors of Economics can afford to ignore. Fourthly, it will be noted that we have been able to get certain commodities placed on the free list. I have already explained the importance of this; and I instanced the case of lac in which I pointed out that we were subject to the keenest competition from substitutes; and I pointed out also how important it was for us to secure the position we had, namely, free entry for our goods and an import duty on all substitutes from foreign sources. Lastly, under the British Import Duties Act, and while it is in force, we shall obtain free entry of all other articles not included in the free list and preference to the extent of the duty. The most important commodities in this class are Indian pig iron and half finished steel in respect of which we shall secure free entry and a preference of no less than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. against competing foreigners. The importance of this to the iron and steel industry of this country is, I think, evident. The surplus blast furnace capacity of this country is in the neighbourhood of about a million tons annually, the bulk of which must find a foreign market for at least a considerable time to come. Japan, three or four years ago, our most important customer, has been gradually diminishing her purchases, and she will continue to do so as she makes fuller use of her own and the Manchurian blast furnaces.

Now, Sir, I have given briefly a conspectus of the preferences we have given and the preferences we have got in exchange. I would like only to lay emphasis on one point even at the risk of repeating myself, and that is, I would point out to the House the way in which our Delegation has safeguarded the main principles of our economic and industrial policy. In the first place, the outstanding feature of that policy is the protection of certain Indian industries. These preferences do not impair that protection by one jot or tittle, or if industries, which are not on the protected list, wish to be included in that list, there is nothing in this Agreement to prevent that being done. I would point out to the House that it is wholly untrue to say that these preferences stand in the way of the protection of our industries either given or to be given in accordance with our policy of discriminating protection. Then, secondly, I would like

[Sir Joseph Bhoze.]

to emphasise the fact that all that we have given is a margin of preference. We have not assured Great Britain either free entry or any particular rate of duty, so that we are free to levy any rate of duty.

And, lastly, Sir, we have safeguarded those commodities which it is our national policy to import, either free or at exceptionally low rates. I cannot do better than repeat to the House, in the language used by the deputation, those categories, because I am afraid that this matter has been most grievously misrepresented or at any rate overlooked:

"The exemptions from duty and the low rates of duty fall into one or other of the following categories:

1. Commodities of importance to the cultivator such as agricultural implements and manures.
2. Particular medicines such as quinine, the wide distribution of which is important from the point of view of health.
3. Commodities, a duty on which might operate as a tax on knowledge, such as printing machinery and appliances.
4. Commodities, a duty on which might retard a desirable development still in its infancy, such as aircraft and Radio appliances.
5. Commodities, duty on which would impede the development of industries such as power machinery and raw materials, and dyes.
6. Commodities, a duty on which might appreciably increase the cost of railway transport, such as locomotives and many other classes of railway material.

In each case the exceptional treatment of the articles concerned was based on broad grounds of national policy deliberately adopted which, it was held, must outweigh purely revenue considerations."

I would point out then, Sir, that in respect of these categories, no preference has been given or promised.

Now, Sir, I come to the third question which I have set myself to answer—why we should accept this Agreement, and I can perhaps best clear the way for an answer by dealing with what may be, and, in fact, has been urged as reasons for its rejection. I have already dealt with the suggestion that we might well have ignored the results of the British Import Duties Act and have accepted the disadvantages that would flow from such disregard. I would like to point out that, while I hold the view that attempts to arrive at a mathematical estimate of the losses likely to result from the rejection of the invitation to discuss matters with His Majesty's Government must be largely illusory, we could not possibly have ignored such losses as even hostile critics of the Agreement are prepared to acknowledge. Such critics have suggested that our losses would only have amounted to something like eight or ten crores of rupees, and even this, we could not possibly have ignored. But another line of attack which has been developed is the attempt to frame a balance sheet and to show from it that we have given far more in the way of preferences than we have received in exchange. Now, Sir, I cannot object to those who have predilections that way indulging in these mathematical exercises, but I do say that the results do not necessarily bear any relation to facts. I would ask the House to look into this matter a little more carefully, and I am sure it will agree with me as to the futility of attempting to arrive, if accuracy is our object, at a profit and loss account at this stage. The main object of a preference is to increase the trade in the commodities for which it is given. But, Sir, the factors which

govern such increase are so complex and are subject to such varying considerations that any *a priori* attempt to work out their respective values and to determine the final result must give results differing little, if at all, from the results of pure conjecture. Take for instance, the case of linseed. We hope, by the preference we have obtained, to very largely increase our market for this commodity, but the moment we attempt to examine the matter more closely and arrive at a closer estimate of the exact extent of the increase, we are faced with formidable difficulties. In the first place, we must ascertain the uses to which this commodity is put; secondly, we must ascertain the comparative value of the Indian article and its competitors for the particular purpose to which it may be put; thirdly, we must know something of the comparative prices at which it is possible for one article to be substituted for the other for a particular purpose. Then we must have some idea of the extent to which, if any, the foreign competitor will absorb the preference, and lastly we must have some idea of the extent to which the Indian cultivator will respond to the better market which we have created for him. I confess, Sir, that the calculation is entirely beyond me, and if anybody is bold enough to embark upon it, I am sure, the House will agree with me that the results obtained can be of little real value. What we have a right to say, and what we do say, is that these preferences *a priori* will result in benefit to our trade and in expansion of its volume, but what we cannot say is the actual extent of the enlargement which will take place. There is only one way, Sir. We cannot evaluate these preferences, and if we attempt to do so, we can get no results which are of any value whatsoever. We can, however, say, that *prima facie* for the reasons which I have given we are likely to benefit from this arrangement which we have made. If, as a result of actual experience for a period of time, we find that our anticipations are not realised, that our actual trade returns do not show the enlargement which it was anticipated would take place, or that we have paid too high a price, it is open to us, Sir, to go back and to determine this Agreement at six months' notice. Article 14 is the most complete and the most conclusive reply to critics of the Agreement. It leaves us, as it leaves His Majesty's Government, free to go back upon our steps and determine this Agreement if we find that the bargain which we anticipated would be beneficial to us is not enuring to our advantage. And I would point out that this provision is only to be found in the Agreement that we have come to with the United Kingdom. It finds no place in the Agreement with any other Empire Country.

Sir, I have now trespassed a great deal upon the patience of the House. It may be that I have been somewhat discursive in dealing with a difficult subject; if I have, I ask the House to excuse me, for I am somewhat of a novice in dealing with matters of commerce and trade. (*Sir Hari Singh Gour*: "No, no.") But I can summarise in a few words the position as I see it, and as I would ask the House to see it.

The attitude of the Government of India towards the question of Imperial Preferences has been most admirably summarised in paragraph 15 of the Delegation's Report, and I would invite the earnest attention of the House to that paragraph. The British Import Duties Act, as I have already said, introduced a fundamental change in the existing situation: It placed the question of preferences in an entirely different perspective. It ceased to be a question of Imperial Preference; it became a pure business proposition, and as a business proposition we have regarded it.

[Sir Joseph Bhore.]

Faced with the consequences of this Act, we had to decide whether we would accept the disabilities which would be imposed upon our trade, or whether we would endeavour to avert or minimise those disabilities by mutual adjustments. And we had no hesitation in making our choice. We could not for a moment contemplate the possibility of a loss of trade of these proportions, which, following upon years of depression, might very well have involved large sections of our agricultural and industrial classes in severe disaster. Nor could we assume that easy optimism which suggests that it is a simple matter to find alternative markets for a trade of this magnitude. We could not ignore the object lesson of the past few years even if we were prepared to overlook the teaching of common sense. We, therefore, through our Delegation, entered into negotiations with His Majesty's Government for a mutual agreement between the United Kingdom and ourselves. I contend that that settlement, as far as we can see at present, is fair, equitable, and likely to be to the advantage of both sides. But, Sir, it is impossible for us at the present moment to calculate what exactly will be the true value of the preferences given and received, nor can we calculate exactly the even more important consideration, namely, the expansion of our trade which we hope will be the result of this Agreement. All that we can say is that we have smoothed the difficulties in the way of, and we have set in motion the conditions favourable to such an expansion, and that it would be a matter for surprise if expansion, and considerable expansion, did not result from it. More than that I do not claim.

Sir, I would say finally that I am not perturbed at condemnation of this Agreement on the ground that we have given far more in preferences than we have got in exchange. For I look to the British side and I see exactly the opposite statements made by those who hold the view that Great Britain has given far more to India than she has got from India. I read the denunciation in Parliament of the Labour Member who asked for protection against Indian pig iron instead of the preference we are getting and claimed that it was wiping out Scotland and Wales. I look to the contention of the representatives of Dundee in Parliament to the effect that Dundee's interests would be most grievously affected by the position we have secured for our jute manufacturers. I note the debate in Parliament on our linseed preference and the contention that this preference is going to affect more than one British industry. I look to the British trade journals and I find those contentions are repeated in regard to our carpets, our rugs, coir mats and coir manufactures. And I feel relieved, because I know that where such diametrically opposite assertions are made on the two sides, our own middle position cannot be far from the truth. (Cheers.) That position is this, as far as we can see at present, the bargain is a fair one, likely to be of advantage to both sides.

We must give the Agreement a fair time to operate, and if, as a result of experience, we find that our anticipations are not realised, that we have, as a matter of fact, given more than we are likely to get, or that our losses consequent upon any action which may be taken by our foreign customers—I confess I cannot visualise what they may be—outweigh the gains accruing from the Agreement, then, Sir, we are at full liberty to determine the Agreement.

In conclusion, I would like to say one word about our Delegation. Most of the members of that Delegation are known personally to the Members of this House. Most of them have occupied seats in this Chamber and have taken part in its deliberations. Every one of them has a record of services—either in public service or in public life—which I submit entitles their words and their actions to regard and consideration. All through the difficult negotiations at Ottawa these Delegates never for one moment forgot the interests of this country or placed them anywhere except in the forefront. They served those interests with a loyalty of purpose, a singleness of aim and a knowledge and understanding which seem to me to be above all praise. And, Sir, I would like to convey to them our warm appreciation of a task, which any unbiassed student of its report must admit, was well and truly done. (Cheers.)

Sir, I have now finished and I would commend my Resolution to the House for acceptance. (Loud and Prolonged Applause.)

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

The Assembly reassembled after Lunch at quarter Past Three of the Clock, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola) in the Chair.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move:

“That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

“That the Ottawa Trade Agreement between India and other countries of the British Empire be referred for scrutiny and report to a Committee of the Legislative Assembly consisting of the Honourable Sir Joseph Bore, Dr. D. B. Meek, Sir Hari Singh Gour, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty, Mr. B. Das, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mr. B. Sitaramaraju, Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Mr. G. Morgan, Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan and the Mover, with powers to co-opt not more than six specialists including persons interested in the industries affected by the Agreement; and to avoid dislocation in trade, this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council not to introduce a Bill to amend the Indian Tariff Act of 1894, till the report of the Committee has been adopted by the Assembly.

This Assembly further requests the Governor General in Council to urge on the British Government to suspend the operations of the Import Duties Act till this House has given its decision on the Agreement’.”

Sir, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation of the manner in which the Mover of the original Resolution, the Honourable Sir Joseph Bore, presented his case before the House and I assure him that I shall discuss this question very coolly, dispassionately and entirely from the economic point of view. I do not blame the Government for taking part in the Ottawa Conference. I strongly believe that we should take our due share in all the deliberations affecting the British Empire. In fact I would have resented, had they kept aloof from the Ottawa Conference. I have nothing to say against our representatives, but I would not go so far as to say that I endorse every word they say, on the ground that two of our representatives have signed it. (An Honourable Member: “They are not our representatives.”) In view of the very strong criticisms

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

from various quarters in the country, not only from the economists, as the Honourable the Mover pointed out, but also from the representatives of various industries and commerce, I think it is our duty, as representatives of tax-payers, to consider very carefully the arguments on either side, before we endorse our opinion on this Trade Agreement. The question of Imperial Preference is one on which opinions are very sharply divided in every country including England. Even those who are not opposed to the principle of Imperial Preference would like to examine the loss and gain to India in regard to each commodity included in the Agreement. It is not fair to the Legislature and to the country to rush through the Bill in spite of the explicit warning of the Fiscal Commission to the contrary. The Fiscal Commission very clearly said in their report in paragraph 268 :

"It is evident that the Legislature can hardly be asked to pronounce an opinion until it has some idea of the extent to which its application is feasible. We, therefore, recommend that as a preliminary to any consideration of the desirability of India adopting the policy of imperial preference, an examination should be made by the Tariff Board to determine whether there are any commodities on which preference might be given in accordance with the principles which we have laid down to the benefit of the Empire and without detriment to the Indian interest."

Now, the same Commission laid down one very important principle that the preference should not involve any particular economic loss to India after taking into account the economic gain which India derives from the preference granted on her by the United Kingdom. Sir, through you, in your double capacity I would request the Government that they ought to have seriously considered this particular paragraph of the Fiscal Commission. As soon as the report was out, they could have referred the whole question by executive action to the Tariff Board and, had they done so, the necessity of moving the amendment, which I am moving today, would not have arisen. What is Imperial Preference? This has been beautifully defined also by the Fiscal Commission. It really means taxing one country for the unemployment of another country. That is really the meaning of Imperial Preference. Then we should like to know how much you are taxing the Indian people for the unemployment in the United Kingdom and how much you are taxing the United Kingdom for the unemployment in India. I should like to see the debit and credit, the balance sheet of the two before I give expression to my opinion whether this particular Agreement is for the good of India or against the benefit of India. We have really to sit down and examine the details of our Agreement. We must go through the loss and gain on each item of the Agreement which, under the Resolution, we cannot discuss on the floor of this House. We can only discuss here the principles without going much into the figures for each commodity. In this case details are as important as principles, if not more.

I now draw attention to the few principles which have not been answered in the report. We know that the Fiscal Commission in their report, which was drawn up in the year 1922, said that India receives about 2/3rds of exports from the British Empire and sends only 1/3rd of exports to them. The question of exports and imports is reviewed in "the Review of the Trade of India for the year 1931-32". Here we find that, in the case of import to India from United Kingdom, the figures are gradually diminishing. The pre-war average was 62.8 per cent. After the war, it was reduced to 57.6. In the year 1930, it was reduced to 37.2 and last year it was further reduced

to 35.5. On the other hand, our export to the United Kingdom has risen during the same period from 24.2 to 28.2. Therefore our export has, during this time, risen while the import from the United Kingdom has certainly diminished. Therefore if protection is needed, it is needed by the United Kingdom and it is not needed by India. I will come later on to the argument advanced by our representatives for signing the Agreement.

Sir, the allied problem, which is really a very disquieting problem and a problem of a very alarming nature is the one to which I am coming now, that is the question of the balance of trade. Now this question of the balance of trade is really a very important feature in the economic development of our country. Now, attention was drawn to it by our Finance Member, Sir George Schuster, in the Ottawa Conference, in these words :

"According to the figures for the first three months of this year, India is only exporting merchandise at the rate of 120 crores per annum (\$90 million sterling) while she needs, as I have already shown, a favourable trade balance of at least 50 crores (£37½ millions) in order to maintain an even keel. Therefore, if it were not for the export of gold she could only afford to be importing at the rate of 70 crores (\$52½ millions) per annum. A reduction of imports to such a figure would create a completely impossible budgetary position. If on the other hand imports were not so reduced she would be unable to meet her external obligations except by raising fresh loans, a course of which the dangers and disadvantages are obvious."

Those remarks were made on the figures of three months, i.e., April to June, and when we take up the figures for the succeeding three months as well, that is, to the end of September, we find that the position has become more disquieting; that is, instead of having a balance of trade in favour of India, we are now having exactly the reverse; that is, in the six months of the year 1930-31 we had a balance of trade in our favour to the extent of 38 crores. Last year we had a balance in our favour of 12 crores, and this year during the same period we have a reverse balance, that is, —8½ crores. Therefore, this reverse balance is really a balance of a very disquieting nature.

Mr. B. Das: What about the export of gold?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I am now talking of merchandise only. The export of gold is a passing feature which cannot go on indefinitely. That is different. Now, coming to this balance of trade, I am sorry the Finance Member is not here, because it is he who will be concerned mostly in his budget debate. The average balance of trade before the war was 78.27 crores. In 1927-28, it was 81.97 crores. Then, in 1928-29, it was 86.47 crores. In 1929-30, it was 71.98 crores. In 1930-31, it was 62.05 crores, and last year even it was 34 crores, but this year we expect a deficit of 17 crores. What does it mean? It would really mean that India will have to borrow 50 crores of rupees in order to meet her obligations in England, and, in addition to that, India will also have to borrow, to pay for this deficit in the balance of trade, about 17 crores. This really means that in this year 1932-33 India will have to borrow a sum of about 67 crores in order to pay up obligations in England and in order to pay up for the unfavourable balance of trade. Now I should like to be assured by our representatives at this Conference on the floor of this House how this Imperial Preference will affect this unfavourable balance of trade. Will it affect that favourably or will it be against us, and why? I should like to be told by means of figures how this balance of trade will be

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

affected by this Ottawa Conference; and if no answer can be given on the floor of this House, then my case is made out for appointing a Committee and I think Government have no alternative but to give us this particular Committee in order to convince the country that this Imperial Preference will not affect adversely this balance of trade against us. Sir, this unfavourable balance of trade may be due to a variety of reasons and it is impossible, in the course of a speech, to discuss all those reasons. We should like to know and discuss what those reasons are and how far those reasons would be affected by this Imperial Preference and the Agreement which we have made with the British Empire and the Colonies.

Now, the third point which requires to be looked into and where the report, I think, has not done full justice is about the raising of the price level. I moved a Resolution last March to the effect that it should be the duty of the Government of India to pay more attention to the fixation of the price level than stabilising exchange and now this Ottawa Conference, in the various resolutions, have confirmed this principle that the price level ought to be raised slightly and then stabilised at that moment. I should like to know whether this Imperial Preference will have the effect of raising the price level or lowering the price level. As far as I can make out, it will lower the price level and will not raise it. Some people may say, it will have opposite effect, but from the figures I have in my mind I am convinced that this Imperial Preference will lower the price level, which is exactly the opposite of the recommendations of the Ottawa Conference. This is also a point which ought to be carefully looked into before we put our seal on the Agreement at the Ottawa Conference.

Then, the fourth point on which I should like to have some assurance from the signatories of the Agreement on the effect this would have on our trade with foreign countries. It has been pointed out that we have got a greater volume of trade with foreign countries than with the British Empire. If we sign this trade document, will it or will it not happen that some of the countries may retaliate against us? Will it not be that some of these countries may have some duties put on our goods exported to them? So whatever we have gained in one pocket, we may perhaps lose in the other, and the net result may be a little loss instead of a gain. This is a point which I should like to visualize and to discuss at the committee stage, as to how it will affect our trade with the countries outside the British Empire. I heard with great comfort what was said by the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution that there are several countries outside the British Empire which would like to come into this pact. Well, I would very much welcome that, and if we could feel really certain that what is said would happen, then it would really be a great consolation to us; but before we put our seal on this Agreement, we should examine a little more closely this particular point and see how it would affect our general trade. My next point, which is the fifth point, and on account of which I move this amendment, is that we are asked to give our consent to this Agreement on the very imperfect material placed before us. Here is only one solitary report, however well-written it may be, from our Delegations. We have not seen the whole proceedings of the Ottawa Conference. I would certainly like to see the report which the British Delegation have written for their own Parliament, and this

particular report is not before us. Then I would very much like to see the reports written by the various Dominion representatives for their own country, and these reports have not been supplied to us; and unless we see the reports written by the various Delegations and we have the whole of the proceedings of the Conference before us, it is very difficult for us to form a judgment on the solitary opinion of a few individuals and on one report alone. It may be entirely a one-sided case and the other side may have been entirely overlooked. It is on account of all these arguments that I have moved that the matter be referred to a Committee so that Members who perhaps may find some delicacy in giving expression to their views in public may perhaps be able to tell us their views in the Committee and we may be able to form our own judgment. I suppose, Sir, that all the Members have been supplied with a copy of a report written by Messrs. Vakil and Munshi. They have given certain figures and I would like to examine them with the help of authoritative figures to find out whether they are correct or not. This is a report which I cannot examine on the floor of the House and I want some time to discuss it. Mr. Munshi has said on page 22 which has already been quoted by the Honourable the Mover:

"If we do not accept the Ottawa Agreement, then our export trade will be affected by an extent of 8 crores. By accepting the Agreement we may capture trade up to the value of 13 crores."

But looking from the point of view of Britain, they say on page 15:

"In view of the fact that it is not possible to take into account the above-mentioned considerations in making the required estimate, we shall err on the safe side if we take the estimate already explained above, namely, 33.3 crores, as the probable additional market that the United Kingdom will capture with the help of the proposed preference."

So, here we have got the figures showing that the United Kingdom will capture a trade amounting to 33.3 crores and India cannot aspire to capture more than 13 crores of rupees. These are the figures which have been supplied to us from one quarter and I would like to discuss the matter with those persons who have got the figures on behalf of the Government of India in order to find out which of the two figures are right. Therefore, I am not asking too much when I say that we should be given an opportunity to verify for ourselves the argument and the figures on either side.

Sir, one argument which was really a central argument in the report of the Ottawa Agreement and which was also mentioned by the Honourable the Mover was that the British Government were going to impose duty on our export commodities and our trade will substantially suffer. So, in order to avoid the falling of our export trade with the United Kingdom, it is very necessary that we should enter into this Agreement of Imperial Preference. Now, I work out the arithmetic from another point of view. Suppose we do not allow any Imperial Preference on the goods imported from the United Kingdom and suppose the amount which we save in the case of this Imperial Preference may be, roughly speaking, one crore of rupees. Then we keep one crore of rupees which we would have saved by not giving preference to the British goods in our pocket, and for all the articles that are exported from India on which the duty is charged we may give a bounty out of this one crore which we have got equivalent to the duty imposed by the British Government. The point which we have then to consider is whether I have got sufficient money here to give in bounty all the articles exported to the United

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

Kingdom. So, this is a question of arithmetic which has to be carefully worked out. If I have got more money left and I have to give less in the shape of bounty, then I am a gainer. If, on the other hand, I have to pay in bounty much more than I possessed, then I would be a loser. But I should like very much to calculate on either side to find out which would be the more advantageous to India. I should like to find out what would be the financial effect on these things if out of the money which we have saved on account of not giving Imperial Preference to the British goods we may give a bounty to all those goods on which the additional duty is charged in the United Kingdom so that they may be able to compete on an equal level. This is a point which I have to work out. The materials that are given to us are not sufficient to work out these things. This is one of the points which I would like to discuss at the committee stage before I can endorse the agreement.

Sir, there is one more point to which our representatives ought to have given consideration and if they failed to do so, the matter ought to have been referred to the Tariff Board. If the Tariff Board also failed to consider it, then we ought to consider it at this stage. That matter relates to the entire question of our tariff policy. In fact, we have no policy whatsoever. Last year the Government said that they wanted more money and we then increased the tariff by 25 per cent. without taking into account the fact whether the law of diminishing returns was or was not applicable in any particular commodity. The Finance Department, on account of their overburdened duties in other sphere of work, never tried to work out in a scientific manner the whole theory of the tariff and the customs duties.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Order, order. The Honourable Member has already had 25 minutes. The Chair wishes him to conclude his remarks within five minutes more.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: They did not work out this theory at all. They might as well have asked the Fiscal Commission to work it out. Speaking personally, I strongly believe in the question of free trade, because I think that free trade is a boon to every country and it is a great mistake to disturb the natural trade of the world by means of tariff walls. We can no doubt impose the protective duties in the manner recommended by the Fiscal Commission. That is perfectly justifiable provided it is done as is recommended by the Commission for a limited period and in favour of those industries which are being run in an efficient manner and which are likely to stand on their own legs within a reasonable length of time. That is perfectly justifiable. If we want to levy a duty for revenue purposes, then we can select a few articles such as salt and matches. The trade with regard to other things ought to be as free as possible throughout the world. The whole thing ought to be scientifically inquired into and then we should frame a regular policy and the question of the Imperial Preference may perhaps be a side issue to it.

I am afraid I have not got much time at my disposal and I must only make a few more remarks. Let me say, in the first instance, that by this Agreement the agriculturists are deriving very little benefit. Take the case of wheat first. India cannot compete in wheat with Australia on her own soil—and this is evident from the fact that we had to impose last year a very heavy import duty on

the Australian wheat, Rs. 30 per ton,—then it is evident that the Indian wheat cannot compete with the Australian wheat on another soil, i.e., in the United Kingdom. So our wheat is not going to derive any benefit by means of the Imperial Preference. As regards cotton, I am exceedingly doubtful. I have no time to develop this, but when the Bill will come before us, I will express my views on this subject.

Now, as regards other products, there are very few items which will derive some benefit by means of Imperial Preference. Therefore, I would urge that we may be given an opportunity to discuss these things and examine the subject more carefully. In principle I am not opposed to the Agreement, I am not opposed to Imperial Preference, but I certainly want that we should be given an opportunity, as representatives of the tax-payers, to consider this question most carefully and to give our opinion in accordance with the dictates of our conscience. With these words, I move my amendment.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Amendment moved:

“That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

“That the Ottawa Trade Agreement between India and other countries of the British Empire be referred for scrutiny and report to a Committee of the Legislative Assembly consisting of the Honourable Sir Joseph Bhowe, Dr. D. B. Meek, Sir Hari Singh Gour, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chetty, Mr. B. Das, Sir Abdur Rahim, Mr. B. Sitaramaraju, Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan, Mr. G. Morgan, Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan and the Mover, with powers to co-opt not more than six specialists including persons interested in the industries affected by the Agreement; and to avoid dislocation in trade, this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council not to introduce a Bill to amend the Indian Tariff Act of 1894, till the report of the Committee has been adopted by the Assembly.

This Assembly further requests the Governor General in Council to urge on the British Government to suspend the operations of the Import Duties Act till this House has given its decision on the Agreement.”

Mr. B. Das: Sir, I beg to move:

“That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

“Having considered the papers on Ottawa Agreement, this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased:

- (a) to convey to His Majesty's Government that India is not prepared to consider any proposal for reciprocal trade benefits with the United Kingdom till such time as India is not given Responsible Self-Government; and

I wish to tell the House that I am making a slight alteration in part (b) of the amendment that I am moving. I am substituting the expression “Colonial Empire” for the expression “Dominions of British Commonwealth of Nations” and the word “Colony” for the word “Dominion”—

- (b) to convey to the Colonial Empire that no Trade Agreement will be entered into or Tariff concessions granted to any Colony which does not concede to Indians settled in their territory equal rights of citizenship.”

Sir, the whole country today is in a mood of co-operation and that feeling of co-operation was started under the sacred mango tree by Mahatma Gandhi in Yeravda jail; Mahatmaji has begun the spirit of reconciliation between caste Hindus and the Depressed Classes. Sir, today that spirit of unity and that spirit of reconciliation is being worked out at Allahabad, where our Leaders are working hard to achieve unity amongst the different communities. But from what I read in the newspapers, there is very slight hope of achieving unity, but still they are all working in that spirit of co-operation. They all want also to co-operate with England. Far be it for me to say that I do not want to co-operate with England. I want

[Mr. B. Das.]

to co-operate with England as a free partner of the British Empire; I do not want to co-operate with England as a subject race, but as a representative of sovereign nation. I fully endorse the high compliments paid by my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bore, to the Delegates that went out from India. I have seen it in the Press that personal reflections have been cast against the delegates who went out from India, that my Honourable friends, Mr. Chetty and Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, represented only the British interests. They themselves never said that they represented the Indian nation. They never said they were the accredited representatives of the Indian nation at Ottawa. Circumstanced as they were and situated as they were, they had to do their best. I will criticise later on the views of my Honourable friend, Mr. Chetty, the Deputy President of the House. But I have found it stated in the Press and he has also been challenged by the Federation of the Indian Merchants Chambers, of which he is a member of the executive committee and to which executive committee I also belong. How is it that the Federation of Indian Merchants Chambers elected or recommended Mr. Chetty to go to Geneva to represent the Indian mercantile community? Knowing that Mr. Chetty is going to Ottawa, how is it that the Federation of the Indian Merchants Chambers elected him to the executive committee? Differing as I do, I do differ from the views of my Honourable friend, Mr. Chetty, and also from the conclusions he has arrived at, differing as I do from him, all the same, I do warn the Press and I do warn the Indian Merchants Federation not to cast personal reflections on those who differ from them. After all, my Honourable friends, Mr. Chetty and Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, did not represent the people of India and they represented the Government of India and they tried to do their best under the circumstances. I may say this, if I were in their place, I do not know if I could have done better than they did. It may be that I would have appended a Minute of Dissent to that Agreement which they manufactured at the India House in London. But my Honourable friends, Mr. Chetty and Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, probably acted in a more statesmanlike manner than I would have done and they wanted to be businessmen only and forgot the political aspect of the question, having been so many thousands of miles away from India.

An Honourable Member: That is no defence for them.

Mr. B. Das: I am only saying that no personal reflections should be cast upon these friends. I was stating that my Honourable friends, while they were in that cold country, while they were in those bleak climes of Ottawa where, I understand, people travel on dog sledges or on sledges drawn by rein-deers, in that country my Honourable friends forgot the political aspect of the question, they forgot the exact implications of an agreement with England or with the Dominions.

Sir, my friends succumbed to the deep laid plot laid by the British Government, a plot which was not a new one. The plot is too well known to you, Sir. Alas, how I wish you were here on these Benches and, instead of my speaking, you would have addressed the House and exposed this deep laid plot which was started in 1903 and which was revived after the War! The plot of Imperial Preference was completed when the Conservative Government, or when the so-called National Government came into power in England. They hatched this plot, they passed

an Act last February, called the Import Duties Act. England only knew too well that the Economic Conference will meet at Ottawa. England passed the Import Duties Act whereby they put certain duties on certain articles imported into England. England wanted India to bow on her knees and bend down on her feet and to accept what Baldwin dictated at Ottawa and this was what my Honourable friends, Mr. Chetty and Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon, did at Ottawa. They did not breathe the spirit which my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, expressed. My Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, said that everything has ended happily. He said that India may not have come out very successfully, but India will not be worse off. I doubt whether the starting point with which my Honourable friends started to write the report was a correct one. What was the basis?

"It is no longer a question of what India stood to gain, but what she stands to lose."

That is the basis with which the representatives of Government of India started writing their report. There was a loaded pistol and there were the calculations of British economic experts and, probably, our experts. I take this opportunity to welcome my old friend, Mr. Burt, as a Member of this House. He was the Agricultural Adviser at Ottawa and he must have marshalled his statistics and figures. There is again my very esteemed friend, Dr. Meek, whom also I welcome here. He also must have sent volumes of statistics for my friends and my friends succumbed to the loaded pistol that England held at their throats. So when my friends all the time thought that India was going to lose everything and they must save everything from the deluge, how could they remember the basis of all agreements and conventions which you, Sir, laid down in that well-known report of the Fiscal Commission of which you were the distinguished Chairman. You, Sir, in your minute of dissent laid down the principles of reciprocity for India. I have always admired this report and I have always admired the minute of dissent that you and your four other distinguished colleagues wrote. You laid down in paragraph 44 on page 199, how India could have a reciprocal trade agreement with England:

"We are in favour of the principle of Imperial Preference on the distinct condition that India should in this matter be put on the same footing of freedom as is enjoyed by the Self-Governing Dominions, and that the non-official members of the Legislative Assembly should be given power by legislation or other equally effective means to initiate grant, vary and withdraw preference as may be necessary in the interest of India, in all its aspects."

This is better illustrated in one of the previous paragraphs and I will just take this opportunity to quote two pertinent sentences. In paragraph 31, on page 193, this aspect is further illustrated:

"The logical conclusion, therefore, is that India cannot accept the principle of Imperial Preference until she has attained responsible government, and is able to regulate her fiscal policy by the vote of a wholly elected legislature."

Then, I will read one more passage. This is from paragraph 34 on page 194:

"It will be obvious that Indian sentiment is practically unanimous against Imperial Preference in view of India's present political status in the Empire. The conclusion is therefore inevitable that this question can only become a matter of practical politics when the promised goal of responsible government is reached."

[Mr. B. Das.]

Sir, if I could sum up my whole amendment and my whole speech in one brief sentence, then I would sum up in this one sentence so beautifully and so admirably put:

“The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable that this question can only become a matter of practical politics when the promised goal of responsible government is reached.”

Sir, as I said, the representatives of India forgot the political aspects of this question. They did forget it as they mentioned some-
 4 P.M. where that they were busy in being lavishly entertained by the Canadian Government. They did forget it in that lavish entertainment and also because they had no alternative present. Of course I cannot ask three of these delegates, namely, Sir Atul Chatterjee, Sir George Rainy and Sir Padamji Ginwala to be Indian patriots or to think of the political aspect of the question. But, I wish, my other two friends had remembered this political aspect of the matter.

Sir, as I stated, the Indian Delegation started from the wrong end of the stick with a wrong premise that India is losing all the time. That is why they made so many misstatements in the body of this so-called admirable report. It is, of course, a very well-written report, but there are many misstatements in it. Too much has been made of discriminating protection. If this House gave certain discriminating protection to two particular industries, the steel industry and the cotton mill industry, it also gave Imperial Preference to England and let me tell the House that the non-official Members were, by a majority, opposed to it. The non-official Members quoted chapter and verse from this Magna Charta of the fiscal policy of India, but that was unheeded. To say that the people of India and the legislature had sanctioned discriminating protection with Imperial Preference is a travesty of facts and is a gross misstatement. If this booklet had been written for non-Indian readers only, I would not have minded at all. And my very esteemed friend, Mr. Chetty, with whom I have always worked and seldom differed, knows that if India was a party to discriminating protection with that adulteration of Imperial Preference, it was not at India's own free will. It was extracted from it under the pretence that the Government of India and the legislature must agree; and, constituted as this House is, with forty valiant men sitting behind the Commerce Member and with my friends of the European Group and my friends the nondescripts, what could you expect and how could India voice her national feeling? Today it will go out that India is a party to discriminating protection with another dose of preferential tariff. But I must say emphatically here that India has never been a party to it. As Mr. Baldwin has extracted from my friend, Mr. Chetty, certain concessions, so also Government have extracted certain concessions, because certain Indian industries wanted protection and Imperial Preference was extracted from us. My friend, Mr. Mitra, says, we accepted discriminating protection. We accepted, at the same time, the policy of giving certain preferential tariff to England. But I can show that both Mr. Mitra and myself voted in the opposite lobby to Government. We did not want to give any preferential tariff to England. Therefore, I understand discriminating protection to mean that the discrimination is such that England receives certain preferential tariffs. This differential duty was accepted from us and here there are statements that it has not done India any harm and India gave it of her own free will. But India never gave tariff preference

of her own free will; and what is said here in section 4 of para. 15, that this has been done entirely in India's interests and not on grounds which would justify the general scheme of tariff preference. I strongly refute this statement. This is a wrong statement, a misstatement.

All the time my friends were labouring that India should establish her position in the colonial markets: in para. 25, they bring about a certain misstatement about colonial markets; but I do not know if India is very anxious to capture the colonial market and tolerate the ill-treatment there. We are anxious to capture the colonial markets, but we do not like the colonials owing to the way we are treated there. This sentiment was so admirably laid down in section 2 of para. 44 of the minute of dissent signed by you, Sir, in the Fiscal Commission's Report.

"That the condition precedent to any agreement with a British Dominion in trade-matters on the basis of reciprocity should be the recognition of the right of Indian people to a status of complete equality and the repeal of all anti-Asiatic laws so far as they apply to the people of India."

When I said that, I would take off the word "dominions" from para. (b) of my Resolution, because I find my friend, Mr. Chetty, has not entered into agreement with any of the Dominions, and yet the fact stands that these Dominions have their large financial investments in British houses; but they have entered into certain agreements with the Colonies and to us, Indians, who are laymen, Dominions and Colonies are the same; and what is our position in the Colonies today? We are not recognised as equals and there are these anti-Asiatic laws that are upsetting and creating a lot of ill feeling among Indians from one end of India to the other; what is the effect of these anti-Asiatic laws? We read in the papers, in Calcutta there are thousands and thousands of returned emigrants from South Africa, New Guinea, Malaya, etc., who are starving and I read in the paper this morning or yesterday that the Government of India have been pleased to sanction the paltry sum of Rs. 2,000 for these people who are under my friend, Mr. K. Ahmed's care in Matia Bruz at Calcutta.

Mr. K. Ahmed: (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): I do not represent that part of the country.

Mr. B. Das: I have made it clear that I have no objection to entering into agreement with England; but the condition must precede that India must be the equal of England, so that we can meet as equals and not as a subordinate nation, as a subordinate race which has no independent point of view. Apart from that I have made it clear that I do not want any trade agreement today or tomorrow or even when India is free, with Canada or Australia or South Africa or with any Dominion or Colony for the bad treatment, for the anti-Asiatic laws they have framed; and I want to ask my friend, Sir Joseph Bhowe, who is so very anxious to enter into a trade agreement with the Colonies, what has he done about the trade discrimination between Indian residents and the European residents in Kenya and Tanganyika and how much our Indian friends and merchants are suffering today under trade disadvantages? My friend, Mr. Chetty, neglected that aspect of the question and today he asks India to enter into trade agreement with the Colonies. I am not going to enter into any trade agreement with any Colony. With these words, Sir, I commend my Resolution to the House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Amendment proposed:

"That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

'Having considered the papers on Ottawa Agreement, this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased:

- (a) to convey to His Majesty's Government that India is not prepared to consider any proposal for reciprocal trade benefits with the United Kingdom till such time as India is not given Responsible Self-Government; and
- (b) to convey to the Colonial Empire that no Trade Agreement will be entered into or Tariff concessions granted to any Colony which does not concede to Indians settled in their territory equal rights of citizenship'."

The next amendment on the Order Paper stands in the name of Mr. Misra, which cannot be allowed to be moved, because the first part is a repetition of what has already been moved and the second part is outside the scope of this Resolution. As regards Mr. Jog's amendment, that is also practically covered. He wants a Committee and a Committee has already been proposed.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh cannot move his amendment, because it is a repetition of what has been already proposed.

Mr. Ramakrishna Reddi.

Mr. T. N. Ramakrishna Reddi (Madras ceded Districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I do not move my amendment.*

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): Mr. Sitaramaraju.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju (Ganjam *cum* Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, with your permission, I propose a few changes in the amendment which runs as follows:

"This Assembly, before accepting the Trade Agreements made by the Government of India with His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, which was signed at Ottawa on the 20th August, 1932, and the Supplementary Agreement regarding iron and steel contained in the correspondence between Sir George Rainy and Sir Horace Wilson, dated the 22nd September, 1932, recommends to the Governor General in Council to refer the matter to the Tariff Board for the purpose of examining the said agreements so that if, on the report of the Tariff Board, the Indian Legislature were to come to the conclusion that the acceptance of the said Agreements are in the interests of India, this Assembly might recommend to the Governor General in Council to introduce such legislative measures as it might deem to be necessary and this Assembly further requests the Governor General in Council to request His Majesty's Government to postpone the operation of the Import Duties Act in the meantime."

Sir, I move. !

* "That for the original Resolution the following be substituted:

"This Assembly, before accepting the Trade Agreement made by the Government of India with His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, which was signed at Ottawa on the 20th August, 1932, and the Supplementary Agreement regarding iron and steel contained in the correspondence between Sir George Rainy and Sir Horace Wilson, dated the 22nd September 1932, would submit the report of the Ottawa Agreement drafted by Sir Atul Chatterjee and other members of the Indian delegation for the consideration of various Chambers of Commerce in India and with the collective opinions thus obtained would submit the Agreement and all connected papers and opinions for examination by the Tariff Board, and if the Tariff Board reports that such Agreement is to the best interest of India, then recommend to the Governor General in Council that he do introduce in the Indian Legislature at the earliest possible moment such legislative measures as may be necessary to give effect to the Agreements in question and to make representations to His Majesty's Government to suspend the operation of Foreign Import Duties Act on Indian commodities entering the United Kingdom until the time the Assembly considers the Ottawa Agreements."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member is reading the word "might"; that makes it indefinite.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: "Will" I propose to substitute for "might" to make it definite. Sir, in moving this amendment I would like to say that my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, who has moved his amendment has placed the question on an economic issue; and my Honourable friend, Mr. Das, has placed his amendment on what he called the political issue. I consider that economics is only a part of politics and politics today is nothing but economics; and, therefore, in moving my amendment I would like to say that it is as much a political as an economic issue. These trade agreements have been entered into by the Indian Delegation which was only representing the Government of India, but not the people of this country. The Government of India's representatives entered into an agreement with His Majesty's Government. The Government of India are not responsible to the people of this country, but they are responsible, under the constitution, to the people with whom they entered into an agreement. Therefore I wish to say that this Agreement, which was entered into by the Government of India, as agents of His Majesty's Government, with their principals, His Majesty's Government, must be submitted to the scrutiny of this House. I repudiate the suggestion that the representatives of the Indian delegation are in any way representing this House.

Mr. K. Ahmed: It is good logic?

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: I always speak good logic only, Mr. Kabiruddin Ahmed. The Government of India said that they did not intend to make any changes without satisfying the Legislature that they are in the interests of India. But I would like to ask the Government of India, whether they have placed this Legislature in a position now to satisfy themselves that the Agreements which they have entered into with His Majesty's Government at Ottawa are really in the interests of India? I submit that they have not placed us in a position to judge and to satisfy ourselves that those Agreements are to the benefit of this country. Today we find that experts have been called in to the rescue of the Government, probably to fight us on the floor of this House regarding the benefits of these Agreements, but the same consideration was not shown to us. We were not given the opportunity to scrutinise these Agreements by any impartial tribunal or by an expert body like the Tariff Board. When I said that this matter must be referred to the Tariff Board, I was only repeating what was laid down in the Fiscal Commission Report. The Fiscal Commission, at page 119, in para. 263. state as follows:

"It is evident that the Legislature can hardly be asked to pronounce an opinion on the policy until it has some idea of the extent to which its application is feasible. We would, therefore, recommend that as a preliminary to any consideration of the desirability of India adopting the policy of Imperial Preference, an examination should be made by the Tariff Board to determine whether there are any commodities on which preference might be given in accordance with the principles which we have laid down to the benefit of the Empire and without detriment to India's interests."

Further, Sir, they have, at the close of para. 264, stated as follows:

"And it is evident that political considerations could not be excluded in determining whether it was desirable for India to enter into an economic agreement or not."

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

That would strengthen my position that political considerations cannot be separated, although this is purely a business proposition. On the strength of this recommendation by the Fiscal Commission that the Tariff Board should examine the various commodities and see how far these agreements are to the interests of this country, I have tabled this amendment that an inquiry should be made by the Tariff Board as a condition precedent to our decision. When some others and I have been proposing these amendments, we were accused of trying to adopt dilatory tactics and imposing political considerations on a measure of an emergent character. To consider a business proposition, I suppose that the parties to that business deal must both be free, and, therefore, when any of my friends ask that India should be a self-governing country to enter into these agreements, they only ask that India should be in a position like any of the other Dominions to enter, as a free and unfettered party, to an agreement in order to avoid any possible undue influence being brought to bear upon such a business deal. You have, Sir, practically, in your minute of dissent, stated, what my friend, Mr. B. Das, repeated in his amendment, looking at it purely from a business point of view. Therefore, I say that it is a purely business proposition and that both parties should be free and unfettered. If this is a business proposition, and if we are placed in a position to judge, that these agreements would be to our interests, I do not think there will be anybody in this House who would forgo an advantage to India. But we must be sure of that. It is not we who were importing political considerations of the character to which those people who are anxious that we should ratify this Agreement say, but they are importing political considerations. I read from an inspired telegram of the Associated Press that the Conservatives who are in a great majority in the House of Commons today might be displeased by any refusal on our part to ratify these Agreements. Thus it is our enemies who introduce political considerations, by threats and promises referring to the constitutional advance. We may expect the Ethiopian to change his skin, the leopard its spots, but we can never expect an Englishman to forget his self-interest in a fit of magnanimity. We shall not be doing good to this country to be led away by such considerations.

Sir, there are two reasons advanced by the Government why they could not submit these Agreements to the consideration either of an expert Committee or to the Tariff Board. It is said that there was a great hurry to pass this Resolution on two grounds—one is the announcement of His Majesty's Government to enforce the Import Duties Act by a certain date, and the other is, the power given under this Report to get out by giving six months' notice. These two grounds

The Honourable Sir Joseph Shore: May I correct my Honourable friend? I do not know whether he is referring to me, but I never said so. In fact, I made it perfectly clear that by reason of the fact that our Delegation has signed the Agreement, the 15th November had ceased to be a crucial date.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: I thank the Honourable Member, and I accept his correction that it is not a crucial date. We are being terrified with the operation of the Import Duties Act and also being assured that we

will not be doing lasting injury if we accept this Agreement, because there is a clause in it which would enable us to get out of the obligation by giving six months' notice if we want to get out. With regard to the six months' notice, of which so much has been made, I would like to say this. This is a trade agreement. It is not a fancy dress ball where we can get in and get out according to our will and pleasure. If we want to repudiate this Agreement, it must be by an Act. And how is that Act passed? A Bill must be passed by this House, and then it must go before the Council of State, and through the bottle neck of the Council of State it must pass. We know the composition of the Council of State. Then, the Bill has to receive the assent of His Excellency the Governor General, and lastly, there are of course the powers reserved to the Crown under the constitution. If there is anybody in this House who so far forgets himself as to think that the six months' notice is such an easy way by which we can get in and get out according to our will and pleasure, he is sadly mistaken. There is also another aspect. References have been made to the freedom we may get under the new constitution. I ask, is there any gentleman in this House who believes that the Conservative majority in the House of Commons will give us a constitution which will be of any use to us, and if some of my friends who think that by accepting these Agreements we will get freedom, let them be satisfied; but I for one am very pessimistic and do not hope to get a constitution worth having from the Conservatives. If by a miracle the Conservatives in England were to give us a constitution which we require, as this is a trade agreement, it cannot assure us to provide when we want to give the six months' notice, the same conditions which prevail at the time when we enter into this Agreement, because in the meantime trade would be dislocated the finances would be upset, and we do not know what changes will be on our budgetary position. There is also the question of retaliation by the foreign countries. Sir, either we have monopolies or we have no monopolies. The report says that except in jute we have no monopolies, and there is danger of other countries coming and competing with us even in that by substitutes. If we have monopolies, where is the hurry for us to enter into an Agreement with England? We need not fear England at all. If we have no monopolies, then surely we must fear retaliation from foreign countries.

The other question is the question of the Import Duties Act, and the announcement of His Majesty's Government that they are going to apply this Import Duties Act by the 15th November if no satisfactory agreements are forthcoming. Although the Government of India may have said in the person of Sir Joseph Blore, the Commerce Member, that that is not a crucial question, that is exactly what frightened the Indian Delegation to come to this Agreement, because they were saying that on account of the announcement of His Majesty's Government that they would put the Import Duties Act into effect

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: If my Honourable friend would permit me, may I say that there is this difference. Before the Agreement was concluded, the 15th November was a definitely crucial date so far as we were concerned. After the Agreement was concluded, it ceased to be a crucial date.

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muham-
madan Rural): Then you can wait.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: Then the only case they have got is the threat of the Import Duties Act, and that is the only thing which frightened the Indian Delegation to surrender practically everything and to grant preferences indiscriminately on almost all British imports. Even the attitude of the British Delegation in refusing to accommodate the Indian Delegation with regard to cotton and hemp did not open their eyes to the real character of the negotiations that they were having with His Majesty's Government. If, as the Honourable Member in charge says, that is not a crucial point now, have the Government of India asked His Majesty's Government that the date may be definitely postponed, pending reference of the matter to the Legislature on behalf of the people of this country since they have been acting so far only as representatives of the Government of India?

There are one or two things which were said by the Indian Delegation to be the factors which guided them in their deliberations. They say that it was no longer a question of what India stood to gain, but what she stood to lose on account of the Import Duties Act and, consequently, they lay down a test. They say:

"The only test by which the value of a particular agreement can be judged is the extent to which it results in an increase in the export trade of the countries concerned or in the retention of trade which would otherwise have been diminished or altogether lost."

It avoids the Fiscal Commission's report and its findings on the question of Imperial Preference by pitching down the question of preference from one of positive gain to a mere avoidance of loss and then giving a rule that the value of these Agreements can only be decided by the increase in exports or by the avoidance of losses. To put their report to their own test, the effect is this. Take the question of increase of exports. An examination of the imports and exports between India and the United Kingdom for a number of years would show that the trade relations with the United Kingdom appear to be for years now the same and that it is not possible to find in the United Kingdom anything in the way of expansion of a substantial character. The intake in the United Kingdom is not sufficiently large, and, therefore, we must come to the inevitable conclusion that the scope afforded in England for our exports is not large. Again, the Indian Delegation, in assessing the loss, have taken into consideration only one factor, and that was the trade relations between India and Great Britain. They have not given consideration to our trade relations with the other countries of the world. Therefore, in order to assess the loss properly, we have no evidence to show how our trade relations with the foreign countries will be affected, and it must be realised that after all it is the foreign countries who take more of our exports than the United Kingdom. Then, again, supposing we are able to divert the trade from those foreign countries to Great Britain or diminish the imports from the foreign countries, we have to consider it from this point of view. If we diminish or divert those imports from the foreign countries, you must remember that the purchasing power of those foreign countries would be considerably lessened and then we will be very much handicapped when it comes to a question of our export trade, as they reduce their purchases or are incapacitated to take our exports altogether. Thus we lose.

I have spoken about retaliation already. The fourth consideration is the statement made by the Honourable the Commerce Member that 16

countries have entered into an agreement or are ready to enter into an agreement with the United Kingdom on account of these Agreements. There is nothing very surprising in that. On the other hand, there is a danger there. Mr. Stanley Baldwin has been saying that with these Agreements in their pockets they could negotiate with foreign countries for advantages. The members of the Indian Delegation did not see what possible effect that would have on India, and they have entered into these Agreements blindly. Again, we have to consider the effect on our budgetary position. It is not possible for me in a debate like this to go into details, but I would ask the Members of this House to read the Fiscal Commission's report on Imperial Preference, where they have laid down clearly the economic principles which have to guide our deliberations in this matter and how we ought to assess the gains and losses on account of any preference or reciprocal arrangements. The conditions which prevailed during the time when the Fiscal Commission sat were similar to the conditions which prevailed when Lord Curzon was administering the country. In fact they approved Lord Curzon's view of Imperial Preference and its possible effect on India, and today we find that the conditions, so far as these conclusions are concerned, are not materially different from those which prevailed at the time when the Fiscal Commission sat, broadly speaking.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Ibrahim Rahimtoola): The Honourable Member will have to conclude in five minutes.

Mr. B. Sitaramaraju: Therefore when we consider the revenue aspect, we have to consider whether we have to pay as a consumer. If we need not have to pay as a consumer, then we must have to pay as a tax-payer, for, after all, customs revenue is our mainstay. How is that customs revenue to be safeguarded under these preferences? Our main trouble at the present time is not want of expansion. Our main trouble is the fall in the commodity prices of agricultural produce and these preferences will not help us to raise those commodity prices. Taking all these things into consideration and the admission in the statement made by Sir Joseph Bore, that no accurate profit and loss account or balance sheet can be struck even approximately and, taking into consideration the fact that several Indian economists and other experts who have gone into this question and who have been issuing voluminous records disproving and denouncing this Agreement entered into by this Delegation and proving that these agreements are not in the best interests of India, I think I have made a very good case that the whole matter should be enquired into by an impartial and expert body like the Tariff Board. Further, the Indian economists and experts who have gone into this matter have differed from the Delegation both as regards statistics and methods of approach and that makes a good deal of difference when we come to assess the profit and loss account under this Agreement. To take a few of the remarks made on some commodities, so far as tea is concerned, we need not fear, because England would take good care that she should not injure her own nationals. Referring to the large number of people who are serving as coolies in these tea plantations, coming as I do from the Vizagapatam district and knowing the conditions of labour prevailing there, I do not think it is a great calamity for India to suffer for want of that employment, but, I am sure, England would not injure her own nationals

[Mr. B. Sitaramaraju.]

As regards jute, it was said that it was a monopoly and as regards the eight crores loss by non-acceptance, in the British market, that trade can be diverted to markets outside the British markets. It will certainly find a place in the markets of foreign countries. I am sure, the Tariff Board will satisfy the Honourable Member for Commerce how the eight crores can be diverted. As regards the three questions which were raised by Sir Joseph Bhore, I would like to answer for him.

Question 1.—Why the delegation went to Ottawa?—They went because the Government of Great Britain wanted them to go.

Question 2.—What did they give and get?—Nobody knew.

Question 3.—Why they have to accept the Agreements?—Because the Conservative majority would have it so.

***Mr. S. G. Jog** (Berar Representative): I had given an amendment which was substantially the same as that given by my esteemed friend Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, who is a student of mathematics. There was a slight addition to the amendment which was ultimately adopted by him and I am glad to find that he has scored a victory on me and I was not in a position to move my amendment as my own.

To start with, I would like to say, I would reserve my remarks on the political nature of the measure that is being introduced here. I for one would like to divorce politics from this measure and consider it on its own merits and demerits. Before doing so, I would like to charge the Member in charge of this Resolution with the offence of rash driving. The idea or the policy of free trade which has been in vogue in England for so many centuries is now attempted to be changed and, in England, economists have given great thought to this question and from free trade to protection, from protection to discriminating protection and, after that, the import duties and they have now reached this stage. Probably in England they had ample opportunity of discussing these questions which were before the country for a long time. They have given their consideration to these questions since 1901 and probably the last result was the introduction of the Import Duties Act. Let us consider the position of India. India has all along been playing a subordinate part to British Government in all matters, political as well as fiscal. It is extremely doubtful whether India has got the right to determine her fiscal policy as she likes and, when it was decided to enter into these Agreements, the question was never discussed on the floor of this House and it was all of a sudden given out on the floor of the House to send a few nominated people who fortunately are Members of the House. I should have really criticised their representative character. One of them is a member of our party and is a student of economics of some name and fame. Whatever that may be, he was simply nominated and not elected by this House. But he was simply a nominated representative and he was not elected by this House. That takes away a good deal from the representative character of my Honourable friend, and howsoever eminent he may be, his opinions are open to grave doubt and we have every right to question them. With due respect to him, then, there is that anomaly in his

position, namely, his going there as the nominee of the Government and not as a representative of this House. Now, what would he have done if he had gone there as the chosen representative of this House? I leave that to my friends to imagine. I doubt very much whether he would have supported this Agreement or would have used the same arguments as he has now done. However, that is a matter of guess and conjecture, and I have no mind to dilate upon that point any more.

Then, this House is now called upon to pass a verdict upon this Agreement which has been reached. The correspondence, I should say only a partial correspondence, was released for publication only a short time ago. Now we received what is called the Trade Agreement only about 20 days ago. It contains so many Schedules and the note written by the Delegates and all these things which are so full of figures; therefore, naturally you expect people to go through them and to study them, and only in that case alone can they come to a conclusion. I am quite a layman in this respect. I am neither an economist nor an industrialist, but, at the same time, I would like to understand what the real position is. The Honourable Member in charge of the Resolution has himself said that he is not an experienced man in this matter. He can neither judge the consequences of this Agreement in pounds, shillings and pence nor come to an accurate decision as to what the actual result would be. He himself has said that it is a sort of experiment, and he wants to make this experiment or rather thrust it on this House and he wants us to come to a quick and final judgment within two or three days without giving us the opportunity of consulting or having negotiations or conferences with interests that may be affected by this Trade Agreement. It is not one item or commodity that we are dealing with: several commodities we are dealing with, several interests will be affected one way or the other, and yet he wants this House to give a hasty decision on this insufficient material. The arguments advanced have been questioned by equally important students of economics as well as by industrialists. The whole matter, I submit, has to be threshed out by all the interests affected, before this House can be called upon to pass a verdict on such an important issue. You cannot ask this House to take a leap in the dark. Let them consult the best economists of India or any other persons in whom they may have confidence, and let their views be formulated on the results of this Conference. That will then give us some idea as to how we should act before we can pass a verdict upon this thing and before we saddle the whole of India with this financial burden. It is very difficult to say whether this Agreement will end in a gain or in a loss to India. The Honourable Member in charge has simply said that after all it is a guess. I quite admit that there are difficulties in the way, but does it mean that the House should not satisfy itself by a thorough and searching inquiry and a close scrutiny before it passes a final verdict on this important issue? The subject no doubt has attracted the attention of economists of some fame and even they say—I am reading from this pamphlet which I think everybody has got:

"An attempt has been made in this pamphlet to explain in simple language the fruits of such study. It is not pretended that a more intensive study is not possible. In fact it is possible and required. If such an intensive inquiry into the effects of the Agreement on each article of trade can be made by those interested in the same, we shall be in a better position to realize the implications of the Agreement. * * *"

[Mr. S. G. Jog.]

Even these schools of economics find themselves in a difficulty in coming to an accurate conclusion as regards the effects, the probable effects of this Agreement. Now, there are very few people amongst us who are students of economics, and they can be counted on one finger's ends and the rest or many of them are laymen like myself. I myself want to be convinced as to the efficacy of the Agreement and so far I have kept an open mind as to how I should vote. I am trying to understand these things for the last eight or ten days, but I have not been able to come to any conclusion. My principal difficulty is that the whole thing is so puzzling. (*An Honourable Member*: "Have you made any head or tail of it?") I am trying my best, but I am afraid the more I read, the more puzzled do I get. (*Laughter*.) There is a strong desire felt in the House generally to understand the problem and to come to an intelligent conclusion and to give an intelligent verdict. So, instead of rushing through this Resolution, I would earnestly request that some thorough and searching inquiry should be made which will give us some idea as to what the final verdict should be. With these words, I would strongly recommend the amendment moved by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad and I lend him my entire support and would earnestly request the House also to support him.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday the 8th November, 1932.