

31st March 1937

**THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

(Official Report)

Volume III, 1937

(15th March to 3rd April, 1937)

FIFTH SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1937



PUBLISHED BY THE MANAGER OF PUBLICATIONS, DELHI.
PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, SIMLA.

1937

Legislative Assembly.

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

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

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

SIR LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SIR COWASJI JEHangIR, BART., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Petitions :

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

SIR LESLIE HUDSON, KT., M.L.A.

SARDAR SANT SINGH, M.L.A.

MR. M. GHIASUDDIN, M.L.A.

MR. MATHURADAS VISSANJI, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—15th March to 3rd April, 1937.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
MONDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1937,—		WEDNESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1937,—<i>contd.</i>	
Questions and Answers	1909—19	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the con- sideration of clauses not concluded	2070— 2120
Short Notice Question and Answer	1919—20		
Motion for adjournment <i>re</i> Jute Mill Strike at Cal- cutta—disallowed by the Governor General	1921	THURSDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Com- mittee	1921—26	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the con- sideration of clauses not concluded	2121—78
Motion of the Standing Committee on Roads	1927	FRIDAY, 19TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways	1927	Member Sworn	2179
Election of the Central Ad- visory Council for Rail- ways	1927	Questions and Answers	2179—86
The Indian Oaths (Amend- ment) Bill—Introduced	1928	Unstarred Questions and Answers	2186—87
The Commercial Docu- ments Evidence Bill— Introduced	1928—29	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the consi- deration of clauses con- cluded	2187— 2233
The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the motion to consider not conclud- ed	1929—82	Statement of Business	2233
TUESDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1937,—		SATURDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1937,—	
Questions and Answers	1983—90	Member Sworn	2235
The Indian Finance Bill— Motion to consider adopt- ed	1990— 2058	Questions and Answers	2235—41
WEDNESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1937,—		Unstarred Questions and Answers	2241—47
Questions and Answers	2059—64	Statements laid on the table	2247—50
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2064—70	Election of the Standing Finance Committee for Railways and the Public Accounts Committee	2250—51
		The Indian Finance Bill— Recommended amend- ment negatived	2251—68

	PAGES.		PAGES.
SATURDAY 20TH MARCH, 1937,—contd.		TUESDAY, 30TH MARCH, 1937,—contd.	
Demands for Supplementary Grants	2268—89	The Indian Soft Coke Cess (Reconstitution of Committee) Bill—Circulated	2384—2403
The Arya Marriage Validation Bill—Passed as amended	2289—95	The Repealing and Amending Bill—Discussion on the consideration of clauses not concluded	2403—15
Statement of Business	2295—96	WEDNESDAY, 31ST MARCH, 1937,—	
Election to and Nominations for the Standing Committee for Roads	2296—97	Questions and Answers	2417—43
TUESDAY, 30TH MARCH, 1937,—		Unstarred Questions and Answers	2443—51
Members Sworn	2299	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Racial Discrimination against Indian Members of the Military Medical Services in India—Adopted	2452, 2493—2510
Questions and Answers	2299—2349	Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways	2452
Unstarred Questions and Answers	2349—58	Election of Member to the Standing Committee for Roads	2452
Statements laid on the table	2358—65	Election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	2452—53
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Banning by the Police Commissioner, Calcutta, of Processions, Meetings and other Demonstrations—Ruled out of order	2365—69 and 2382—84	The Repealing and Amending Bill—Passed	2453—58
Declaration by H. E. the Governor General	2369	The Commercial Documents Evidence Bill—Circulated	2458—59
Election of the Standing Finance Committee	2369—70	Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Accounts of 1933-34	2459—93
The Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2370	THURSDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1937,—	
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	2370	Members Sworn	2511
The Indian Oaths (Amendment) Bill—Circulated	2370—91	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Firing by Police at Panipat—Disallowed by the Governor General	2511—12
The Code of Civil Procedure (Third Amendment) Bill—Passed	2381—82 and 2384—85		
The Indian Red Cross Society (Amendment) Bill—Passed	2385—94		

PAGES.	PAGES.
THURSDAY, 1ST APRIL, 1937, — <i>contd.</i>	FRIDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1937, — <i>contd.</i>
The Indian Arms (Amendment) Bill—Motion to refer to Select Committee negatived	Message from the Council of State
2512—28	2573
The Moslem Personal Law (<i>Shariat</i>) Application Bill—Referred to Select Committee	Resolution re—
2528—44	Introduction of Homeopathic Treatment in Government Hospitals and Recognition of Homeopathic Colleges in India—Adopted
The Muslim Intestate Succession Bill—Circulated	2573—92
2544—46	India's withdrawal from the Membership of the League of Nations—Discussion not concluded
The Indian Subscriptions Bill—Discussion ruled out	2592—2605
2546—48	
The Control of Coastal Traffic Bill—Discussion on the motion to refer to Select Committee not concluded	SATURDAY, 3RD APRIL, 1937,—
2548—52	Questions and Answers
FRIDAY, 2ND APRIL, 1937,—	2629—33
Display of Flags or Emblems on the tables of Honourable Members within the Assembly Chamber	Motion for Adjournment
2553	2633
Member Sworn	The Insurance Bill—Appointment of Mr. J. A. Mackeown to the Select Committee in place of Mr. P. J. Griffiths
2553	2633
Questions and Answers	The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed
2553—58	2633—38
Short Notice Question and Answer	The Payment of Wages (Amendment) Bill—
2558—61	Passed as amended
Statements laid on the table	2638—62
2561—65	Resolution re—
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Arrest of Congress Leaders and Volunteers in Delhi—Adopted	Amendment of the Indian Legislative Rules—Postponed
2565—72	2662
and 2605—27	Payment of the Depreciation Reserve Fund from the Railway Revenues—Postponed
Election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department	2663
2572—73	Report of the Public Accounts Committee
	2663—68

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 31st March, 1937.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

CESSATION OF REPRESENTATION BY BURMESE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

787. *Mr. Sham Lal: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that according to the Legislative Assembly Rules in force a Member elected to this House can only cease to be a Member on his resigning his seat or on the dissolution of the Assembly?

(b) On what date Members representing Burma in this House will cease to continue to be the Members of this Assembly?

(c) Will they cease to be Members of this Assembly on the 1st April, 1937, and if so, how will this be done, unless they resign, or the Assembly is dissolved?

Mr. G. H. Spence: (b) On the 1st April, 1937.

(c) Under the operation of paragraph 8 of the Government of India (Commencement and Transitory Provisions) Order, 1936, which requires Members of the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly who have been elected or nominated to represent Burma or Burma constituencies to vacate their seats on the commencement of Part III of the new Act.

(a) As Burma Members will vacate their seats otherwise than in pursuance of the Electoral Rules, this part of the question does not arise. But the Honourable Member is mistaken in supposing that resignation and dissolution are the only contingencies which have the effect of vacating a seat.

MANDI AT THE NARELA RAILWAY STATION IN THE DELHI PROVINCE.

788. *Mr. Sham Lal: (a) Are Government aware:

(i) that a *mandi* was established by Major Beadon, the Deputy Commissioner of Delhi, at Narela Railway Station in Delhi Province;

(ii) that the sites of the shops were sold by auction and Rs. 1,76,000 were realised by him;

(iii) that at the time of the auction assurances were given by the Deputy Commissioner to the purchasers that arrangements for light and sanitation of the *mandi* would be made and the *mandi* would be connected with other important places by *pucca* roads;

- (iv) that after the establishment of the *mandi* a further tax of As. 1-8 per rupee of the rent was also imposed upon the shopkeepers;
- (v) that Government or the District Board have done nothing to make good the promises held out by the Government that there are no arrangements for sanitation or light and that no roads have been constructed to connect Narela *mandi* with important towns; and
- (vi) that there are no arrangements for drinking water, there being only one well, the water of which is saltish and unfit for drinking?
- (b) Will Government give an account of the sale proceeds realised at the time of the auction?
- (c) Is the money lying to the credit of the Government or the District Board?
- (d) How much money has been spent for the *mandi* and in what manner?
- (e) Are Government aware that this *mandi* can be connected with Alipur, Kharkhaudah and Bahadurgarh by *pucca* roads?
- (f) Are Government aware that if this is done, it would become a flourishing *mandi*?
- (g) Are Government prepared to provide a well at this *mandi*? If not, are Government prepared to allow the *mandi* people to sink a well in the District Board land adjacent to the *mundi*?
- (h) Are Government prepared to enquire into all the grievances of the *mandi* people and redress them?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) to (h). Information has been called for and will be supplied to the House as soon as possible.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS IN THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE, 'E' DIVISION, CALCUTTA, TO THE *MOFFUSIL*.

789. ***Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Are Government aware that some officials enjoying the higher scale of pay in the Railway Mail Service, 'E' Division, Calcutta, have been recently transferred to the *moffusil* (lower scale of pay)?

(b) Is it a fact that the financial position of the department is showing signs of recovery?

(c) How do Government reconcile their policy with the statement made by the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, last year on the floor of the Assembly in the course of which he definitely stated that: "As regards the number of the staff employed at present, Mr. Giri has undoubtedly some reason for the grievance which he put forward....." Now that the financial position is easier. I do not think there is the same complaint as existed some time ago?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government have no information. If the officials concerned consider that they have a grievance, it is open to them to represent it to the proper authority in the usual manner.

(b) Yes.

(c) The passage quoted by the Honourable Member related to the provision of adequate staff in post offices and the R. M. S. and has no relation to the point raised by the Honourable Member.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: With reference to the reply to part (a) of my question, will Government kindly make inquiries and take the necessary steps if they find that the case is a genuine one?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: No, Sir; my reply was that if any official considers that he has a grievance, it is open to him to represent it to the proper authority in the usual manner. So far as I know, that has not yet been done, and if it is done, the proper authority will deal with it.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know, Sir, if the Honourable Member will be good enough to send a copy of the question and answer to the officer there to consider the matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Certainly.

RELAXATION TO THE STAFF WORKING IN THE HOWRAH RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE OFFICE.

790. ***Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Is it a fact that with a view to giving relaxation to the staff in the Railway Mail Service office at Howrah, Government have issued orders to afford relaxation to four officials per week?

(b) Are Government aware that the strength of the staff is about 40 in the above office and, according to present arrangement, an official can only get one day off in two months?

(c) Is it not a fact that officials belonging to the Post Offices get relaxation every alternate week?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the affirmative, what are Government going to do to remove this anomaly and to afford proper relaxation to the staff working in the Howrah Railway Mail Service office?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) and (b). The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the statement laid on the table of the House on the 31st August, 1936, in reply to parts (d) and (e) of his starred question No. 1365.

(c) No, not in all cases.

(d) Does not arise.

FIXATION OF THE SCALES OF PAY OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE OFFICIALS.

791. ***Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury:** (a) Are Government aware that in the statement laid on the table of this House on the 31st August, 1936, in answer to starred question No. 1388, asked on the 26th March, 1936, Government stated that less period of duty is prescribed for administrative office due to the exacting nature of the work done by the officials concerned?

(b) Is it a fact that work in the Head and Sub Record Offices and in the Sorting Mail Offices in the Railway Mail Service has been classed as less exacting and less hazardous than work in the administrative office? If so, are Government aware of the portion of the speech of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, in the course of which he stated in the Assembly (1936) amongst other things—"that in fixing the scales of pay of the Railway Mail Service officials, some small additional allowance is made—that they are given twenty days casual leave as compared with 12 days' leave enjoyed by the department and that a leave reserve of 20 per cent. is maintained in the Railway Mail Service, as against 17 per cent. in the Post Office"?

(c) Is it a fact that these extra concessions were allowed to the Railway Mail Service officials in view of the fact that their nature of work is more hazardous and more exacting?

(d) If the reply to part (c) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to revise the working hours of the above offices and prescribe a less period of work?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes, but it was in reply to question No. 1887, dated the 23rd March, 1936.

(b) The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. In regard to the second part, Government are aware of the statement made by the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs.

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

(d) Does not arise.

RECESS INTERVAL TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS EMPLOYEES ASKED TO STAY FOR OVERTIME.

792. *Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: (a) Is it a fact that Government do not allow any recess interval to the Press employees, when they are asked to stay for overtime and that the employees have to find their own recess interval, i.e., they have to break for half an hour for which they are not paid, before returning for overtime?

(b) Is it also a fact that they have to put in 2½ hours while they are paid only for two hours?

(c) Is it also a fact that formerly they used to enjoy the privilege of getting this recess interval from Government?

(d) Is it also a fact that Mr. Coombs, the then Controller, had recommended to the Government of India that "as the employees have to work overtime in the interest of Government work, Government should allow them the recess interval"?

(e) Are Government prepared to go into this matter with a view to granting the Press employees relief in this respect?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Rest intervals are allowed to the Press employees as required under the Factories Act, 1934; no payment is made for them.

(b) I presume that the Honourable Member refers to overtime. Payment for overtime is made for the whole period of overtime worked exclusive of the rest interval.

(c) They still get the rest interval: but prior to 1926, payments were made for intervals to certain men.

(d) Views expressed departmentally by officers of Government are confidential and Government are not prepared to disclose them.

(e) No.

SCANT ATTENTION GIVEN TO THE ECONOMIC CONDITIONS OF INDIA IN THE BOOK "WORLD ECONOMIC SURVEY, 1935-36" OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

793. *Mr. K. Santhanam: Will Government state:

- (a) if they have read the book 'World Economic Survey, 1935-36' of the League of Nations;
- (b) if they have noted the scant attention given in the book to the economic conditions of India during the period dealt with; and
- (c) if the answer to part (b) be in the affirmative, whether they propose to draw the attention of the authorities of the League of Nations to this fact?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a), (b) and (c). The "World Economic Survey" published by the League of Nations deals with economic tendencies in the world as a whole and with international trade and finance. It illustrates these tendencies by reference to national conditions, but does not purport to present a complete picture of the domestic economy of any particular country. The Government of India do not consider that the number of references to India calls for any action of the kind suggested.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are Government aware, Sir, that statistics for India are not available on the same scale as they are available in other countries?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is precisely the trouble; the statistics compiled do not give a complete picture as they do in other countries, and that is one of the matters which will have to engage the consideration of the Government.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Why don't Government set up a machinery by which accurate statistics could be obtained?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Hitherto the reason has been that the preparation of complete statistics is a very expensive matter, and the limitations placed on the collection of statistics have been on grounds of finance alone.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did the Honourable Member make inquiries as to the probable cost of establishing a machinery for the collection of statistics?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: A good deal of information about it is contained in Bowley-Robertson's Report.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if there will be sufficient funds for that purpose at any time?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am not a prophet.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have Government considered the question of the accuracy or adequacy of the "World Economic Survey, 1935-36" the book mentioned in this question,—whether that survey is adequate when the references to India are so scant as alleged in this question? I am merely asking whether the scant attention paid to India is or is not likely to affect the accuracy or adequacy of the World Economic Survey.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I don't think so. The World Economic Survey relates mainly to international conditions, and not so much to domestic conditions, and I have often gathered that it was the desire of the Party opposite to limit the trade exchanges with the world outside.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Nothing of the kind! May I know whether the Honourable the Finance Member has considered from the point of view of international trade with which alone this book is concerned that the scanty references to India are sufficient to give us a true picture of the international trade considering that India is a very big part of the world?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is a matter of opinion. I think it is conceivable that there might be more references to India if we advertise ourselves a little more.

Mr. K. Santhanam: Does the Honourable Member know that even China gets greater attention in this book than India?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am prepared to take it from the Honourable Member, but China is a very big country.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government be pleased to draw the attention of the League of Nations to the scant attention paid to India in this book, considering the fact that we are contributing a large sum to the League, and in view also of the fact that we are an original Member of the League, may I know if my friend will be pleased to draw the attention of the League of Nations to the scant attention paid to India?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I would rather like first to put our own house in order?

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Is the Honourable Member of opinion that the money spent on the collection of statistics is not commensurate with the benefit we derive?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I don't think that arises out of this question.

ACQUISITION OF A BUILDING IN PURANI MANDI, AJMER, TO PROVIDE A LIQUOR SHOP ON RENT.

794. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria:** (a) Are Government aware that the Ajmer Local Administration is acquiring a building in *Purani Mandi*, Ajmer, to provide a liquor shop on rent to a liquor vendor under the Land Acquisition Act?

(b) Is the Collector appointed also the Excise Officer and as such officially interested in the acquisition?

(c) Are Government aware that the liquor shop, if acquired, would mean a continued permanent nuisance to the richly populated locality?

(d) Did the Collector reject the protests of the gentry inhabiting the locality?

(e) What is the price offered for the building and what is its present rent?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Information has been called for and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

EXTENSIONS TO OFFICERS ON ATTAINING THE AGE OF SUPERANNUATION.

795. *Syed Ghulam Bhik Nairang: (a) Are Government aware that the communal proportions in the services fixed by them for new recruitment cannot come into effect unless, *inter alia*, senior officials are retired on attaining the age of superannuation?

(b) Are Government aware that extensions of service above the age of 55 years are being granted, especially in the Postal Department?

(c) If the answer to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state how they propose to give effect to their orders regarding fixation of communal proportions in the services?

(d) Are Government aware that by the grant of extensions referred to above, the promotion of junior officials is blocked, and the unemployment situation is also *pro tanto* aggravated?

(e) If the answer to part (d) be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to issue strict orders that such extensions should not be granted in future?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The proportions fixed are for recruitment and are thus already in effect.

(b) Under Fundamental Rule 56 (b), a ministerial servant should ordinarily be retained in service, if he continues efficient, up to the age of 60 years, and, therefore, the question of granting extension of service does not arise before he attains the age of 60 years. This rule is being strictly followed in the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

(c) By applying those orders to vacancies as they occur.

(d) and (e). Do not arise in view of the reply given to part (b) above.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know, Sir, what is the present policy of the Government in regard to extensions? Do they give extensions now-a-days?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Does the Honourable Member mean the policy of Government generally in regard to extensions?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Extensions are only given when they are in the public interest.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: From the point of unemployment in the country, I am asking whether this policy of extensions is desirable. If extensions are given, then no employment could be found for those who really need openings. Is there any change in the policy of the Government with regard to that?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I should say that the number of extensions is infinitesimal compared with the number of unemployed in the country.

ARTICLE ENTITLED "RAILWAY STORES SCANDAL" PUBLISHED IN THE *PILOT*.

796. ***Mr. Sham Lal:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to an article headed "Railway Stores Scandal" in the *Pilot*, dated 3rd of January, 1937?

(b) Is it a fact that an Indian officer of the Stores Department has made grave accusation against the Controller of Stores? If so, what are the accusations, and what sort of cases have been cited by this officer against the Controller of Stores?

(c) Is it a fact that no action has been taken on this report? If so, why?

(d) Are Government prepared to appoint an independent enquiry committee immediately to look into this and to punish the officer at fault? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) to (d). Government have decided to appoint a committee of enquiry into the whole question of the disposal of scrap on the North Western Railway.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will there be any non-officials on this Committee?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am afraid I am unable to give any further information.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is this Committee appointed to inquire into the allegations referred to in the question?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: It is appointed to deal with the whole question of the disposal of scrap iron.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Who are the Members of this Committee, may I know?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am unable to supply the names of the members at present.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know, Sir, what are the terms of reference?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: They will have to look into the whole question.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will the Committee conduct a public inquiry?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: At the moment I am not able to add anything more to the information I have already given.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is it only a departmental committee, or will it consist of non-officials as well?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The same reply.

CONNECTION OF SOME CLERKS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI, WITH THE CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT DEPARTMENT.

797. *Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that some clerks of the Government of India Press are connected with the Co-operative Credit Department as well and are attending to the duties connected with the latter in the Office of the Government of India Press?

(b) Do Government propose to see that they disconnect themselves from the Co-operative service?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) I am not clear to which Press the Honourable Member refers and what he means by "connected with the Co-operative Credit Department". I understand that Co-operative Thrift and Credit Societies have been established in certain Government of India Presses, and some of the Press employees do work connected with them in their spare time.

(b) No; I see no reason for discouraging co-operative effort of this kind.

FILLING UP OF CERTAIN VACANCIES IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS

798. *Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur: (a) Is it a fact that vacancies in the Government of India Press are not filled up for months together and the work in the Press suffers on that account?

(b) If so, do Government propose to see that vacancies are filled up without delay?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The Honourable Member has not indicated the press to which he refers. But vacancies in the Government of India Presses are normally filled with the least possible delay.

(b) Does not arise.

APPOINTMENT OF THE INDIAN TRADE COMMISSIONER AT MOMBASA, EAST AFRICA.

799. *Mr. Ganga Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they are aware that the post of an Indian Government Trade Commissioner at Mombasa (East Africa) was recently advertised by the Public Service Commission?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state (i) the number of applicants for the aforesaid post, and (ii) the number of persons interviewed by the Public Service Commission?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the name of the person selected for the appointment and the special qualification he has, for being chosen for the post?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) 92 and 10 respectively.

(c) Government have provisionally made the selection but are not yet in a position to announce the name of the selected candidate. The selected candidate stood first in the opinion of the Public Service Commission.

SUBJECTS FOR THE COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS HELD BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

800. *Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the object of holding competitive examinations by the Public Service Commission?

(b) Is it for the purpose of testing the general culture and intelligence of the prospective public servants, or is it for testing their specialised knowledge in any particular subject or subjects?

(c) If the former, what is the principle on which some subjects of cultural and intellectual importance, which are taught in the Universities, are excluded from the syllabus of some of these examinations?

(d) If the latter, what is the practical value to a public servant of the specialised knowledge of subjects like Higher Physics, Astronomy, Old English, Latin, etc., which are included in some of these examinations?

(e) Are Government aware of the opinion of the Inter-University Board that the exclusion of subjects of high cultural value from the syllabus of the competitive examinations reacts adversely on the study of these subjects in the Universities?

(f) In the matter of selection of subjects for the syllabus of the Public Service Examinations, do Government propose to act on the expert advice of the Inter-University Board?

(g) Are Government prepared to recast the syllabi for the competitive examinations in the near future in consultation with such expert and competent bodies as the Indian Universities and the Inter-University Board?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (d). The object of holding competitive examinations is to obtain recruits for Government service after testing the fitness of candidates for admission to the public service. The general object kept in view in the framing of the syllabus is to obtain a fair criterion of intellectual ability and to afford a fair opportunity to the average Indian student to compete. Highly specialised subjects studied by very few students are excluded because of the difficulty of comparing results in these subjects with those in others and the difficulty of securing the services of suitable examiners.

(e) Yes.

(f) and (g). No.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (e) of the question, may I know whether Government have taken any action on this expression of opinion by the Inter-University Board?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The answer is "Yes".

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But I am asking a supplementary question on that, whether, in view of the knowledge on the part of the Government of this opinion, they have taken or propose to take any action with a view to including subjects of high cultural value in the syllabus of these competitive examinations?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think due weight has been given to the opinion of the Inter-University Board in regard to this matter and subjects of high cultural value are to some extent included, but experience has shown that they are subjects which are taken by very few competitors and it is difficult to obtain competent examiners.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government consider the suggestion contained, in clause (g) of the question, that is to say, to recast the syllabus or syllabi as it is called, for the competitive examinations in the near future in consultation with such expert and competent bodies as the Indian Universities and the Inter-University Board?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No. I cannot pledge the Public Service Commission to accept the opinion of the Inter-University Board in such matters.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am not saying that they should accept the opinion of these bodies. I am simply asking whether the Government will consult these highly competent bodies on a matter on which they are quite competent to advise?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot say as regards the future, but I will pass that suggestion on to the Public Service Commission.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that the Inter-University Board made certain representations to the Government of India for inclusion of subjects of high cultural value in the syllabus for the competitive examinations?

An Honourable Member: What are such subjects?

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: There is, for instance, Indian Philosophy.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is a later question about it.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member if the Sapru Committee considered this question and made any recommendation on the subject?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That does not arise. Next question.

EXCLUSION OF SOME SUBJECTS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EXAMINATIONS.

801. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Is it a fact that the Inter-Universities Board forwarded to the Public Service Commission their

resolutions conveying protests against the exclusion of some subjects from the Public Service Examinations and urging that subjects should be fixed in consultation with them?

(b) What action, if any, has been taken in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Yes.

(b) Government considered these protests and recommendations and informed the Inter-University Board that the existing syllabi were adequate, and that they did not intend to burden candidates with more options, it being the duty of intending candidates to study the syllabi framed by Government and plan their studies at the Universities accordingly.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that the Inter-University Board represented to the Government that these subjects should be included in the syllabus, because their case was not that the syllabus was inadequate but that the syllabus excluded subjects of high cultural value?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Exclusion of which particular subjects?

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I am referring particularly to Indian philosophy.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is a question about it.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: The Honourable Member said that the syllabus was adequate. What did he mean by saying that it was adequate?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I meant what I said—adequate, sufficient, satisfactory.

EXCLUSION OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY FROM THE SYLLABUS OF THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION.

802. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Are Government aware that Indian Philosophy is going to be excluded from the syllabus of Indian Civil Service Examination from 1938?

(b) Is it a fact that this exclusion has been decided upon in spite of the protests of such competent and expert bodies as the Inter-University Board, the Calcutta University and the All-India Philosophical Congress and of the Press?

(c) Is it a fact that Indian Philosophy has been until now one of the optional subjects carrying 100 marks only in the Indian Civil Service Examination?

(d) If the answer to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state their reasons for the exclusion?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) to (c). Yes.

(d) The main reasons for the exclusion of Indian Philosophy are those given in part (a) of the Honourable Member's next question No. 808?

Pandit Lakshmi Kantra Maltra: Have Government examined the objections, and is it not a fact that the University of Calcutta gave a reasoned reply to all these points?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think the Honourable Member is correct in saying that the University of Calcutta was in favour of inclusion of Indian Philosophy as a separate subject, but that was not the opinion accepted by the Public Service Commission. As a matter of fact, Indian Philosophy has not been completely excluded, as I shall show subsequently.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know, apart from the Public Service Commission, whether the Government of India in the Education Department, represented by my Honourable friend, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, or I do not know who else represents that Department—may I know whether the Government of India in the Education Department applied their minds to this aspect of the question?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes. The Government of India accepted the view that Philosophy should not be included.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to the answer to clause (d), of the question, referring to the statements made in the first part of question No. 808, may I ask for an elucidation of the exact difficulty of securing suitable examiners sufficiently detached from the candidates? What is the suggestion there?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member had better put that question to the Honourable the Deputy President.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My Honourable friend has accepted those suggestions as his own answer, and I am simply asking what is meant by saying, "the difficulty of securing suitable examiners sufficiently detached from the candidates"? Is it suggested that they will give more marks than the candidates deserve, or they are relations, cousins and so on?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: This is not my phrase but that of the Honourable the Deputy President

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But the Honourable Member has accepted it as his own reason. The question is this:

"If the answer to parts (a) and (b) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state their reasons for the exclusion?"

My Honourable friend's answer was that the reasons are what are given in clause (a) of the next question.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The next question has not yet been answered.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He has answered by referring to it as his reason for the exclusion of Indian Philosophy. I am asking for an elucidation of the answer contained in sub-clause (ii) of clause (a) of the next question, namely, "the difficulty of securing suitable examiner sufficiently detached from the candidates".

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: What my Honourable friend, the Deputy President, had in mind was probably the difficulty of getting as examiners in these subjects people who had not been teaching the subjects themselves.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: May I intervene and say, Sir, that the reasons suggested in question No. 808 are not my reasons at all? Those are the reasons which had been communicated by the Government of Bengal to the Calcutta University.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Those are the exact wordings of the Government of Bengal to the Calcutta University.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Communicated by the Government of Bengal to the Calcutta University?

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Anyhow, I did not invent the phrase.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know from the Honourable Member if his Department has not even got this reply from the Government of Bengal? The Government of Bengal wanted the Calcutta University to give their opinion on these points and the question has been framed on the very wording of the reply of the Government of Bengal.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Government of Bengal is the best authority then to explain it.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: This has been approved by the Government of India. Opinions were invited from the different Universities, and the Calcutta University was also addressed. "Sufficiently detached from the candidates" was the point which was put by the Government of Bengal to the Calcutta University, and those are the grounds on which philosophy has been excluded and the Government of Bengal wanted the opinion of the Calcutta University. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Craik, says that that has been approved by the Public Service Commission and also by his own Government. I want to know from the Honourable Member, when this is an expression which emanates, not from the questioner himself, but from the Government who wanted the opinion of the Calcutta University—I want to know what is it that is exactly meant by saying, "the difficulty of securing suitable examiners sufficiently detached from the candidates".

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thought the Honourable Member gave an answer.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: He never gave any answer. He has invited us to ask the Deputy President.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I gave an explanation.

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: Is the Honourable Member aware that there are as many as 57 optional subjects out of which Indian Philosophy was only one up to 1937, and even that one subject has been excluded. There are six compulsory and 57 optional subjects.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member asks me if I am aware whether there are still 57 optional subjects?

Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta: Including Indian Philosophy which it is proposed now to be excluded.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot say offhand. I cannot remember the whole syllabus by heart.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Will the Honourable Member kindly consider all these questions and the replies given by the Calcutta University, the Inter-University Board and other bodies and then take up the question of revising the syllabus of these examinations?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: All the relevant opinions were taken into consideration.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Will the Honourable Member reconsider them in the light of all these questions?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the matter has been fully discussed.

EXCLUSION OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY FROM THE SYLLABUS OF THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION.

803. ***Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta:** (a) Is it a fact that the reasons for the exclusion of Indian Philosophy from the syllabus of the Indian Civil Service Examination are:

- (i) the small number of candidates who have taken this subject;
- (ii) the difficulty of securing suitable examiners sufficiently detached from the candidates; and
- (iii) the opinion that Indian Philosophy is another name for Hindu Philosophy and therefore it will be a source of sectional rivalries?

(b) If the answer to the above be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state in detail their reasons for the exclusion of this culturally important subject?

(c) If the answer to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to lay on the table of this House a list showing the number of candidates who had taken Indian Philosophy as one of their subjects for the Indian Civil Service Examination during the last five years?

(d) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a comparative statement showing the total number of candidates taking up in their examination, as subjects, Latin, Arabic, Pali, Higher Mathematics, Higher Geology and Astronomy?

(e) Are Government aware that the exclusion of Indian Philosophy will act as a great handicap to those candidates who are trained in it and desire to take it as one of the subjects for the competitive examination?

(f) Are Government aware that the exclusion will also have the effect of discouraging a study of the subject in the Indian Universities?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Yes.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d). I lay a statement on the table.

(e) and (f). Government have not excluded questions on Indian Philosophy but have arranged for the inclusion of the Hindu part of the subject in the paper on Sanskrit Civilisation and for the inclusion of the Muslim part in the papers on Arabic Civilisation. They have, therefore, no reason to think any student of the subject is unduly handicapped or that the study of the subject is discouraged at the Indian Universities.

Statement showing the number of candidates who had taken Indian Philosophy, Latin, Arabic, Pali, Higher Mathematics, Higher Geology and Astronomy as one of their optional subjects for the Indian Civil Service Examinations held in India during the years 1933—37.

Year.	Indian Philosophy.	Latin.	Arabic.		Pali.			Higher Mathematics.		Higher Geology.	Astronomy.
			Language.	Civilisation.	Language.	Civilisation.	Total.	Pure.	Applied.		
1933 . . .	5	1	10	9	..	1	1	29	17	1	6
1934	2	10	7	34	20	..	8
1935 . . .	1	..	2	1	1	..	1	22	14	..	3
1936 . . .	7	1	8	8	1	1	2	17	11
1937 . . .	4	..	16	13	1	1	2	21	7	..	1

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know the answer to parts (e) and (f)?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I said that Government have not excluded questions in Indian Philosophy, but have arranged for the inclusion of the Hindu part of the subject in the paper on Sanskrit Civilisation and for the inclusion of the Muslim part in the paper on Arabic Civilisation.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that Indian Philosophy is a subject by itself and Indian Civilisation is a matter which deals with Epigraphy, Ancient History, and so on. Indian Philosophy used to be an independent subject, and that has been excluded.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That is the same question as the Honourable Member has asked. Indian Philosophy was a separate optional subject, but is so no longer.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: With reference to part (f) of the question, are Government aware that in many Indian Universities there is a landslide in favour of sciences at the expense of humanities, and that Indian Philosophy is practically neglected? I can speak for Madras. Are Government aware that this landslide is not educationally sound and that the exclusion of Indian Philosophy is having a deleterious effect on educational standards?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is a highly controversial matter.

RULES REGARDING TRANSFER OF STAFF ON THE BOMBAY, BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.

804. ***Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Will Government be pleased to state if there are any rules on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway regarding transfers of staff? If so, will Government be pleased to lay on the table a copy of them?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Government have no information.

REPRESENTATION REGARDING THE AMALGAMATION OF THE TWO CLERICAL GRADES IN THE OPERATING DEPARTMENT OF THE DIVISIONAL SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE, LUCKNOW.

805. ***Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** (a) Is it a fact that the clerks of the Divisional Superintendent's Office, Lucknow, submitted a representation to the Secretary, Railway Board, regarding the amalgamation of the existing clerical grades of Rs. 55—3—70 and Rs. 75—5—90 in the Operating Department? If so, will Government state the reasons for not granting their prayer made therein?

(b) Is it not a fact that a similar prayer for amalgamation of grades in the Accounts Department of the Railway was accepted in December, 1934?

(c) Is it not a fact that the duties of the clerks in grades Rs. 55—3—70 and Rs. 75—5—90 in the Accounts and Operating Departments are similar? If so, are Government prepared to consider the feasibility of amalgamating the two grades in the Operating Department for the clerks?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am collecting information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

MEETINGS OF THE WORKS COMMITTEE IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, NEW DELHI.

806. ***Qasi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether they are aware that prior to the arrival of the new Manager of the Government of India Press, New Delhi, the meetings of the Works Committee used to be held monthly, but since he has taken charge, for months together no meeting is held? If not, how many meetings have been held since April 1936?

(b) Are Government aware that no steps are taken to remedy the grievances put up in the Works Committee under the new regime? If not, what was the number of grievances and how many of them were redressed?

(c) Is it or is it not a fact that some of the members of the Works Committee resigned as a protest against this treatment, and their places were filled up by persons of a very low grade? If not, what has been the number of resignations since April, 1936?

(d) Is it or is it not a fact that the Manager does not often even attend the meetings of the Committee? and

(e) Have Government considered the advisability of removing the complaints of the members of the Works Committee, so that it may work efficiently as before? If so, what steps do they propose to take in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) So far as my information goes, general meetings of the Works Committee were not held regularly every month either during the time of the previous Manager or of the present Manager. Six meetings of the Committee have been held since April, 1936.

(b) No; steps are being taken to redress the legitimate grievances of the employees. The last part does not arise.

(c) No. Two members resigned since April, 1936, but not for the reason given by the Honourable Member. Their places were filled by persons duly elected.

(d) The reply is in the negative.

(e) Does not arise. So far as I am aware, the Committee is working satisfactorily.

REMOVAL OF SHOES BY VISITORS TO THE MOSQUES AND TOMBS UNDER THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT.

807. ***Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kasmi:** (a) Are Government aware that the visitors to the mosques and tombs under the Archaeological Department often do not take care to take off their shoes before entering the buildings, which is shocking to the feelings of Muslims?

(b) Have Government considered the advisability of removing this grievance by putting up notices at such places for the removal of shoes? If not, what other steps do they propose to take in this matter?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). Notices have already been put up at important mosques and tombs in charge of the Archaeological Department requiring visitors to remove shoes when entering these places and cloth over-shoes or slippers have been provided.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government aware that at the Taj Mahal Europeans are not expected to take off their shoes?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I do not know that, but I have already answered that either cloth over-shoes or slippers must be worn. One of the two things has got to be done.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: Are Government aware that putting on cloth over-shoes is not enough according to Indian sentiment?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: So far as I am aware, this particular rule has been in force for a number of years, and no protest has been made against the use of over-shoes.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: Have Government provided sufficient number of cloth covers?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: If my friend has personal experience of any place where they are inadequate, I shall have the matter looked into.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: The provision of over-shoes does not take away the character of the leather shoe?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I am merely referring to the practice which has been in force for 15 years. It has not so far given rise to any complaint.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will Government be satisfied if we, Indians, when visiting churches, put on some artificial hair over our caps? (Laughter.)

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I fail to see what relation this had to the question of wearing shoes.

Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi: May I know how the persons who do not put on these things when visiting tombs are dealt with? I know, as a matter of fact, that they do enter without any of these things. Is there any punishment?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I am afraid there is no special penalty for a person forcing his way into tombs.

Mr. Ganga Singh: Will Government make the system uniform and say that shoes should be removed?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I will have that suggestion considered.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: If notices are put up, are they not intended for all classes of people including Europeans?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: They are intended for all classes; there is absolutely no distinction.

GIVING OF WORK IN CONNECTION WITH THE KILOKARI EXTENSION SCHEME TO
MESSRS. DUNCAN STRATTON AND COMPANY.

808. ***Mr. Ganga Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that work worth about 25 lakhs in connection with the Kilocari Extension Scheme has been awarded to Messrs. Duncan Stratton & Co., a British firm, without calling for any competitive tenders for the work?

(b) Is it a fact that the work is of a special kind?

(c) Is it a fact that the work includes construction of staff quarters, roads, and re-inforced concrete tanks?

(d) Are Government aware that work of a similar nature in Bihar, excluding the installation of machinery, was given as a result of calling of tenders and executed by an Indian firm?

(e) Have Government considered the question of separating the contract for Kilokari Extension Works, Delhi, into two portions, viz., construction of staff quarters and roads, etc., and the installation of machinery? If not, why not? If so, why could separate contracts, particularly quarters and roads, not be given to a local Indian firm?

(f) Why were not tenders called for even from foreign firms?

(g) How did Government satisfy themselves that the works are given out at the most economical rates, beneficial to the tax-payers?

(h) Is it a fact that only lump sum quotations were obtained for two different types of installation from two English firms? Was it not possible to obtain item rate tenders for the work?

(i) Are Government prepared to institute an enquiry into the circumstances under which the contract was given? Have Government taken steps to see that alterations will not be made in the plans, specifications, etc., during its actual execution, bearing in mind the fact that the work has been given on a lump sum basis?

(j) Was it not possible, to get the work executed through the Central Public Works Department, as recommended by Hydari Sewage Enquiry Committee in its Report?

(k) Is it a fact that this work is being executed by the Superintending Engineer, Health Services, without the assistance of an Executive Engineer or the control of a Chief Engineer?

(l) Will Government state the reasons for combining the executive and administrative functions in this particular case?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) No. Competitive tenders were called for.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes. The roads and staff quarters represent about 2.5 per cent. of the total cost.

(d) At Patna also the machinery is being installed by Messrs. Duncan Stratton and Company, who, however, have not given the same stringent guarantees as are incorporated in the Delhi contract. On the other hand, at Secunderabad and Bombay similar works and subsequent extensions thereto have been constructed by Messrs. Duncan Stratton and Company on Lump-Sum Contracts and with stringent guarantees which have been met.

(e) The main work relates to the installation of Bio-eration plant. The construction works relating to this are integral part of the scheme and Government were satisfied that the efficiency of execution would be better secured by entrusting whole of this part of the work to one agency than by separating construction work and the fixing up of machinery. The construction of quarters was also entrusted to the firm because of the cheapness of the tender.

(f) and (h). (i) Tenders were called from all firms established in India who deal in this variety of plant. (ii) For the reasons explained in answer to (e) it was not necessary to obtain item rate tenders.

(g) The lowest tender was accepted.

(i) The tenders were submitted to Government who made the decision. Whether the contract is on a lump sum or other basis no changes in plans or specifications may be made without the sanction of competent authority.

(j) The Enquiry Committee recommended that the agency of the Public Works Department should be employed for the construction elements of the scheme but for the reasons explained in answer to part (e) the whole contract for this part was given to one firm. As the work will be constructed under the supervision of the Superintending Engineer, Health Services, the technical advantages of construction through the agency of the Public Works Department have been secured.

(k) The Superintending Engineer, Health Services, is an officer of the Delhi Administration and is responsible directly to the Chief Commissioner for technical advice on Public Health Engineering Works in the Delhi province. The executive control of the work is under a Resident Engineer and suitable staff.

(l) Does not arise.

Mr. Ganga Singh: May I ask, with reference to part (f) of the question if a public notice was issued calling for tenders?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: All the formalities which are required for the purpose of calling for tenders were complied with.

Mr. Ganga Singh: My question is simple, *viz.*, whether a public notice in the newspapers was issued, or not?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I am not in a position to say as to what particular details are included in this procedure; all I am telling my Honourable friend is that the usual procedure was followed on this occasion.

Mr. Ganga Singh: My information is that certain contractors were asked to quote rates and no public notice was called for?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: As far as I know, the whole of the proceedings fell into two parts. In the first instance, inquiries were made from certain firms. After that, tenders were called for in the ordinary way.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: What is the reply to part (g)?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have said that the lowest tender was accepted.

POSTS OF GAZETTED OFFICERS CREATED IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA OFFICES.

809. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to state:

(a) the number and designation of new posts of gazetted officers above the rank of Superintendents created in 1984, 1985 and

1936 in the following Secretariat Departments and offices attached thereto:

Home, Foreign, Army, Education, Health and Lands, Industries and Labour, Commerce and Railways, Legislative and Finance; and

- (b) the salary of such posts and the names of the officers who occupied such posts?

The Honourable Sir Henry Crank: With your permission, Sir, I shall reply to questions Nos. 809 and 810 together. The information is being collected and will be laid on the table in due course.

FILLING UP OF POSTS OF GAZETTED OFFICERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA OFFICES BY NON-INDIANS.

†810. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will Government state how many gazetted officers' posts above the rank of Superintendents in the following Departments which were previously held by Indians, were filled by non-Indians in 1934, 1935 and 1936 and the designation of such posts:

Home, Foreign, Army, Education, Health and Lands, Industries and Labour, Commerce and Railways, Legislative, Finance?

EXPENDITURE ON OFFICIAL WHIPS.

811. ***Mr. Sri Prakasa:** (a) Do Government maintain a regular office for their whips? If so, what is the cost?

(b) Is the cost borne by the members of the Government and their supporters from their private pockets, or is it a charge on the public revenue?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

INSANITARY CONDITION OF THE GOL MARKET AREA IN NEW DELHI.

812. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government please state how many times the Health Officer, New Delhi, himself inspected the Gol Market area and its adjacent squares (Foch, Diaz, Pershing, etc.) of quarters during each week in the last three months?

(b) Are Government aware that generally the whole of that area is neglected and has been a centre of various infectious diseases?

(c) Are Government aware that the drains, parks in front of quarters and service roads, are generally seen full of dung and other rubbish and are not kept clean and tidy?

(d) What steps do Government propose to take to ensure proper looking after of this area in future to safeguard the health of the locality?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have called for the information and will supply it to the House as soon as possible.

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 809.

RADIO RECEIVING LICENCES.

813. ***Mr. Ganga Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state the number of Radio Receiving Licences issued during the years 1934-35, 1935-36 and 1936-37, in British India and the other parts of India?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The number of Wireless Receiving Licences issued in British India is in round number as follows:

1934-35	18,000
1935-36	28,100
1936-37 (eleven months to end of February, 1937)	38,400

Government have no information regarding the number of licences issued in places outside British India.

BROADCASTING STATIONS IN INDIA.

814. ***Mr. Ganga Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state at which places in British India and other parts of India, broadcasting stations are established, up to date?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state in which places they have plans to establish broadcasting stations during 1937-38, 1938-39 and 1939-40?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The All-India Radio at present maintains broadcasting stations at Delhi, Bombay and Calcutta. There are privately owned stations at Lahore, Dehra Dun and Madras in British India, and I understand that there are stations at Hyderabad (Deccan), Aurangabad, Gulbarga, Warangal and Mysore in the Indian States.

(b) The Government of India propose to establish new stations at Peshawar, Lahore, Lucknow, Madras, Trichinopoly and Dacca during the next two years.

RADIO RECEIVING SETS IMPORTED OR MANUFACTURED IN INDIA.

815. ***Mr. Ganga Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state the number of radio receiving sets imported or manufactured in this country during the years 1934-35, 1935-36 and 1936-37?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The number of radio receiving sets imported during the ten months ending January, 1937, was 19,702. No figures are available for previous years, nor of the number of sets manufactured in this country.

RELAYING OF THE SPEECHES DELIVERED BY MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURES IN THE LEGISLATIVE CHAMBERS.

816. ***Mr. Ganga Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they are aware that the masses of India have a keen desire to hear the Members of Legislatures when debates take place in the Chambers of the Legislatures?

(b) If so, will Government please state if they are prepared to relay the speeches when they are actually delivered in the Legislative Chambers? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

REMOVAL OF UNEMPLOYMENT AMONGST THE EDUCATED CLASSES AND OTHERS.

817. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that a youngman, namely, Natya Nand Kapur, committed suicide by hanging in one of the Government quarters in New Delhi, on or about the 4th or 5th March, 1937? If so, is it a fact that the deceased left a note in his handwriting to the effect that he was committing suicide for want of employment?

(b) In view of the desperate situation of educated youngmen, do Government propose to take immediate steps to remove unemployment amongst the educated classes and others?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The only report I have seen of this case was contained in a local newspaper. This report mentioned a note left by the deceased but did not indicate that that note gave unemployment as the reason for the act.

(b) As regards the steps which Government have taken, or are taking, to relieve unemployment, I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by the Honourable Mr. Clow to parts (a) and (c) of the Honourable Lala Ram Saran Das's question No. 60 in the Council of State on the 28th September, 1936.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONS, BOARDS OF TRIBUNALS BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

818. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that Local Governments have been appointing Commissions, Boards or Tribunals under the provisions of section 3 of the Act 1850 read with Section 23 of the Act?

(b) Is it a fact that in the case of one Sukumar Sen, late of Indian Police Service, Bengal Government appointed such a Tribunal in the first instance when, after objection as to the legal constitution and consequent jurisdiction of the Commission, legal opinion was obtained and the Commission had to be dissolved and reappointed by the Government of India?

(c) Was there any similar case in any other Province? If so, did Government issue any general instructions to the Local Governments not to appoint such Commissions? If not, do Government propose to issue such instructions in order to save the public exchequer from waste of money?

(d) How many cases are either pending before such Commissions in Bengal, or in other Provinces, or the proceedings of such Commissions before the Government of India or Public Service Commission?

(e) Has the question of the legality of the constitution of the Commission been considered by Government of India? If not, are Government prepared to take the opinion of their Law officers on the point?

(f) How many cases during the last seven years were dealt with by the Commission against Imperial Service Officers (All India Services)?

(g) How many Indians and how many Europeans were proceeded against and with what result?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Except the case referred to in part (b) of the question, I have not heard of any case of infringement of the kind referred to by the Honourable Member in recent years.

(b) Yes.

(c) Instructions were issued.

(d) I am not aware of any inquiries now proceeding.

(e), (f) and (g). I do not know to what Commission the Honourable Member refers.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I know if it is not a fact that, under that Act of 1850, a Local Government can appoint Commissions of Inquiry into the conduct of public servants only in those cases where the appointment and dismissal of public servants rest with the Local Government, and not in those cases where the appointment and dismissal rest with the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think that is correct.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is it a fact that Commissions are sometimes appointed by a Local Government in cases where members of the Imperial Services are concerned?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Excepting the case referred to in part (b) of the question, where a mistake was made, I have said I have not heard of any other case.

Sardar Sant Singh: May I remind my Honourable friend if he has not heard of the case in the Central Provinces of a Bengali officer of the Imperial Service where a Commission was appointed, where an objection was taken up that the Commission had no jurisdiction, but where the Government of India did not overrule the Local Government and the latter appointed a Commission? It was about the case of one Mr. M. Chaudhury.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: When did this happen?

Sardar Sant Singh: It has been going on for the last two years?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have not heard of it.

MEAT SHOPS IN THE MINTO ROAD AREA, NEW DELHI.

819. ***Dr. N. B. Khare:** (a) Is it a fact that there are only two meat shops in Minto Road area to cater for the need of the residents of more than one thousand quarters?

(b) Is it a fact that sufficient meat is not kept for sale in these two shops and the residents are compelled to purchase their meat from the city, where meat is kept for sale exposed to flies and dust?

(c) Are Government aware that these two shops remained closed from the 22nd to the 25th February, 1937, on account of Id-uz-Zuha and the 15th and the 16th March, 1937, on account of strike, and also remain closed off and on at the sweet will of the butchers, causing great inconvenience to the residents?

(d) Do Government propose to put some restrictions at the time of the allotments of all the shops in New Delhi whereby butchers may not be able to close their shops without the previous sanction of the authorities?

(e) Do Government also propose to construct more meat shops or make some other provision for more meat shops in the Minto Road area? If not, why not?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: Information has been called for and will be furnished to the House as soon as possible.

BAJRI QUARRIES IN THE NEW DELHI CANTONMENT.

820. ***Seth Sheodass Daga:** (a) Is it a fact that the *bajri* quarries in the New Delhi Cantonment were given on contract during 1935-36 for Rs. 800?

(b) Is it also a fact that a compensation to the extent of Rs. 500 was allowed to the contractor for releasing a portion of the quarries for a period of less than six months?

(c) Are Government aware that the compensation is out of all proportion to the number of quarries released and the period for which they were returned to the Cantonment authorities?

(d) Is it a fact that the application for compensation by the contractor was received privately by the Executive Officer and did not pass through the Office? Is it also a fact that it was not produced before the Board of monthly proceedings?

(e) Is it a fact that both the Executive Officer and the contractor belonged to the same community?

(f) Do Government propose to investigate the matter and punish the officer responsible for irregularity, if any?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I am making enquiries and will place the information on the table of the House when received.

CASE OF ONE MR. GURUMUKH SINGH, A PRISONER IN THE ANDAMANS.

821. ***Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (i) when Mr. Gurumukh Singh (1914-15 prisoner) was sent to the Andamans;
- (ii) whether he was found to be suffering from bleeding piles on the eve of his departure to the Andamans;
- (iii) whether his teeth were extracted under medical advice a few days before he was deported and his gums were swollen and bleeding;
- (iv) whether he had protested in the presence of high C. I. D. officials and other officials against his being deported;

(v) whether it is a fact that his repeated requests to permit him and arrange for him to interview his Counsel when he was in Lahore Fort Jail and also when he was serving his sentence in Lahore Central Jail were not acceded to; and

(vi) what is his present state of health?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (i) On February 8th of this year.

(ii), (iii) and (vi). I have no information on these points, except that a Medical Board convened on the 19th December last found him to be fit for deportation to the Andamans.

(iv) and (v). I have no information.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did not the Honourable Member call for any information?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have not got it yet.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: What was the answer to part (vi) of this question?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have not any information yet; I have called for it, but I have not yet had a reply.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: When the information is received, will the Honourable Member furnish it to Honourable Members and lay it on the table at some future date?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: If the Honourable Member wants the information, he had better put down a question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: I want to know whether the Honourable Member is prepared to place that information on the table of the House when he gets that information,—that is, with regard to parts (vi), (ii), (iii) and (iv) of the question.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

COLLECTION OF STATISTICS OF PROPERTY OWNED BY THE EMPLOYEES OF THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT IN NEW DELHI.

130. Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan: Is it a fact that Government have collected statistics of the property owned by the Central Public Works Department officers, subordinates, clerks, etc., in New Delhi? If so, for what purpose, and what action has been taken?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The information was collected in pursuance of the Government Servants' Conduct Rules which require that every Government servant should submit a declaration to Government of all immovable property held or acquired by him or his wife or any member of his family dependant on him. The object of the rule is to enable proper supervision to be exercised over Government servants.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

131. Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan: Will Government please state whether the appointments in the Central Public Works Department are made according to communal quota? If so, what is the number of Christians, Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs in various capacities in the Divisional Offices of the Central Public Works Department?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes. A statement—the latest available—showing the communal composition of the permanent staff of the Central Public Works Department, as it stood on the 1st January, 1936, is placed on the table. I am unable to give separate figures for each divisional office.

Statement showing the Communal Composition of the Permanent Staff of the Central Public Works Department as it stood on the 1st January, 1936.

Name of service.	Europeans.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Domiciled Europeans and Anglo-Indians.	Sikhs.	Indian Christians.	Total.
Superintending Engineers.				1	1		2
Executive Engineers.	5	2	2		1		10
Assistant Executive Engineers.	3	10	5	3	1	1	23
Subordinates		73	23	6	13	3	118
Superintendents		5	1			..	6
Stenographers		1	..	2		..	3
Assistants		23	2	2		1	28
Head Clerks		6	2				8
Clerks	..	126	46		2	4	178
Draftsmen, etc..	..	22	21	..	2	1	46

WORK GIVEN BY THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT TO THE HINDU, MUSLIM AND SIKH CONTRACTORS.

132. Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan: Will Government please state the amount of work given by each circle in the Central Public Works Department to the Hindu, Muslim and Sikh contractors, separately, during the last and the current financial years?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The information asked for by the Honourable Member is not readily available, and Government do not propose to collect it as contracts are not given on communal grounds.

ENTERTAINMENT OF NEW SUBORDINATES IN THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

133. **Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan:** (a) Will Government please state if it is a fact that last year certain new subordinates were entertained in the Central Public Works Department but no Muslim was taken? If so, why were the claims of the Muslims ignored?

(b) Is it a fact that Government orders are that appointment of 25 per cent. Muslims do not apply to the appointments in the Central Public Works Department especially in the Second Circle? If so, will Government be pleased to lay a copy of those orders on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) It is not a fact. Sixteen permanent and 27 temporary subordinates were appointed in 1936 of whom five and seven respectively were Muslims.

(b) The orders as to communal representation apply to, and are duly observed in, the Central Public Works Department.

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF STAFF IN THE DIVISIONAL OFFICES OF THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

134. **Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan:** (a) Will Government please state the total number of Europeans, Hindus, Muslims and Sikh Superintending Engineers, Executive Engineers, Sub-Divisional Officers, Subordinates, Clerks and Mistries, etc., separately employed in the Divisional Offices of the Central Public Works Department?

(b) Is it a fact that though Muslims, in comparison to the ratio of their population in the country, number much less in all ranks of this Department, Government orders for appointing 25 per cent. Muslims are not acted upon in the department, and non-Muslims are being frequently appointed in new vacancies? If so, are Government prepared to take steps to safeguard the claims and interests of Muslims in this respect?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the statement I placed on the table in reply to his question No. 131. This does not, however, include *mistries* and other work charged establishment whose numbers are not readily ascertainable.

(b) The Government orders referred to are being observed, but it must be remembered that they relate only to direct recruitment and must, therefore, take some time to have full effect.

COMMUNAL COMPOSITION OF CONTRACTORS OF THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

135. **Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan:** (a) Will Government please state the number of Hindu, Sikh and Muslim, first, second, third class, and petty approved contractors of the Central Public Works Department separately?

(b) Is it a fact that non-Muslims, and Sikhs in particular, with no question of financial status have been and are being enlisted as approved contractors of this Department? If so, are Government prepared to take necessary steps in the matter to stop this practice?

(c) Is it a fact that Muslims are mostly refused enlistment as approved contractors of this Department and are discouraged from entering the Department as contractors? If so, do Government propose to take any steps in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The information desired by the Honourable Member is not readily available, but I can assure the Honourable Member that the registration of contractors is not done on a communal basis and depends solely on their reliability, previous experience and financial status.

(b) and (c). No.

PRIVATE BUSINESS CONDUCTED BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE CENTRAL PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

136. **Maulvi Muhammad Ahsan:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that some of the officers and subordinates of the Central Public Works Department are doing business in different shapes, contrary to the Government Servants' Conduct Rules?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: I have no information that this is the case, but if the Honourable Member has any information, I shall be glad to be supplied with full particulars so that I can have enquiries made.

REVISION OF THE FREE PASS RULES FOR THE RAILWAY STAFF.

137. **Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that the free pass privileges of railway staff were taken into consideration in fixing their rates of pay, both under the old scales and the revised scales, at a figure less than that granted to other departments of Government?

(b) Will Government please state the corresponding scales of pay of ministerial staff for the following departments as regards both the old and revised scales of pay:

- (i) Railway Department,
- (ii) Posts and Telegraphs Department,
- (iii) Customs Department, and
- (iv) the Staff of the Secretariat?

If not, is this information available to the public in any published records? If so, which records?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state whether in view of the recent drastic curtailment of the free pass privileges of the Railway Department from the 1st January, 1937, they propose to increase the scales of pay of the staff of the Railway Department? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am collecting information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

REVISION OF THE FREE PASS RULES FOR THE RAILWAY STAFF.

138. **Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that the revision of the free pass rules issued under the Railway Board's letter No. 2740/T.A., dated the 21st September, 1935, did not materially affect the

privileges of the non-gazetted staff, either as regards the number of passes granted per annum, or as regards the inclusion of dependent relatives?

(b) Is it a fact that the above revision reduced the privilege of the gazetted officers from receiving an unlimited number of passes per annum to twenty-four single journey passes per annum?

(c) Is it a fact that many gazetted officers misused the privilege of passes by taking over fifty passes per year?

(d) Will Government please state why the curtailment of the free pass privilege for non-gazetted staff was only done fifteen months after that of the gazetted officers and not at the same time?

(e) Why are 24 single journey passes granted annually to gazetted officers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes.

(b) No. A reduction to twelve had effect from the 1st April, 1938, but the number was subsequently increased to 24.

(c) I understand that one case of this nature was brought to notice.

(d) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply I gave to part (b) of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai's question No. 608 on the 24th September, 1936.

(f) Government considered that restricting the number to 24 when under the rules in force prior to April, 1933, there was no limit was a sufficiently serious curtailment of the privileges officers had been allowed.

PAY LIMIT FOR FREE PASSES FOR THE RAILWAY STAFF.

139. Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Is it a fact that the pay limit for free passes has been raised twice during the last two years:

(i) second class from Rs. 116 to Rs. 126 and intermediate class for all non-gazetted staff below Rs. 116 to those drawing over Rs. 50, *vide* the orders of the Railway Board contained in their letter dated the 21st September, 1935; and

(ii) second class passes from Rs. 126 to Rs. 176 and intermediate-class passes from over Rs. 50 to Rs. 76 and over with effect from the 1st January, 1937?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the pay limit was raised by Rs. 50 and Rs. 25 for second and intermediate classes, respectively, from the 1st January, 1937, compared to the Rs. 10 and the holding of a non-gazetted post for second and intermediate classes as per the orders, dated the 21st September, 1935?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The general pay limits on the majority of the Railways concerned were Rs. 126 for second class and Rs. 50 for intermediate class for many years previously and have since been raised once with effect from the 1st January, 1937.

(b) The reason for raising the pay limits governing the class of pass admissible was explained in the reply I gave to part (d) of Mr. Lalchand Navalrai's question No. 159 on the 25th January, 1937. I am unable to understand the comparison which the Honourable Member makes in the latter part of his question.

**FREE PASSES GRANTED TO NURSES, GOVERNESSES OR GUARDIANS OF
GAZETTED OFFICERS ON RAILWAYS.**

140. **Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** (a) Is it a fact that under the Railway Board's new orders regarding free passes which are now in operation, Matrons and Sisters-in-charge of Railway Hospitals are treated as gazetted officers for the purpose of obtaining the benefits of the first class free passes? If so, will Government please state whether they are actually gazetted officers or not?

(b) If these employees are not gazetted officers, will Government please state why they should be granted first class free passes instead of second class passes?

(c) Is it a fact that in the orders of the Railway Board, nurses, governesses or guardians accompanying gazetted officers' families may be included in the pass issued for such families, but when travelling alone on the business of the gazetted officer, they may be given second class passes?

(d) If the answer to part (c) be in the affirmative, will Government please state:

- (i) whether nurses, governesses or guardians accompanying gazetted officers' families are treated as Government servants; if not, why they should travel in the first class;
- (ii) whether nurses, governesses or guardians of gazetted officers when travelling alone on the business of gazetted officers are private servants; if so, why they are eligible for second class passes;
- (iii) whether the private servants of non-gazetted staff when travelling alone on the business of the non-gazetted employees are eligible for passes; if not, what is the reason for this distinction; and
- (iv) whether they propose to discontinue the grant of free passes to the nurses, governesses or guardians of gazetted officers when travelling alone on the business of the gazetted officer?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Matrons and sisters-in-charge are not gazetted officers. Their inclusion in the list of those to whom first class passes are admissible merely continues a practice which has been in vogue for many years.

(c) Yes.

(d) Nurses, governesses or guardians are not Government servants. The privileges referred to have been allowed to gazetted officers for many years, and Government do not propose to withdraw these privileges at present.

RULES FOR EMPLOYMENT OF DEAF PERSONS IN RAILWAY SHEDS OR YARDS.

141. **Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya:** Is it a fact that Government have prescribed certain rules which lay down that employees who suffer from deafness are not to be employed in sheds or yards where there are train movements? If so, will Government please state whether these rules are obligatory or discretionary?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I would refer the Honourable Member to the regulations for the medical examination of candidates and employees, non-gazetted, (including inferior) and labourer's grades, Indian State Railways, a copy of which is in the Library of the House.

TRANSFER OF STAFF EMPLOYED IN THE CARRIAGE AND WAGON SECTION ATTACHED TO THE DIVISIONS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

142. Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya: (a) Is it the policy of the East Indian Railway that the staff employed in the Carriage and Wagon Section attached to the Divisions should be transferred every three to five years?

(b) Is it a fact that this policy is observed on all the Divisions except the Howrah Division?

(c) Is it also a fact that out of the 768 employees in the Carriage Inspector's section about 95 per cent. have been retained at Howrah since their appointments? If so, why?

(d) Is it also a fact that illiterate staff have been promoted as trains examiner on Rs. 180? If so, why?

(e) Are Government aware that considerable discontent prevails among the staff of this section due to the unusual methods of operation on the Howrah Division? If not, do they propose to have this matter investigated?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am collecting information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

TELEGRAPHISTS RECRUITED TO THE STATION SERVICE IN 1930 UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS.

143. Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Is it a fact that some telegraphists were recruited to the station service in 1930 under conditions laid down in the "Memorandum (August, 1928), regarding the conditions of service, recruitment and training of telegraphists"?

(b) Is it a fact that one of the conditions of service of those telegraphists was that they would have the option to join general service?

(c) Has any of them applied for transfer to general service in pursuance of the above-mentioned condition? If so, how many of them were transferred?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) The condition was contingent upon the fulfilment of the conditions described in Section II of the Memorandum referred to by the Honourable Member, namely, that the question of transfer to the general service of station service telegraphists will be considered when applications for such transfer are called for by Heads of Circles and that only those who are selected will be transferred.

(c) As regards the first part, the reply is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, no one has been transferred as further recruitment to the general service has been discontinued.

DIFFERENT RATES OF PAY FOR LINEMEN AND CLASS II OPERATORS OF THE TELEGRAPH ENGINEERING BRANCH.

144. Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Is it a fact that there are at present three different rates of pay for linemen and class II telephone operators of the Telegraph Engineering Branch?

(b) Is it a fact that there is no difference in the nature of duties performed by linemen or class II telephone operators drawing different rates of pay?

(c) Are Government aware that the officials working side by side with others drawing a higher rate of pay are dissatisfied?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider this matter and make one scale of pay for all linemen and one scale for all class II operators, allowing them at the same time option to elect any of the existing scales?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) So far as new entrants to the service are concerned, there are three different scales of pay for linemen as well as for telephone operators. The scales vary according to the costliness of living in the different localities.

(b) It is a fact that the nature of duties performed by linemen are the same in all localities. The same applies to telephone operators.

(c) Government are not aware that any dissatisfaction of the nature mentioned by the Honourable Member exists. The rates of pay vary according to the date of recruitment and the nature of localities where the officials are serving.

(d) No.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE STAFF OF THE TELEGRAPH OFFICES.

145. Sardar Sant Singh: (a) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for classification of the staff of Telegraph Offices into superior and inferior?

(b) Are Government prepared to change the designation "Inferior" and grant the staff, so called, the privileges of superior service in the matter of leave and pension, etc., by changing the existing rules in the matter? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Service under Government (including service in Telegraph Offices) is classified as superior or inferior according to the nature of the duties performed in it.

(b) No. The duties and responsibilities of inferior servants are not of such a character as to justify the grant of superior status.

INFORMATION PROMISED IN REPLY TO CERTAIN UNSTARRED QUESTIONS REGARDING THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

146. Dr. N. B. Khare: Is it a fact that in reply to unstarred questions Nos. 240, 242 and 243. put by Sardar Sant Singh on the 16th October, 1936, in regard to the North Western Railway the Honourable the Railway Member stated that he was collecting information? If so, do Government propose to disclose the information during the current Session of the Assembly?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The reply to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, the information in regard to unstarred questions Nos. 240, 242 and 248 asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 16th October, 1936, was laid on the table of the House on the 25th January, 1937.

ARTICLE ON RAIL-ROAD COMPETITION WRITTEN BY MR. HAWKES, CHIEF COMMERCIAL MANAGER, NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

147. **Dr. N. B. Khare:** (a) Is it a fact that in reply to question No. 241. asked by Sardar Sant Singh on the 16th October, 1936, regarding an article on Rail-Road competition written by Mr. Hawkes, Chief Commercial Manager, North Western Railway, the Honourable the Railway Member stated that Government had no information? If so, will Government state if enquiries were made from Mr. Hawkes? If not, why not?

(b) Is it a fact that the article referred to appeared in the *Civil and Military Gazette*, dated the 27th August, 1936?

(c) Further, will Government now reply to the question No. 241 put by Sardar Sant Singh at the last Session of this Assembly?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative; to the latter parts in the negative as Government did not consider any enquiry necessary.

(b) I have now seen the article referred to by the Honourable Member.

(c) Government do not consider that permission to publish the said article was necessary.

CASES OF FRAUD AND EMBEZZLEMENT IN THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY GENERAL STORES.

148. **Mr. Sham Lal:** (a) Is it a fact that there have been several cases of fraud and embezzlement in the North Western Railway General Stores in which the Chief Controller of Stores is stated to be the chief culprit?

(b) Is it a fact that an assistant in the Stores Department has disclosed most of these defalcations in a representation to the Agent?

(c) Is it a fact that this state of affairs has been commented upon in the Press *vide Daily Herald*, dated the 23rd December, 1936, and the *Pilot*, dated the 3rd January, 1937, and has also been the subject of interpellations in the Assembly?

(d) If the answer to the above be in the affirmative, are Government prepared to order an impartial enquiry into the affairs of the Stores Department?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) to (d). Government are appointing a Committee of Enquiry into the whole question of the disposal of scrap on the North Western Railway.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIAN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY MEDICAL SERVICES IN INDIA.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member, Mr. Ghiasuddin, has given notice of a motion for "the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence, namely, the racial discrimination against the Indian members of the Military Medical Services in India as set forth in the Government communiqué of the 25th March, 1937". Is there any objection?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham (Defence Secretary): No, Sir; there is no objection.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The motion will be taken up at 4 o'clock today.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR RAILWAYS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that the following Non-Official Members have been elected to serve on the Central Advisory Council for Railways, namely:

- (1) Babu Baijnath Bajoria,
- (2) Mr. B. B. Varma,
- (3) Mr. Muhammad Nauman,
- (4) Mr. Kuladhar Chaliha,
- (5) Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, and
- (6) Mr. Umar Aly Shah.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR ROADS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that upto 12 Noon on Tuesday, the 30th March, 1937, the time appointed for receiving further nominations for the remaining two vacancies on the Standing Committee for Roads, only two nominations were received. I, therefore, declare Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra and Babu Kailash Behari Lal duly elected to the Committee.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, three non-official Members to serve on the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department for the financial year 1937-38."

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

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, three non-official Members to serve on the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department for the financial year 1937-38."

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I know if this Committee ever met last year?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: Yes, Sir, regularly, as do all the Committees connected with my Department.

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

"That this Assembly do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Honourable the President may direct, three non-official Members to serve on the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department for the financial year 1937-38."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I may inform Honourable Members that for the purpose of election of Members to the Standing Advisory Committee for the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department the Notice Office will be open to receive nominations upto 12 Noon on Thursday, the 1st April, and the election, if necessary, will be held in the Assistant Secretary's Room in the Council House between the hours of 10-30 A.M. and 1 P.M. on Saturday, the 3rd April, 1937. The election will be conducted in accordance with the principle of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote.

Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I make one suggestion, Sir? Will you kindly fix the date of nomination on the 2nd April, and not on the 1st?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. We receive nominations up to 12 Noon. Notice can be sent even today.

THE REPEALING AND AMENDING BILL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume consideration of the following motion:

"That the First Schedule stand part of the Bill."

Sir Leslie Hudson's following amendment is now before the House:

"That in the First Schedule to the Bill, in the proposed amendment to section 155 of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923, after the words 'unberthed passengers' the words 'unless she is exempted from the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 184' be inserted."

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Mr. President, the matter to which I was calling the attention of the House, when it rose yesterday, can be stated in a very few words.

[Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai.]

The House may or may not be troubled to come to a decision if the explanation satisfies the Honourable the Mover and my friend, Sir Leslie Hudson. I presume that they will be so satisfied. Under section 148:

"The Governor General in Council may, subject to such condition as he thinks fit, exempt any ship or class of ships from any provision of this Part relating to unberthed passenger ships."

Therefore, if reference has got to be made to any existing Act, it must be to that single part of the Act where the provision for those qualifications exists, and it would be erroneous entirely so to do. To illustrate the matter which is familiar to this House: Suppose the Governor General has power to exempt any particular person or class of persons from any of the conditions necessary to qualify them to stand as a candidate for a particular constituency or for a particular office, the condition being that the man shall not be less than 25 years old. It may be under such an exemption section open to the Governor General to say that he can exempt a class of persons, say, the graduates of the Bombay University, though they are not 25, but above 21. I am only suggesting that with a view to pointing out that that does not qualify the conditions. The general conditions must always remain the same for all persons qualified to stand subject to this that there may be an order either of a temporary duration or a longer or shorter duration or applicable to a class of persons. Therefore, if you put conditions there, you must qualify each of them; they may be 10 or 20. In fact, the whole of Part IV has numerous other conditions, and, therefore, by merely putting an exception under section 155 (*ee*), you do not achieve any object at all. You will have to have under each one of those sub-sections (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), (*f*) and many other provisions existing in the Act by which it is competent to the Governor General to exempt a class of ships. Therefore, the object can be attained by an appropriate wording of the exemption order and not by putting an exception in every single condition. The drafting of these conditions, I respectfully submit, would be entirely erroneous and very confusing. For instance, section 153 requires that "a ship intended to carry unberthed passengers or pilgrims shall not commence a voyage from a port or place appointed under this Part, unless the master holds two certificates". Then, the contents of the certificate are given in sections 154 and 155. Take another certificate, say, Certificate C. Supposing the Governor General says that the master of a particular ship or class of ships need not hold Certificate A and the section is to stand as it is, it would be perfectly all right, but if the other side were right, you would have to have an exception thereto except in cases where the Governor General has so exempted. Therefore, you must have an exception in each single sub-section of the whole of that part of the Act, which, I submit, is in itself a sufficient condemnation of such drafting. What is, therefore, required by law is that a man who says that he does not hold any of the certificates or any of the conditions in any of those certificates has got to produce the appropriate order under section 148 in order to protect himself and he finds this protection by an express mention in the Act itself. For this reason I submit that the proper course is not to put in an exception in section 155 as sub-clause (*ee*), because such an exception would have to be put down in every one of the sub-clauses. Such exemption can be given with reference to each one of those conditions, because section 148 says that the exemption may apply to any

provision of this part. Therefore, by putting an exception to any particular condition merely because it exists now will be an entirely wrong way of drafting legislation. I, therefore, suggest and submit that it would be a proper thing to do if the language of the exemption of the present operating order is not sufficiently wide to make it comprehensive enough to exempt that class of ships from having item 155 (*ee*) as a part of their certificate. That, Sir, is the submission I make and I submit that the intended exception is erroneous.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Sir, in view of the suggestion which has been made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to ask the Government Member in charge of this Bill as to whether the notification which is now issued by the Commerce Department exempting ships carrying 100 unberthed passengers engaged on short voyages of less than 72 hours duration under sub-section (4) of section 148 can be extended to include an exemption from the requirements of section 155, sub-section (*ee*). That is the real point. If the notification can be so amended as is suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, then there is a substance in his point that there is no need for this particular amendment. But I think we should be assured on that point by the Member in charge of the Bill before any further action is taken.

Mr. J. Bartley (Government of India: Nominated Official): The notification will, as a matter of fact, be issued by the Commerce Department, and it is impossible for me to say anything about the notification. But speaking of the language of the notification, it would, as the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, and with his authority I should be very sorry to quarrel, be quite possible to so re-draft the exemption notification that the difficulty that we are attempting to overcome by this amendment could be met.

Sir Leslie Hudson (Bombay: European): Sir, in view of what the Honourable Mr. Bartley has told the House, I feel that I cannot possibly press my amendment. After what the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition has said, I do not press my amendment. I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

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

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

"That the First Schedule do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

The First Schedule was added to the Bill.

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

"That the Second Schedule do stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Sri Prakasa (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I move:

"That in the Second Schedule to the Bill, the last item repealing the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1935, be omitted."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is the Honourable Member really serious?

Mr. Sri Prakasa: I am very serious. When Mr. Bartley moved that the Bill be taken into consideration, he very rightly said that even if this amendment was carried, that would make no practical difference. But the difference is of a moral and sentimental nature, to which I personally, and I am sure many of my Honourable friends in this House, do attach more importance. If Honourable Members will kindly see the list in the Second Schedule, they will find that there are four sets of Acts: there are the Acts of the Governor of Bengal in Council; there are the Acts of the Governor General in Council; there are the Acts of the Indian Legislature; and lastly, there are the Acts of the Governor General. I am not concerned much with the first two types of Acts, because they deal with a period before the Flood. But in passing I should like to say that I was rather surprised to hear Mr. Bartley saying that year after year such Bills have come before the Legislature and no objection has ever been raised to any of the items in them. If that is a fact, how is it that Acts passed so far back as 1864 are still allowed to be here; and that notice of such ancient Acts had not been taken during the many years in which he or his predecessors have been moving similar Bills in this House.

Now, Sir, we come to the next two types of Acts, the Acts of the Indian Legislature, and the Acts of the Governor General. I am particularly concerned with the Acts of the Governor General. The first three Acts, to which amendments are sought to be made, are the Finance Acts. Now, Sir, these Finance Acts are in the nature of annual functions; they begin with the year and die at the end of the year. The last Act, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, however, is a permanent Act. If this is repealed the result will be that the necessary relative entries will be made in the Act of 1932; and the naked fact that this particular Act was made by the Governor General despite the vote of the House, will be obliterated. That is the main point which I should like the House to concentrate its attention upon. The House will remember that this Act in the form of a Bill, was presented to the House, and it was rejected. Then the Governor General in the exercise of his own discretion made it into an Act despite the wishes of this House. Now if this Act, under the General Clauses Act of 1897, as amended in 1935, gets itself incorporated in the Act of 1932, then the heading of this portion will also be "passed by the Indian Legislature" and not "made by the Governor General on the 4th October, 1935," as is the case today. My desire is that this Act should stand in all its naked horror and be a sort of a permanent blot on our statute book. I do not want that this Act, under the cover of the General Clauses Act, should be so incorporated in the earlier Act of 1932, as to show to the world that that particular Act was passed by the Indian Legislature and not forced upon the country by the Governor General against the express verdict of that Legislature. That is the chief reason why I have ventured to move this amendment. I should like to assure you, Sir, that I am very serious when I move this amendment.

Now that I have made my point perfectly clear to the House, I should like to appeal to all sections of this House—I am not now discussing the merits of the Act itself, as it is quite possible that many Members of this House think that the Act as it has been made by the Governor General is justified and is absolutely necessary for the safety of the

country—I appeal to Honourable Members to vindicate the honour of this House, because it seems to me that our honour is at stake today. It may be that by a majority we on this side of the House reject an Act that the other side brings forward as has been the case in this particular matter; but some day it might easily happen that they may reject an Act which we bring forward; and if an Act should happen to be restored by the Governor General, it would and should be their natural desire that the fact that despite the verdict of the House some outside authority has forced the Act on the country, must be permanently known to the people who follow. In these circumstances I have every confidence that to vindicate the honour of this House and to enhance its dignity and prestige, every side of the House will support the amendment that I have ventured to move.

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

“That in the Second Schedule to the Bill, the last item repealing the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1935, be omitted.”

Mr. J. Bartley: Sir, I oppose this amendment. I admit that I was very considerably puzzled as to the reasons which actuated Mr. Sri Prakasa in tabling this amendment.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Will the Honourable Member speak up, at least as loud as I spoke, because we on this side cannot hear what he says?

Mr. J. Bartley: I admit that to a certain degree I was puzzled as to the reasons which influenced Mr. Sri Prakasa in originally tabling this amendment and in sticking to it. I thought perhaps first that he might not like the appearance of the entry here, secondly that he was so affectionately disposed to the Act which is referred to here that he did not like it to be removed from the statute book. Now, I find that his reason for retaining it is not affection, but he desires it to be retained just as in less enlightened times the instruments of punishment for crime were exhibited in the form of gibbets all over the country side as an act *in terrorium* to malefactors. I can only say that if this item is omitted from the Second Schedule and the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1935, is not removed, the main disadvantage will be that it may have to be reprinted from time to time, and it will no doubt be a matter of gratification to all concerned that Mr. Sri Prakasa has been unable to part company with an old friend. I think myself that there is a good deal to be said for removing it and every trusting people will know enough about the provisions of the Government of India Act to be aware that the Governor General has power to pass legislation without any artificial reminder of this kind. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

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

“That in the Second Schedule to the Bill, the last item repealing the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1935, be omitted.”

The motion was negatived.

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

“That the Second Schedule do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was adopted.

The Second Schedule was added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Mr. J. Bartley: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to amend certain enactments and to repeal certain other enactments be passed."

All I need say is that I am very grateful for the attention that Members of this House have devoted to the Bill, and that I shall
12 NOON. always value criticism and corrections, where necessary, in matters of this kind. The points dealt with in Bills of this kind are generally small and sometimes abstruse points, and the more the attention given by Members of the House the less probability there is of the Legislative Department slipping up and of our making unintentional errors. I desire to thank the Members of the House who have paid attention to the details of this Bill.

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

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE COMMERCIAL DOCUMENTS EVIDENCE BILL.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): Sir, I move:

"That the Bill to amend the Law of Evidence with respect to certain commercial documents be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon."

This measure has been under consideration in the Government of India for a pretty long time as a result of a suggestion made by the Bombay High Court. That court, while investigating various ways of improving the procedure in commercial causes, found one obstacle which could not be removed except by legislation. In the court's letter, an incident was quoted which will illustrate the difficulty. In a certain case, one side produced copies of Lloyd's Weekly Index to show that, according to the information received at Lloyds from their agents, a certain ship visited certain European ports on certain dates. It was admitted that though Lloyd's Weekly Index is a publication which business men would treat as affording reliable information regarding the movements of ships, it was not evidence, and that it would be necessary, in order to prove where a ship was on particular date, to produce evidence of witnesses who had actually seen the ship. That is one instance, and the Bombay High Court gave other instances of documents generally accepted by business men but not admissible under any provision of the Indian Evidence Act without further proof. These instances included a certificate issued by the Manchester Chamber of Commerce about the national strike of coal miners in England between certain dates in 1921; it was decided that this was not admissible.

When we received this letter from the Bombay High Court we consulted all Local Governments on the question of introducing legislation and on the nature of the legislation to be introduced. The Local Governments were unanimously agreed that legislation should be undertaken:

and this was the general, but not altogether unanimous, view of the High Courts, Bar Associations and commercial associations. As regards the form of legislation, the general opinion was in favour of the sort of Bill which we have introduced.

Sir, having decided to introduce a Bill, we set about preparing the list of documents to be appended as a schedule to the Bill. This proved a laborious as well as an important task. The House will observe that our schedule now contains more than 40 documents. We do not claim, even in its present form, any finality for this, but I should explain how it has been prepared. We first of all asked the Local Governments to give us, after consulting High Courts and commercial bodies, their views as to the documents that should be put in the schedule. We thus obtained a great many suggestions. On that the Director General of Commercial Intelligence and Statistics threw these into the form of a draft schedule and forwarded it to the Associated Chambers of Commerce and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce for scrutiny. With the assistance and advice of these bodies, a further list was prepared, and this, after more laborious examination by the Draftsman, has developed into the schedule at present appended to the Bill. This process has taken a long time; and although, as I have explained, a great deal of care and labour has gone into the preparation of the schedule, we do not think it safe to assume that it is even now beyond criticism. It is in fact necessary to give it the widest possible publicity, specially in commercial circles; and that is why my motion today is that the Bill may be circulated, in order that we may have the views of the persons most concerned, both on the provisions of the Bill and on the details of the somewhat lengthy schedule.

Sir, I move.

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

"That the Bill to amend the Law of Evidence with respect to certain commercial documents be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon."

The motion was adopted.

REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ON THE ACCOUNTS OF 1933-34.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume consideration of the following motion moved by the Honourable Sir James Grigg on the 26th September, 1935:

"That the report of the Public Accounts Committee on the accounts of 1933-34, Parts I and II, be taken into consideration."

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, there is one point on which, if you will be so good, I should like to abide by your views and direction. There are two motions given notice of, one with regard to the accounts of 1933-34 and the other with regard to the accounts of 1934-35. You will realise that these are continuing accounts, and there are points taken year after year. I have tabled a motion which I hope the House and the Finance Member himself will agree to, when we come to consider the accounts of 1934-35 and the report thereon, that the evidence which had been published during the

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

last 15 years should be published. I propose at the proper time to move that motion. I take it that I shall confine myself, in these remarks of mine, to the report on the accounts of 1933-34 alone, and we shall take up this question, and the House will decide at that time, on a consideration of all the relevant factors, whether my amendment will be accepted or not. If that is so, I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this Public Accounts Committee is a statutory body which has very important powers, and it is right for the Honourable Members of this House to be able from time to time to take a lively interest in what is happening; because, after all, Sir, the basis of all modern democratic government, so far as it is based on British precedent, is that all moneys sanctioned by this House are spent for the purpose for which they are sanctioned; and not only that, but that all extravagance is avoided, and that the various spending departments observe certain canons of sound financial propriety. Now, on that matter, this Committee sits for nearly three weeks or slightly more, and we go through a very elaborate procedure: we get the departmental heads who come before us as witnesses and answer questions. Of course, they vary. Some of them are very frank; some of them are reticent; some lose their temper; but all of them somehow manage to survive our examination. I do not know whether as a result of our examinations things improve: things move so slowly in this country and so imperceptibly, that it is impossible for us to expect quick results; but, on the whole, I should like to give a certificate to the committee, although it includes myself, that we get on as a happy family, in so far as we have not taken a vote on any question, in spite of the presence of a highly peppery gentleman in the chair, the Honourable the Finance Member. Although he often loses his temper there, I think we abuse one another for a minute or two, and immediately after become friends and get on. That is the way in which this Committee has been going on, and I am hoping that when I draw the attention of this Honourable House to a few important features or recommendations in the report and evidence to show that too much attention cannot be paid by the House to the important matters brought before this Committee and before this House by the Committee.

So far as the main functions as detailed in the rules are concerned, the first is the most important: that is, we have got to satisfy ourselves that the money is spent within the scope of the demand. On this matter, there has been some difference of opinion in the Committee; but on the whole, I think, the Committee is fairly unanimous, that is, the phrase "within the scope of the demand" is interpreted by several spending departments like this, namely, "after all you have given us, say, five crores: we have spent on the whole only five crores: you must not look into the sub-heads: suppose I have exceeded in one demand by half a crore, I have saved under another demand; and if on the whole I have spent only five crores, then you must not criticise us too much." I have dissented from that view strongly. The Honourable the Finance Member seemed to agree with me; but, sometimes when a harassed spending department appealed to his sympathy, he seemed to veer round and suggest: "Oh, yes: we must not be so strict in a matter like this." I take a strict view that the Government of India are not a mercantile concern: they are not as if this House votes for them 85 crores every year, and tells them:

"You may spend it as you like, so long as you do not exceed that amount". I am satisfied that that is not the function of the Public Accounts Committee or of this House. I think the bulky volume of Demands for Grants which is placed before us every year containing detailed heads and sub-heads has some purpose and some meaning. That purpose and that meaning are that the demands asked for and voted by this House should be spent for the purpose mentioned in those demands under the various sub-heads. I quite recognise there are minor exceptions; but there is a tendency on behalf of some departments, notoriously on the part of Railways; Civil Works Department, about, which I shall say a few words later on, and some other departments, to treat these grants as more or less lump grants to be spent at their sweet will and pleasure, so long as they do not exceed very much the entire demand granted for that department. I think that is a tendency which this House should condemn; otherwise, these detailed heads and sub-heads become a farce.

The second purpose is to report to this House every re-appropriation from one grant to another. I am told that there is no such re-appropriation at all. If that is the case, I think this ought to go out from the rules altogether. We are asked to report to the House every re-appropriation from one grant to another: and I am assured by the Finance *pundits* of the Government of India that this thing never takes place. If that is so.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): There never has been.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I suggest then that this function should be taken away from the rules.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is a very good safeguard.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: We should like to hear from the Honourable the Finance Member how it is a safeguard, and I shall be glad if all safeguards will remain, as this safeguard, wholly unused.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: It is there.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: It is no use: you are never going to use it; and if you are wise, you will assure us you will not use it, or you will rue the day.

Then, we have got also to report every re-appropriation, not in accordance with the rules. That is always done by the Finance Department and we recommend to the House, if there is an excess grant, that the grant be sanctioned; otherwise we simply put some questions, and satisfy ourselves that the re-appropriation was inevitable.

Then, there is another subject on which I wanted some information; but that was not available because I heard from the Accountant-General that they have entered into a convention regarding "all expenditure which the Finance Department has requested should be brought to the notice of the Assembly". In the two years during which I was functioning there was not a case in which any expenditure was asked by the Finance Department to be brought to the notice of the Assembly by the Public Accounts Committee. I am told that this is really in desuetude; and the

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Accountant-General told the Committee that there is a convention, *i.e.*, where the Accountant-General and the Finance Department differ, they hammer out their differences; and if they agree nothing more is heard: if they do not, then the Auditor-General reports the matter to the Public Accounts Committee for such action as we may take. My information is that so far no case has come before the Public Accounts Committee of any instance in which an expenditure was recommended by the Finance Department to be brought before the Assembly—I can asseverate that with regard to the two years during which I was a Member.

Now, coming to the report of 1933-34, at page 4 the Committee say:

"We went through the appropriation accounts in great detail and were struck by the large number of major variations between the estimates and actuals. Even in cases where variations under the totals of the grants were not great, the variations in individual sub-heads were very large indeed. This was especially the case in the case of Civil Works and Posts and Telegraphs grants. We understand that until two years ago there were no proper rules for budgeting for Civil Works and we hope that, as a result of the rules then issued, the appropriation accounts of later years will show some improvement."

I do not know about the rules, but there is an unhappy feeling in my mind that "Civil Works" is one of those spending Departments of the Government of India which requires very close scrutiny. We had a scene last year—I will deal with that when we come to the accounts of 1934-35. But I do suggest to this Honourable House that we are losing some money, the extent of which we do not know, in this expenditure on civil works, and I think it is a matter which needs very careful looking into by those who can usefully do so:

"As regards the Posts and Telegraphs Department, previous Committees have commented on the serious faults in budgeting and control of expenditure."

I am bound to admit that there has been some improvement in the Posts and Telegraphs budget and control of expenditure. But from the way those witnesses spoke before the Committee, there is an impression that they talk too much, although I am not the man to blame others in this respect—still it seems to me that these witnesses from the Postal Department who came before us have missed their vocation: I think they ought to be more propagandists than official witnesses, and I do suggest to the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable Member for Posts and Telegraphs that we should have more help by way of actually carrying out these suggestions, rather than always attempting at window-dressing and trying to make the worse appear the better. The Committee say:

"Judging from the results of the year 1933-34, we too are definitely of opinion that budgeting and control of expenditure in the Department were far from satisfactory and the Auditor-General particularly brought to our notice the continuance of the over-budgeting under the Repairs grant which had been a marked feature of the preceding ten years we hope that future appropriation accounts, at least from 1935-36, will show the results of the action taken by the Department."

Another grant under which we found large variations was the grant under the Survey of India. The Committee say:

"The grant for the Survey of India was another grant under which there were large variations, due mainly, we understand, to the difficulty of estimating the work to be done for Provincial Governments and consequent recoveries from them"

I realise, Sir, that in this matter the Government of India are more or less helpless. After all if they continue to do work for Provincial Governments,—and these Provincial Governments make their programmes sometimes very ambitious, which they are not able to carry out, but I do hope whatever else may or may not happen, at least these financial irregularities will not be allowed to continue, and that we shall have some kind of real financial control and proper financial dealings between the provinces and the centre. . . .

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): You reject the constitution, and still you hope that something will come out?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, because there are men like you. If you come to me, there will be Swaraj tomorrow.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: You talk one thing and do another. You talk of rejection and you don't reject?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What do you mean by that? You don't want me to be here?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Hear, hear.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I am willing to pair with him, this very minute. He will go to England and I will go to Madras.

Then, Sir, at the end of this paragraph the Committee lays down,—and I want the House to attach very great importance to it and endorse it:

“We specially desire to impress upon the various Departments that, though variations within a grant are less important than variations in the grant as a whole, even here large variations are to be deprecated as showing a certain indefiniteness in estimating.”

That is a matter to which, I think, increasing attention is being paid, and more attention should be paid, and we should avoid this undue disturbance of the variations of the grants under particular heads.

Then, Sir, on the question of supplementary grants, I merely want to say this, that until, I think, the Finance Member and this Committee began to deal with this question, it was very unsatisfactory; I do not know if the Finance Member has supplied to all Members a copy of the rules which the Finance Department issued, I think, some time last year, regulating the procedure with regard to supplementary grants. Copies were given to the Members of the Public Accounts Committee, I believe. If copies have not been given, I would suggest to the Finance Member the desirability of supplying copies of these new rules to all Members of this House. There is nothing confidential about it. . . .

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I will consider it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: . . . and I hope as a result of that, we shall get a more satisfactory deal with these supplementary demands. I may mention that every year we come across cases in which supplementary grants obtained from the Assembly proved to be unnecessary. I hope

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

that kind of thing will not be allowed to continue. In paragraph 11, the Committee say this:

"The Accountant General, Central Revenues, has brought to our notice six cases in which supplementary grants obtained from the Assembly proved to be unnecessary. We were informed that the Finance Department were considering the whole question of more effective control of expenditure and the procedure for obtaining supplementary grants."

We made a suggestion that—"the Finance Department should consider whether, when they go for a supplementary grant to the Assembly for a portion of the amount required for a scheme as a whole, the balance being met by re-appropriation from savings elsewhere, the particular sub-heads under which the savings are available should not, in the case of large savings at least, be shown in the supplementary demands presented to the Assembly. We understand that a similar procedure is in force in Great Britain."

I believe I am right in saying it is being done now.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Very respectful.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, very respectful, but I am afraid something else is coming up later.

Then, in paragraph 12, we make a suggestion with regard to the various funds which have now been constituted like the Development of Civil Aviation, Bihar Earthquake Relief Fund, Broadcasting, etc., and we recommend that "progressive accounts of expenditure from the various funds should be included in future appropriation accounts." I believe that is also being done. I think it is a good thing, because we can know how money is being spent year after year.

Then, in paragraph 14, at page 4, we deal with the London Stores Department. We are convinced that there is no need for the continuance of a separate London Stores Department. Considering the transactions, they put through and the money we spend on it, I think the Committee is fairly unanimous that the Indian Stores Department as such can deal with all the purchases in London, and there is no need for a special London Stores Department. This is what the Committee say:

"We are informed that the Government of India have decided to depute Sir James Pitkeathly, the Chief Controller of Stores, Indian Stores Department, who will be on leave during the winter of 1935-36, to make a detailed examination of the working of the London Stores Department and to submit a scheme for the amalgamation of the two Departments."

I think, Sir, Sir James Pitkeathly has gone and returned, but even last year we were not told whether any final decision has been taken. I think the House will be interested to know from the Finance Member if he is in a position to state whether any final decision has been taken in this matter. This matter has been hanging fire for a very long time.

Then, Sir, I would invite the attention of Honourable Members to the continuance of the Mathematical Instruments Office at Calcutta. In view of the decision of the Army Department to get their work done through their own agencies, the Committee thought that that office should be closed down, as it has not been able to pay its way. Last year we got a report from the Department concerned saying that they made some economies, they hoped to continue the Department for some time and that they did not propose to close it down. I think as a matter of economy, the matter should be pursued further to see whether the Department cannot be closed down altogether.

Then, coming to the North West Frontier Province, about which one has to speak with very great trepidation nowadays, because what is happening in the Frontier Province nobody knows, and we get alarming news morning after morning. In that province, there are about 30 funds which are called Unauthorised Excluded Funds. The important ones are the Motor Lorry Depreciation Funds and the Khas Sadar Fund. Now, Sir, some of these funds have been closed, and orders have been issued to close the other funds as well. Even last year we found that all the funds had not been closed. We would like to know from the Finance Member whether all the funds which the Committee wanted to be closed down within two months after the Committee's sittings last year have been now definitely closed.

Then, we come to a very big question in paragraph 17 of our Report with regard to the financial position of the Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department. I do not want to weary the House with various figures, but there is one point on which I think this House would like to have its opinion recorded on a proper occasion. I do not know if it is possible to do so on this discussion. In the Postal Department, they have what is called a Depreciation Fund. It is one of those phrases which are used by all people. I do not know what is the latest financial theory about the depreciation fund. There are as many ideas of depreciation funds as there are departments which are spending. I have not come across a uniform rule on which you build up a depreciation fund. I think ultimately at the instance of the Finance Member the Committee agreed that this depreciation fund should be only a repairs and renewals fund, and no more and no less. And if it is to be a repairs and renewals fund, we find on a calculation of actual expenditure incurred on repairs and renewals year after year, you want only 12 to 15 lakhs a year, but they used to set apart 20, 25 or 30 lakhs for depreciation. I think the ultimate decision now arrived at by the Finance Member and the departments concerned is about 20 lakhs

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: 25 lakhs.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: 25 lakhs year after year. I am of opinion, and I believe a large number of Members of the Committee agree with me in that opinion, that this errs on the generous side, that is to say, that there is no need to set apart Rs. 25 lakhs for renewals and replacements. That is a matter of some importance to this House, because when we ask for the half-anna postcard we are constantly told it means Rs. 50 lakhs and so we cannot have it. I say that this matter of a depreciation fund on the basis of repairs and renewals should have some relation to the actual needs of the department from year to year, and should not be put at too

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

high a figure, so that the chances of either opening more post offices in rural parts and thus giving more facilities to the villagers, or the possibility of giving the half-anna postcard as early as possible or of both, may be brought nearer, and that depends to a large extent on a proper computation of the basis on which the depreciation fund is made.

This Public Accounts Committee constitutes a Sub-Committee of its own called the Military Accounts Committee. It goes into the accounts of the Army Department and makes a report in its turn to the Public Accounts Committee, which reports in its turn to this Honourable House. That report is to be found at pages seven and eight of this volume, and one or two matters in that report to which I desire to draw attention are these. With regard to the control of over expenditure :

"We are glad to note that the Auditor-General considers that 'so far as control of expenditure in bulk is concerned, the financial administration of the year has been shown to be careful, efficient, and, in the abnormal circumstances mentioned by the Financial Adviser, successful'."

But it adds :

"There is, however, room for still further improvement, and we hope that this will be achieved in future years as a result of the efforts that are being made by the Army authorities."

I want to add one comment on all these remarks of ours. This is the lowest common minimum of the agreement of all the members. Therefore, when we say that there is room for still further improvement, you must understand that some of us feel more strongly than the words actually convey. But as I told the House, we do not take a vote on the wording of these sentences and we leave a fairly wide margin to the Finance Member and his very efficient Secretary, Mr. Sanjiva Row, in drafting this report. Therefore, it must not be imagined that this expresses the entire feeling of every Member of the Committee, but as I said, this is the lowest common minimum of the agreement among the members of the Public Accounts Committee, and when we say that there is still room for further improvement, some of us feel very much more strongly than the words actually convey. I should like to know with regard to the revision of the army regulations mentioned in paragraph 4, what is the latest position.

"We consider that this is a very important matter and the Army Department should take every step possible to complete the revision earlier, if possible."

Concepts of time vary with people. Once Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto: "Time is one thing, and eternity is another". When we ask the Department how long it will take to revise, they say two or three years coolly, as if it does not matter. It looks as if these gentlemen can never do a thing in less than a year or two. Months and weeks are simply fleeting moments for them; they must take years. I do hope that we shall get something definite, by way of the completion of these regulations in some recognisable time. With regard to the financial irregularities, we make one comment in paragraph five to which I should like to invite the attention of this House :

"In any case we assume that, in view of the instructions which have been issued by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the impending simplification of the regulations, it will not only be clear that the Army authorities take a serious view of negligence or inefficiency but also that they will in no wise admit ignorance of the regulations as an extenuation of shortcomings under these heads. The natural corollary of this should be a manifest tendency for the punishments awarded in such cases to become heavier in future."

There lies a tale behind this. We have often found, I will not say often, but sometimes, we have found in dealing with punishments meted out to people who disobey regulations or who are dishonest that Government's canons differ. If it is a case of punishing a civil disobedience offence, the Government are ruthless, but in the case of a breach of their own regulations or dishonesty, I find that the punishments vary. I have known at least of one or two cases in which the standard of punishment of the lower paid official was much heavier than the standard of punishment of the higher paid official. That is why we have said in this paragraph that the standard of punishment must be heavier and stricter, than we happened to notice in these cases. There are just one or two matters in the report of this Military Accounts Committee to which I should like to draw attention. At page 10, paragraph 11:

"The Military Accountant-General informed the Committee that he had agreed to take over certain trained Public Works Department accountants who will also train others. The Committee desired to have a report of the success or otherwise of the new arrangement after two years."

I think two years will be nearly over next summer, and I hope that by that time we shall have a report as to how far this matter has really progressed. Then, with regard to the Royal Air Force we found a case—page 11, paragraph 13, I will read the paragraph:

"In this connection, the Auditor-General brought to the special notice of the Committee the former absence of a proper system of provisioning, the overstocked condition owing to this reason, and the necessity of a valued account of all surplus and obsolete stores in the Royal Air Force. The Army Secretary circulated a note explaining the steps taken to improve the system. The Auditor-General stated that he thought that measures had been taken locally to remedy the defects in the provisioning system, and that as far as he could see they were reasonably satisfactory. He urged that Government should issue authoritative orders regarding a provisioning system and fix stock limits."

I forget just now, but I shall be obliged if the Finance Member will inform us at the appropriate time whether Government have issued these authoritative orders and have fixed stock limits for the Air Force particularly. I should like to have some information on that matter. At page 13, Honourable Members will find that in the statement given by the Department, paragraph 6 is very important:

"The fact that surplus stores are held is admitted. They represent the accumulation of several years and will take time to dispose of economically."

We have often asked in this House that the army expenditure should be reduced. We are told that they cannot do that. I am not now on the larger question of British personnel or of the equipment of the army, but I am satisfied, Mr. President, as a member of the Military Accounts Committee, that there is considerable scope for retrenchment in expenditure even on the present scale without reducing a single British soldier or officer. I am convinced that if the pruning knife were applied by an honest, efficient officer who did not care for vested interests and who cared only for the money of the poor tax-payer of this country, we could still save some crores of unnecessary and wasteful expenditure in the army. I am informed by my Honourable friend, the Chief Whip of the Party, that the surplus stores are sold as out of date, at very low and very cheap rates. I think that this deserves looking into. The army is a sealed book to us, and it will become a still more sealed book tomorrow, when one man will become the lord of the whole defence expenditure of this country. But even then, it seems to me if there is any financial conscience

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

anywhere, if the Finance Member is not merely out to kill protection in this country but also to do something to raise the standard of financial administration, he may occasionally turn his capacious brain to the way in which the public money is being wasted.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I don't want to kill that kind of protection.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Not on the 1st April, but when the Federation comes in.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: You will see an Order-in-Council today or tomorrow constituting the Viceroy the sole autocrat of all this, whether Federation comes or not. My Honourable friends are too clever for all this.

These are the main matters in the report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Civil and Military, the Posts and Telegraphs, to which I should like to invite the attention of the House, but, Sir, as the question of the publication of evidence will come before the House very shortly, I want to point out to the House by a very few references to the evidence volume, how valuable this publication will be to the Honourable Members of this House. I am still hoping that the Honourable the Finance Member will, in a generous mood, accept my amendment and agree to publish this evidence volume. The idea of saying that the publication of 500 copies of this volume is going to be so expensive as to upset the financial equilibrium, is too thick even for the Finance Member.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I do not say that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti You mentioned the question of expense. I would refer Honourable Members to pages 4 and 5 of the evidence volume. I raised this point and said:

"This rule says that it shall be our duty to bring to the notice of the Assembly all expenditure which the Finance Department has requested the Committee to do so. Have you any idea in your mind as to the class of expenditure which you request us to bring to the notice of the Assembly.

Mr. Badenoch: There is a rule under the Auditor-General's rules laying down that when the Auditor-General and the Government are at issue over an objection, the Auditor-General may waive the objection provided the Finance Department brings the expenditure to the notice of the Public Accounts Committee and through them to the Legislative Assembly. It is a method of resolving a difference of opinion between Government and the Auditor-General."

This is a matter of great importance, and if the evidence volume is not available, how will Honourable Members know it?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I do not know what argument the Honourable Member is developing but differences of opinion between the Government and the Auditor-General are not brought to the notice of the House in the volume of evidence but in the appropriation accounts or in the Auditor-General's report on them.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I quite accept that, but my point is this. The House is entitled to know what are the circumstances under which the Auditor General raises the objections. That is my only point. Then I had a long discussion with the Finance Member over this Convention,

which I understood is based on the British convention, that all money remaining with the Government out of the budget grant for the year which is not appropriated before the end of the year, on a motion by the Honourable the Finance Member, goes automatically to the reduction or avoidance of debt. I raised that point and the Honourable the Finance Member mentioned that Mr. Winston Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted to bring in legislation that the balance of the year, instead of lapsing into the sinking fund should be available for general expenditure in the following year. That required specific legislation and could only be undertaken on the initiative of the executive. That is an important point. Then, I refer to pages 7 and 8 of the evidence. I said:

"I want the Legislative Assembly to have the right to say how we shall use the money. They may want to use it for other purposes. Is it right that by ignoring the legislature the executive should by a fiat of its own say that this money shall go towards reduction and avoidance of debt? It is an opening balance which should come under the control of the Assembly.

Chairman : In order to intercept that surplus or prospective surplus action has got to be taken before the close of the current financial year. Nothing that you do after the financial year can get hold of the money for the current requirements of the subsequent year."

I do not want to pursue this matter but this is a matter which the House is entitled to know—how the money voted by us is being utilised. We should be very careful not to vote a pie more than what is actually required, because, once we vote the money, it goes beyond our control. Before we vote, we must be satisfied that the money is required, and we must vote not a pie more. At any rate, one point is very clear to me and that is that we must see that we are not voting for a surplus budget.

Then, there is one point to which I want to draw attention, and that is on page 17. It arose from page 25 of the Auditor General's report about the decision to reduce the sinking fund:

"Mr. Satyamurti : When was it taken?"

Mr. Sanjiva Row : It is mentioned in the budget speech.

Mr. Satyamurti : Is it considered financially proper to do that in the middle of the year?

Mr. Tallents : The reasons are fully set out in Sir George Schuster's speech.

Mr. Satyamurti : The original grant was for 2 crores 14 lakhs and you spent only 68 lakhs and you saved 68 per cent. of the original grant. It seems to me rather extraordinary for any Finance Member in the middle of the year to say that he will save this money.

Chairman : I imagine one of the prevailing motives was that, if he had not reduced it, he would have shown an apparent deficit which would have had a bad effect on the world's markets and the other thing was to release a certain amount of money to help Bihar. It was really a raid on the sinking fund and people have different opinions as to the extent to which it is legitimate.

Mr. Satyamurti : It seems to me trifling with the revenues of this country. It seems to me that you cannot change this in the middle of the year.

Chairman : Circumstances beyond your control may occur.

Mr. Satyamurti : You gave as one reason that there may be a deficit. Why not face the deficit. I think we should record a resolution that the sinking funds should not be raided in the middle of the year to avoid a deficit.

Chairman : I am prepared to draft a formula saying that as a general rule it is illegitimate to raid the sinking fund in the course of a year.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

There is one other matter to which some attention should be drawn, and that is on pages 19 and 20 of the Evidence Volume. In our country, once money is voted, there is no control, and we don't know how the money is spent. We get only an *ex post facto* control. I said:

"I suggest we recommend that no payment should be made without a specific appropriation.

Chairman: I am a little out of my depth because in England there is not only the voted supply but there is the Appropriation Act and you cannot possibly have money issued in the absence of any specific appropriation, but not so here.

Mr. Badenoch: We have discussed that *ad nauseum* and we consider it is not practical politics. When you are spending money not from one but from thirty or forty treasuries, you cannot keep an account in the same way as you can in England."

This is a very important question. Once the money is voted, the expenditure is beyond our control, until audit detects it and brings it to our notice. As the Chairman said, there is no machinery in India just as they have got in England.

I now wish to refer to another point and that relates to the contract allowances to the Viceroy's House. It is found on pages 21 and 22. Mr. Das raised the point on page 21:

"Mr. Das: Why were items C and D on page 84 left unaudited?

Chairman: All the Governors and the Governor General have contract allowances, and they are unaudited.

Mr. Satyamurti: Under what authority does he get this sum?

Chairman: Under the orders of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Satyamurti: I want to know under what statutory authority these accounts are left unaudited.

Mr. Badenoch: We merely get a statement from the Military Secretary that so much money has been spent against the grant.

Mr. Satyamurti: Why don't you call for vouchers?

Mr. Badenoch: The whole system of a contract grant is a recognised system.

Mr. Satyamurti: By whom is it recognised and under what authority?

Mr. Badenoch: It is recognised in this case by the Secretary of State.

Mr. Satyamurti: So, the money under these two accounts was spent without being audited?

Chairman: You cannot go behind the orders of the Secretary of State. Do you want every penny that he spends out of his salary to be audited?

Mr. Satyamurti: No.

Chairman: Then, these amounts are only an addition to his salary.

Mr. Satyamurti: Where do you get them from?

Chairman: It is laid down by the Secretary of State. It is not actually part of his salary but it is part of his allowances.

Mr. Satyamurti: C. and D. are not called allowances; only B is so called.

Mr. Badenoch: They are also contract allowances. Actually, I think if an inquiry is made it will be found that His Excellency spends quite a lot out of his pocket. It costs him more than Rs. 45,000 to run his cars.

Mr. Satyamurti: What is wrong from the point of view of reasonableness if it is audited? Who is going to suffer from this?

Chairman: Is it not rather absurd to extend the scope of audit to that extent? One of the terms of the office of the Governor General is that he shall have a salary of so much, he shall have a contract allowance of so much for motor cars and so on. These allowances were fixed after elaborate calculations.

Mr. Satyamurti: Who says that his salary shall include all these allowances?

Chairman: The Secretary of State's orders are there.

Prof. Ranga : If Secretary of State's orders are there, why not show them to us?

Chairman : It is the Audit people who are entitled to be satisfied with the Secretary of State's orders. You cannot expect me to produce every order before this Committee.

Mr. Satyamurti : Are you satisfied that these two items, namely, expenditure from contract allowance and State conveyances and motors, are contract allowances sanctioned by the Secretary of State for the Viceroy?

Mr. Badenoch : Yes.

Mr. Satyamurti : Therefore, you think they are above audit?

Mr. Badenoch : They are unaudited. They are sanctioned as contract unaudited allowances.

Sir Muhammad Yakub : If these are contract grants and if they are exceeded, what happens?

Mr. Badenoch : Either His Excellency will have to pay himself or he will have to come to the Government of India and say that his grant is not enough. The Government of India will consider the matter. They cannot sanction it themselves but will have to go to the Secretary of State."

Mr. President, the House will be glad to know that after lunch, Mr. Badenoch came to the Committee, and this is what happened; *vide* page 58 :

"Mr. Badenoch : On the question of the contract grants and audit, I had a talk with Mr. Satyamurti and I hope he understands now what a contract grant is. His difficulty is that he wants some assurance that the contract grant is actually spent on the purpose for which it was granted and if a certificate is given by the Controlling Officer he is content. At lunch time I rang up Colonel Muir, the Military Secretary and I asked him whether he had any objection to giving a certificate. He said 'none in the world'. We shall arrange now that he will give an annual certificate,—that the expenditure from the grant has been incurred for the purposes for which it was given."

Sir, I think we must see that these accounts are also audited; I do not see any reason why they should not be.

Then, with regard to the Survey of India, I have already said a word. On that, we had Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai. Sir, as the witness, he said so much that at the end of it we found that we were not very much enlightened as to why this grant could not be more accurately spent. This is what we find on page 62 of the Evidence Volume:

"Chairman : If you make it as a sort of general proposition that, if in any department, although its main budget total is not very far out, there are a very wild number of large excesses and savings in its sub-heads, you should consider that the budgeting was not very good and take steps to tighten it up, it is all right, but the Auditor General's point is that, if one saving emerges and you also want a supplementary grant, it would be proper to re-appropriate from that saving."

Sir, I leave it at that. I come now to New Delhi, with great respect, because we all live here. Sir, it seems to me that the New Delhi Municipality is a joke. It has no money, it has no constitution, you nominate a few people, and, as my friend reminds me, it is a fraud. Mr. Badenoch himself speaks on this thus at page 68:

"Mr. Badenoch : This grant-in-aid is to the New Delhi Municipality and it is very difficult to deal with it because the expenditure is divided over between the Departments of Industries and Labour and the Home Department and the control is with the Department of Education, Health and Lands. Actually, the reason why I want to raise the matter is that, as is known, the New Delhi Municipality has been formed by Government. It is a body which manages a very large amount of Government property and we are at issue with the Government as to the extent of the audit of this account. The attitude of the Department of Education, Health and Lands has been that we should content ourselves with the ordinary standard and scale of audit. Sir Ernest Burdon thinks that as a great deal of Government money is involved in it, there should be proper audit of it."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

I think, Sir, they have appointed a Financial Officer to the New Delhi Municipality, and I hope that the standard of audit has improved.

Then, I come to the evidence with regard to the Central Publications Department. I do not know what is the latest position. We examined it, and we found that it left very much to be desired. Mr. Badenoch says this at page 80:

"So far, there has been no real check of stock at all. We found actually that the figures for stock were not correct according to their own vouchers. I think the audit comments speak for themselves. They are strong. With regard to the policy adopted by the Department of Industries and Labour stated in paragraph seven, we do not actually accept that policy as the ideal policy by any means. I have talked the matter over with Mr. Clow and he can give you his explanation of why that policy is adopted, but we consider that, whatever the difficulties, there ought to be an effort to count the stock on its arrival in Delhi and to take as the opening figure in ledger accounts the actual stocks which have been counted. There is no doubt that stock accounts of the Publication Branch are in a pretty mess and the only way in which you can get the stock accounts in the proper form is to count your stock, put the verified figure down in your ledger and start on a clean sheet; and if there are very big variations, try and get some explanation of them afterwards."

Sir, I know there has been some improvement, because we were told last year something about this, but the House would like to know what the latest position in this matter is. With regard to the Indian Stores Department, it is brought out from the Evidence Volume pp. 105-08 that although many Departments are now trying increasingly to use the Indian Stores Department for their purchases, the Army and the Railways have not yet come into line. The company-managed Railways are the worst; even the Railways have annual conferences, and Sir James Pitkeathly is doing his very best to get this Department to buy through his own Department. But the Army, Sir, is above all control, and they will not buy through the Indian Stores Department as much as they can usefully do. We must ask the Government to see if they cannot make the army and the railway authorities buy very much more through the Indian Stores Department.

Sir, there is one more matter. I refer to page 145 of the Evidence Volume. Sir, out of the revenues of this Government to which the poorest contribute, the Government indulge in the luxury of giving loans to States and individuals, and some of them are becoming irrecoverable. Take these loans to Alwar of Rs. 25 lakhs. This is what we find on page 145

"Chairman: Is the Bhawalpur loan being repaid now?"

Mr. Tallents: No; they cannot pay. They have been let off interest now for two years. The principal is remaining there."

I think, Sir, they have settled the matter now? I raise the whole question—why should taxes be raised in this country from the poor taxpayer, for whom we are told the heart of my Honourable friend bleeds, in order to oblige impecunious Princes with loans to individual States and so forth? Sir, it is not proper, it is not just, it is not right.

Then, Sir, with regard to the Railways, the Railways are always with us and I think we shall be having a discussion either now or during the Simla Session as regards the quiet proposal of repudiation of debts that they make! Sir, when we, the humble folk of the Congress, made a proposal that the national debts should be examined, there arose a huge

outcry from the banks of the Thames and the Jumna that the Congress are trying to repudiate debts but today this Government come forward with the proposition to write off Rs. 61 crores of debt. As a preliminary to my dealing with that, let me invite the attention of the Honourable House to this report and to the two published volumes of evidence, the first being with regard to Civil, Military and Posts and Telegraphs, and the second being with regard to Railways. On page 8 of the report, we say this:

"We also noticed several cases where either no funds were allotted for expenditure which could reasonably have been foreseen and provided for or insufficient or excessive provision of funds was made Even after making allowance for all these, we are of opinion that there is considerable room for improvement. The Railway Administrations should see that the totals allotted by the Railway Board are distributed among the individual subheads with greater accuracy."

Again, I may add the comment that this is a positive statement in a mild form. Some of us felt very strongly, but, after all, the Finance Member is mild where his own departments are concerned, and his colleague, Mr. Sanjiva Row, is still milder. That is why the report is written in that mild form. In the next paragraph we say:

"Under demands for capital expenditure on the other hand even the total expenditure diverged very far indeed from expectations. For example, under Demand No. 8, the total expenditure amounted only to 5.81 lakhs against an allotment of 8.92 lakhs."

What is this budgeted for? It is a fraud on this House to come and ask you to vote nearly nine crores, when they cannot spend even six crores. Is it not really giving a false picture to this House to ask you to vote nine crores when they cannot spend more than six crores? The explanation is:

"We were told by the Financial Commissioner that the capital programme was settled several months in advance, that it was very difficult for Railway Administrations to make accurate estimates so much in advance and that many factors entered into the picture over which Railways had little control. The Financial Commissioner has informed us that he is drawing the attention of all Railway Administrations to the large difference between the amounts they have been demanding and the amounts they have been actually able to spend."

Last year, we were told that they have now introduced a system under which they will make a lump cut, but there is a danger in that also. I think the Chairman pointed it out that, unless it was done very carefully, the result will be that the railways would put it up by 50 per cent., and the thing will go on in a vicious circle. Therefore, it has got to be done in a more scientific and much more effective manner. Then we raised this point:

"While examining the question of the control of the Railway Board over Railway Administrations we have considered whether a more effective control could not be exercised if the Board were enabled, by a further delegation in minor matters, to relieve themselves of any necessity for interfering in questions of detail and so to leave themselves free to concentrate on securing effective control in matters of first class financial importance."

I should like to know what has happened to this recommendation. Has any attempt been made to re-constitute the functions of the Railway Board, so that they may be able to deal with these large questions of financial policy and financial control and give us better results? What will happen is that they will undoubtedly relieve themselves of lot of work but whether the relief will result in effective control is a different matter altogether. I should like to wait and see.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Then, as regards the financial position of the railways, I would respectfully suggest to my Honourable friends to read paragraphs nine to twelve on pages four to six very carefully.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Take it for granted that we have read the report.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: You read only labour comments. Will my friend answer a few questions on these paragraphs? At the bottom of page five we point out this:

"But it is now clear that what appeared to be a process of continuous improvement has suffered an interruption and that unless the remaining months of this year show a great change, the deficit for 1935-36 may not be materially less than that for the preceding year."

I think we were right there:

"Even so, as has already been pointed out, this understates the real position by something like two crores. The question thus becomes not so much one of a slow tendency to overcapitalisation because of a somewhat lax accounting system but of the inability of the railways as a whole to show a profit even on the present system."

We conclude:

"We do not at all intend to imply that the expenditure side should be neglected. We are most reluctant to accept the Railway Board's estimate of the possible further economies and we think that the search for them must be relentlessly pursued."

Then, Sir, there is one point. In 1924-25, we had the separation Convention between the railway and the general finance. One of the conditions of that Convention was that at the end of three years the whole Convention ought to be re-examined. But do you know, Mr. President, that owing to the fault of someone or other that Convention has never been examined and that has resulted in this enormous expenditure on capital works, and today we are paying the price of that failure on the part of this House not to have re-examined the Convention at the proper time? If the Convention was re-examined at the proper time, then we would have known exactly what the railway finances were like. That is what we say on page six:

"We hope we have made clear that we regard immediate and continuous attention to the solution of these problems as of vital importance to Indian interests. Some of the non-official Members wish to place on record their views in regard to the failure to press to an earlier conclusion an examination of the working of the separation convention. Under the Resolution passed by the Assembly regarding the separation of railway from general finance, the convention should have been revised periodically after being tried provisionally for at least 3 years. The explanation given by the Financial Commissioner for not revising the convention is recorded in paragraph 3 of the proceedings. If however the convention had been revised earlier, the question of the proper allocation of expenditure between capital and revenue would have come up for consideration earlier and an examination of the question of allocation between capital and revenue could not have failed to disclose that the surplus was really less than it appeared to be under the old allocation. In the face of this, it is doubtful whether Government would have felt justified in embarking on the very large capital expenditure of the 'prosperity' years. In that case the unremunerative capital at charge would clearly have been reduced and the present financial problems would have assumed a less intractable aspect."

Therefore, it seems to me that so far as railway finance is concerned, the position has not considerably improved. As I said, I do not want to say more on this subject, because I think the House will have a fuller and a more appropriate opportunity of dealing with the whole question of

railway finance, when the Resolution of my Honourable friend, Sir Raghavendra Rau, comes before it. There is only one more paragraph on page seven of this volume, to which I would like to call the attention of the House. In paragraph 15 we say:

"While going through the Quarterly Statement of outstanding items, we found that the departments generally took a considerable time in taking action on the recommendations of the Committee. The departments should try to avoid such delays in future. In this connection, we recommend that a special meeting of the Committee should be held some time during the Delhi session, if so desired by the members, to examine the action taken by the departments on the various recommendations and suggestions of the Committee."

I do not know what has happened to it. I do not propose to read from the evidence volume of the railway, because I have already quoted some extracts from the other volume merely to convince the House, if I may, that there is plenty of material in the evidence, and it should continue to be published.

I only want to make one point in conclusion. When this Public Accounts Committee was originally formed, Sir Malcolm Hailey (Mr. Hailey then), in moving for the appointment of this Committee, said that this Committee was very important and added:

"Let me add, that there is a still wider field for the Committee when it gets, if I may so express myself, thoroughly into its stride. It may be able to compare the scale of expenditure of one Department with another and to point out economies as a result. It may be able to point out where larger financial recoveries can be made on public account. It may be able to reveal cases where expenditure has been incurred on hasty or unbusinesslike lines. Those who are acquainted with the reports of the Public Accounts Committee in England will be aware of the enormous influence exercised by that body in bringing pressure to bear upon the Government to enforce economy in the expenditure of public monies."

Sir, after all, the Public Accounts Committee is not a mere auditing committee, it is a committee which deals with the manner in which public money is spent, and I think it will be common ground of all sections of this House, including I hope the Government, that there is ample scope for economy in public expenditure. I am not talking of economy in the sense of cutting down budget grants. Once the budget has been sanctioned, even then I suggest, Mr. President, with some confidence, with some knowledge as a Member of this Committee for the last two years, that there is considerable scope for economy in expenditure. In that work, we seek the assistance of the Honourable the Finance Member and of all the Members of the Committee.

I should like to conclude as I began, no doubt in this House we fight on many issues, but on the whole my experience of two years on this Committee has satisfied me that we do not differ fundamentally on the main questions which come before this committee. We are all anxious that rules of business should be observed, that budget control ought to be effective, that there ought to be economy in expenditure, and there ought to be sanction for every item of expenditure, but there is one feeling I have in my mind, that is to say that even such a vigorous personality as the Honourable the Finance Member becomes weak, when faced with the tremendous inertia of the Government of India's Departments, including the Military Department; these witnesses come and tell us stories which will melt even stony hearts, they say, they cannot do this, they cannot do that, they are doing their best, and, therefore, please do not shoot us. That is the answer which all these witnesses give us. While I recognise

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

there has been some improvement, and I hope there will be more improvement, I think this House should always expect the Public Accounts Committee to be filled by men who will give freely of their time and energy to study up all these big reports and put useful and searching questions. Let me tell you, Sir, that the work on this Committee is not an easy one. We have got to study for weeks, sometimes for months, all the papers and we have to be ready with questions, because on the one hand you have a vigilant Chairman who trips you up if you make the slightest mistake, there is his watchful Assistant, Mr. Sanjiva Row who is always instructing the Honourable the Finance Member, lest he should allow any Member of the Committee to put inconvenient questions, there is on the other hand the witness, very clever and trained and very able who knows his briefs through and through and who will expose you if you put questions without book or authority. On the whole, however, the work on this Committee is a thankful thing. You get inside knowledge of the way in which the Departments function. I think if the Members of the House should make a serious study of the report and of the evidence volume—which I repeat should continue to be published before this House as it has been done in the past—then the Members of the House will get inside knowledge as to how the money is being spent, and I hope the Honourable the Finance Member will not look at the Members of the Committee as natural enemies, but as colleagues in the great task of improving the financial tone and probity of the administration. (Applause.)

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock, Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta) in the Chair.

Mr. B. Das (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, better late than never; what we should have discussed in September, 1935, or in the beginning of 1936 we are discussing at the end of March, 1937. Sir, I take a good deal of interest in the Public Accounts Committee. Probably I happen to be the oldest Member of that Committee, though there are other people present here who happened to be connected with it earlier than myself,—I refer to Sir Raghavendra Rau. Sir, the Public Accounts Committee, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, explained, happens to be the only Committee where we get a complete picture of the public finances of the Government of India, and where we exercise the largest amount of financial control and scrutiny over expenditure which this House is unable to do while it discusses budget proposals. Unfortunately owing to the statutory changes, some of the powers that the Public Accounts Committee at present enjoys will pass away from our hands, not necessarily through our consent and assent but through machinations over which we had no control. Very likely, the Public Accounts Committee in future will not exercise any control over the railway accounts after the statutory railway authority comes into existence; and I will not be surprised if after we leave New Delhi, Government bring forward an Order in Council whereby the control of this Legislature in matters of accounting is taken away with regard to the railways. While certain Honourable Members of

this House were in London trying to formulate a statutory railway authority, I drew the attention of some of my friends that they must see that the authority of the Public Accounts Committee continues. In private, my Honourable friend, Sir Muhammad Yakub, who happens to be a member of the Public Accounts Committee did assure me that it should be so. I should like to hear from the Finance Member or Sir Raghavendra Rau or Mr. Sanjiva Row,—because every year in the Public Accounts Committee I raise the issue and get no satisfactory answer,—whether the authority of the Public Accounts Committee will continue over the railway accounts after the 1st April, *i.e.*, after the railway authority comes into existence and which might come into existence any moment.

The most important work that the Public Accounts Committee does is to see that the Finance Department have exercised proper control of expenditure through the different statutory auditors and the Accountants-General. I may say with due respect to the Auditor General and the Accountants General that they try to do their utmost, in the light that comes to them at the time they write their report, to bring forward before the Public Accounts Committee any irregularity in financial control or any defalcation that might have taken place. But, of late, I have found that the Auditor General and the Accountants General do not present a large bulk of defalcations that happens in the various spending Departments such as Defence, Railways and Posts and Telegraphs. Recently it has been the practice to just indicate one or two types of the defalcation that takes place, whether it is in the Army or in the railways. Nowhere does the Auditor General indicate the quantity or the quantum of defalcation in particular Departments; but knowing what happens, it might amount to crores of rupees in the Defence Department and crores of rupees in the Railway Department. Of course stricter financial control has been exercised; but when we come to the Defence Department, we find military officers mismanaging funds, drawing travelling or luggage allowances to which they are not entitled, or a director of army contract or his subordinates having permitted running contracts in the army whereby the Government of India and the tax-payers lose lakhs and lakhs of rupees. I do not understand why perpetual running contracts should be allowed by the Defence Department to certain pet contractors, and there is no opportunity for the heads of the Defence Department or for the Quarter-masters General to see that prices have fallen and the rates should be reduced. Certain of my observations regarding this apply to the railways as well.

Sir, I will take the Departments of the Government of India, department by department, and I will first deal with the Leader of Government. The Leader of the House controls the Indian Stores Department. As my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, pointed out, two years ago we had a debate on the floor of the House and we were promised that Sir James Pitkeathly would go to London, and the India Stores Department of London would be a branch of the Indian Stores Department in India. As one who has taken a keen interest that the Government of India should make all their purchases through the Indian Stores Department, whether in Defence, Railways or any other spending department, one does not know what passes between the India Office and the Government of India, and though the High Commissioner is supposed to control the India Stores Department, the controller of that Department is not amenable to the control of the Government of India, and it is high time to have a uniform policy. I hope that the Honourable Member for

[Mr. B. Das.]

Industries will see that that Department becomes a part of the activities of the Indian Stores Department. My Honourable friend will shortly leave the shores of India; and if he makes that announcement that he has been successful in bringing down the mighty controller of the India Stores Department, London, under his own Department, it would be a welcome thing not only to us but to the mercantile community all over India.

I do hope I will also hear from my Honourable friend, the Member for Industries whether the Defence Department and the Railway Department are making their full quantum of purchases through the Indian Stores Department. It is a matter in which the Public Accounts Committee takes a keen interest. In the past the Committee got hold of the heads of the Railway Board, the Stores Department and the Military Contracts Department and brought them together to see why they should not purchase everything through the Indian Stores Department. Although the Railway Department have come up to our expectations and are buying large quantities through the Indian Stores Department, the Defence Department is adamant and will not see their way to buy through the Indian Stores Department. These are days when great changes occur: and there may be an Order in Council tomorrow that the Defence Department will not purchase anything through the Indian Stores Department, because defence is an excluded subject completely under the Governor General, and the Governor General in Council will have no further control.

Then, I come to my Honourable friend, the Finance Member. The Finance Department have got much larger spending powers than the Legislature itself. At the same time the Finance Member has received our cordial support in any proposal that his Department brings forward in the Public Accounts Committee about stricter financial control. But the Finance Department is often hoodwinked by the spending departments, they always want to spend more. We know, when this year's budget was introduced, there has been 76 crores of expenditure transferred to the non-voted side and only 26 crores remain on the voted side. That shows the extent of work which the Finance Department takes on itself. If the Finance Department shows laxity there will be lots of waste of public money; and in the Committee, we have very often brought out how the Finance Department can exercise greater financial control. I will give an instance. After the economic depression, the Finance Member who is always the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee agreed with the Public Accounts Committee that there should not be any heavy capital expenditure. That policy has been in actual operation: we find in railways recently there has not been capital expenditure to the extent as used to be the case four or five years ago. But we live and learn. It is not the Finance Department's money: it is our money: they borrow on our account and they borrow at high rates of interest from England and India and they go on merrily spending it through the advice of their spending departments: only the other day, I raised the issue as to why the Finance Member should not see his way to convert some of the sterling loans and rupee loans: I received no answer, but a tittering from the Finance Member that I want to repudiate part of the obligations; and my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, only spoke this morning: "What about the repudiation by the Government of India of their obligation to the general revenues of 31 crores?"—a Resolution which my unfortunate friend, Sir Raghavendra Rau, will father in a day or two on the floor of this House.

Again, Sir, the Finance Department naturally adopts an attitude of over-lording it: it tries to write off capital without the consent of this House. The fact comes out to light in one or two lines somewhere in the appropriation accounts submitted by the Accountant General, Central Revenues, to the Committee a year or two after the action was taken. I will refer to two instances. It has been discussed already on the floor of the House that the Postal Department, through the recommendations of the Cowasji Jehangir Committee, wrote off 166 lakhs when we discussed the Public Accounts Committee's Report of 1933-34; and this year we learn that they have been written off to the extent of two crores. A line in a note in the appropriation accounts of the Central Revenues revealed that the Education, Health and Lands Department, which Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai represents, that the New Delhi Capital Committee has been permitted to write down its assets by 110 lakhs. The Finance Department do not allow a lakh or two for any nation building department, but when it suits them, it can hand over an asset of 167 lakhs and write off 111 lakhs. There must be certain method in regard to any capital that is written off and which is of a voted character, the Finance Member should introduce resolutions and motions on the floor of this House and inform the House that the Government have decided to write down the capital. On the merits, I do not grudge the writing down of capital in the Postal Department. Under the form of accounting when experts like Sir Cowasji Jehangir and others decided that this should be so, it was done; but it was the duty of the Finance Member to bring it on the floor of the House and inform this House that on such and such grounds such a sum had been written down. I object to the mode of informing the House through budget memorandum: in the first page in the explanatory memorandum this year, it was said that so much had been written off from the capitalised valuation of the Postal Department. My Honourable friend, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, got only 110 lakhs: it may be nothing to him; his Department is very poor—it is the step-child of the Government of India. Spending Departments have no business to ask the Government to write off such large amounts without the assent of the House. I will tell the House that we did discuss it in the Public Accounts Committee: there is the New Delhi electric supply company built at an enormous cost of from 60 to 70 lakhs of capital. And today their total assets is 60 or 70 lakhs of rupees of which one electric supply co., is 60 lakhs. Therefore, the Public Accounts Committee suggested to the Auditor General that he should have full control of the accounts of the New Delhi Capital Committee; not only that, we also suggested that in the distribution of re-valuation of the assets, he should be the final authority. We do not know what has been done in the matter. While I ask for detailed information from the Departments concerned, I do lay this charge against the Finance Department that they should not treat this House lightly, and in future when they contemplate any expenditure, whether it is to be incurred on revenue account or capital account, it should be brought up by a special resolution or a motion on the floor of this House.

Then, I have one more point to show how the Finance Member can play ducks and drakes with our money. My friend, Mr. Saṅyamurti, did allude to it,—I refer to the loan to the Bhawalpur Durbar. The Punjab Government contemplate a joint irrigation project for a small State like Bhawalpur State which has got an income of 80 lakhs, and that State is saddled today with a debt of 12 crores of rupees as its share in the Sutlej Valley Irrigation scheme. The Government of India lost money on the

[Mr. B. Das.]

mad project. They decided last year to write off two and a half crores as the interest charges due from the Bhawalpur Durbar. When the Finance Member does it, this House is entitled to know how and why he does so; he ought to bring up a specific motion saying that the Government of India have decided to make a present of these two and a half crores to the Bhawalpur Durbar. Sir, on the eve of constitutional changes,—I am one of those who is not very friendly to Indian States, nor do I show my friendship to them,—I do not like that the Finance Member should take money from the poor tax-payers or borrow money on India's credit, give it to the Indian States and write off interest charges, and we know it for a fact that for the next 50 years the Bhawalpur Durbar will not be able to repay that loan, and the Finance Member has taken interest, through a special officer, to see if all the lands could possibly be irrigated and the increment of revenue therefrom could meet the dues of the Government of India.

Then, Sir, coming to my friend, the Railway Member,—I am glad Sir Raghavendra Rau is present here.—as one who has seen the extravagance of the Railway Chief Commissioners and the Railway Board, I must say that during the last five years there has been stricter financial control over the railway account. But, Sir, the mischief has been done for which not only the railways but the Indian tax-payer will suffer for years together. There have been mad electrification schemes on the B., B. and C. I. Railway and the G. I. P. Railway. The B. B. and C. I. Railway scheme has now proved to be a slightly paying proposition, but the G. I. P. Railway electrification scheme is an extravagant proposition. We have discussed these schemes. The Public Accounts Committee took note of the reports that the Auditor of Railway Accounts submitted to them, but, Sir, any fair-minded person can say that these mad electrification schemes should never have been undertaken. The Railways have spent five to seven crores of rupees on these schemes, and there is as yet no return on the money, although it was thought at one time or the other that the railways would show increased earnings. Sir, I do think that one of the good things which the Railway Department does through the pressure of the Public Accounts Committee is the Review of the Appropriation Accounts on Railways in India which my friend Sir Raghavendra Rau, submits to the Public Accounts Committee from year to year. It was not the practice in the past,—I am talking of a period of five years before,—to submit such a review. The Chief Commissioner for Railways and the Financial Commissioner used to appear before us and answer any questions that we put. We said: 'Both of you happen to be the managing directors of Indian Railways and it is your duty to submit to the Public Accounts Committee a review of the working of the Indian Railway.' Those friends of mine who have read these reviews will find admirable statistics very well arranged! it is a very fine document from which one can get a balanced view of the railway affairs, but yet a perusal of it shows that things which happened five years ago ought not to have happened at all, and we have now to pay for all those mistakes, and probably the provinces will suffer, because the Railway Department will not pay to the Centre and the Provinces will not enjoy shares of Income-Tax.

Sir, I wish we have discussed both the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee together, but my friend, Mr. Satvamurti, has given an amendment that the evidences of 1934-35 Committee must be published, but

as one is discussing the subject which ought to have been discussed two years ago, it is rather hard to bring back to memory the issues and place them before the House separately. I suggest that in future the Finance Member should see his way to permit the Assembly in the Simla Session to discuss the report of the Public Accounts Committee. If for want of time or for any other reason it is not discussed, then it should be discussed on the first Government day in Delhi. If that is done, then the House will get some idea of the financial control exercised, and the Finance Member cannot say, as he did say last year, that he had a private agreement with Mr. Satyamurti, and he did not want the Public Accounts Committee Report to be discussed in his absence. I do hope that if Government wants a fair discussion, they should bring it up on the first Government day at Simla or Delhi

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member must arrange that with his leader—it is no good beating me about it.

Mr. B. Das: I am not pulling my friend's leg!

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: If the Honourable gentleman wishes to complain about the action of his leaders, perhaps he had better take it up with them direct.

Mr. B. Das: As my friend the Finance Member did not listen to that portion of my criticism on the defence, I do wish to bring it to his notice that the Public Accounts Committee is not very friendly to the system of giving out running contracts in the army, whereby contracts go perpetually to only one or two firms which are the favourites of the Quarter Master General and the Director of Army Contracts, and whereby thousands of contractors are deprived of their legitimate trade with the Army Department, and probably the army spends more. I was talking to a friend of mine, one who is very proficient in army expenditure, and he told me that if proper scrutiny is kept on the army expenditure 15 per cent. of the present expenditure can be easily reduced. Sir, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, reminds me, our old colleague, the late Prof. Shahani, made a charge about that on the floor of this House a few years ago. With these few observations, I would commend to the Honourable the Finance Member that he must not delay in future discussions on the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): I take up Part II of the Report dealing with
3 P.M. Railways, but before I do so, I would like to relate a story. (Laughter.) A person purchased a pair of boots for Rs. 10, and then he used it for about three or four years. Every three months he had it resoled and on each occasion he paid Rs. 2-8-0 for re-soling. At the end of three years he was asked what was the value of the pair of boots. By calculating all the amounts he had spent, he said Rs. 40, and he would sell it for half the price, that is, Rs. 20. The same is the case with the capital of our railways. One station was built probably about 50 years ago and it had a thatched roof, and the thing cost about Rs. 1,000. Then it was re-shaped and built in a pucca fashion with a cost of another Rs. 2,000, and this Rs. 2,000 was added to the capital at charge. It was re-modelled after some years and ultimately it became like the station at

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

Cawnpore or Lucknow at a cost of one crore. So, the capital has been added to from time to time just as in the case of the re-soling of the pair of boots. Then you have a depreciation fund even on the thatched roof which had been demolished fifty years ago. I come now first to page five of this report where they draw attention to this particular point. They say:

"The question thus becomes not so much one of a slow tendency to over-capitalisation because of a somewhat lax accounting system but of the inability of the railways as a whole to show a profit even on the present system."

This over-capitalisation has been a standing difficulty in the case of the railways. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, has pointed out, and I wish to do the same,—at page 10 of this report we have:

"The Financial Commissioner explained that a committee of the Assembly was set up for the purpose in September, 1928. It met in February and March, 1929, and appointed a sub-committee which held one meeting in June, 1929. It then became *functus officio* owing to the dissolution of the Assembly. The question was not again taken up as the revised arrangements for administering Railways under the new constitution were under active consideration, and it was felt that the whole position would be reviewed in that connection."

Eight solid years have passed away and nothing has happened on the subject. In the year 1931, when the Retrenchment Committee met and wanted the railways to have some kind of economy, it was pointed out that an expert committee was soon going to meet which would deal with the entire system of the railways and would probably consider the convention between the Legislature and the Railway Department. But to our great disappointment, this resulted in the Pope Enquiry Committee and job analysis. This was the outcome of the promise which was held out to the Assembly from the year 1929 to the year 1931. Job analysis may be a thing of very great importance, but still it was a very limited enquiry. The whole question of administration and of finance was never gone into though it had been repeatedly promised to us. The question of over-capitalisation is a very important question which we have to tackle sooner or later. In a manner the process of writing off the capital has commenced. They are not paying one per cent. of the capital at charge, they have not paid us for the last several years. The accumulated amount which they have not paid us is over Rs. 30 crores, I have not got the exact figures with me. This amount has not been paid, this means writing off the capital and interest which they have not paid us. Adding on and on to the capital has led to this position that they cannot really pay back what is due by them. The next point, I raise, is page 5, and I shall quote the relevant sentences.

"In paragraph 42 of his Review, the Financial Commissioner expresses regret that it has not been possible to proceed much further with the examination of various important questions essential to a proper financial settlement for Railways, such as, the correct amount to be set aside for depreciation, the principles of allocation of expenditure between capital and revenue, and the amortisation of railway capital at charge."

At page 6 we find:

"If however the convention had been revised earlier, the question of the proper allocation of expenditure between capital and revenue would have come up for consideration earlier and an examination of the question of allocation between capital and revenue could not have failed to disclose that the surplus was really less than it appeared to be under the old allocation."

There is one point which I should like to emphasise. I understand that the Government are contemplating to bring forward a Resolution to write off the whole of the depreciation amount. If this is a fact, I think it is very unfair to the Assembly. The Wedgwood Committee has written a report on the subject and that report should be placed in our hands before we discuss the question of the writing off of the depreciation fund altogether. This method of Government taking action without revealing all the facts to the Assembly has become rather chronic.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member. Is the Honourable Member making a request that the Resolution which stands in the name of my Honourable friend should be postponed until the Wedgwood Committee Report is published? Is that his suggestion?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Yes. I would like to mention, not in the time of my Honourable friend, but in the time of his predecessor, two instances in which the Government took action without giving us the true facts. Take the case of the sugar duty. The sugar duty ought to have been levied after the publication of the Tariff Board's Report. They never published the Tariff Board's Report, the facts were not given to us and still they took action on the report. The second case was that of the hosiery. The report was before the Government, but they did not take action on the report. They brought forward a Bill embodying all the recommendations which were in their mind but in perverted form. It is only fair that the reports of Committees should be available to Members beforehand so that we may be able to form our own judgment and come to a conclusion. On this question of depreciation fund, my own view is this. There is no need for us to set aside large sums of money under the head of depreciation fund; it is quite unnecessary. From the figures of the last 15 years, we ought to know quite definitely what amount we spend on renewals and maintenance. That we can know and we must set aside the same amount, and it ought to be paid from the revenue.

Now, there ought to be a definite distinction between the expenditure charged under capital and expenditure charged under revenue, and all the expenditure which really brings in revenue, that is opening out new lines and so on, must be paid out of capital, but it is not fair to pay out of the capital for rebuilding the railway station at Lucknow and Cawnpore and adding the capital in the same manner as the price of the original shoe was raised by the amount spent in re-soling it. If this principle is adopted, then the difficulties pointed out by the Auditor and by the Public Accounts Committee will disappear.

In this connection, I would like to point out that the head "Depreciation Fund" is peculiar to the Indian Railways. It does not exist in any foreign railway. May I say in this connection that Sir Joseph Bhore was once comparing the working ratio of the Indian railways with the working ratio of foreign railways, and after quoting these things, he said that we have got two ratios, one in which depreciation is included and the other in which it is not, and he failed to understand whether the foreign railways have given these ratios with or without depreciation. The real reason was that they never set aside any big sum for depreciation and they set aside a definite amount for the renewal and maintenance which

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

is required during the current year and it was included in working expenses. It is just the same as what we are introducing in the case of the Post Office. They put aside from their experience as much sum as is necessary in any particular year. The third point I take up is on page six of this report, where they say:

"We are most reluctant to accept the Railway Board's estimate of the possible further economies, and we think that the search for them must be relentlessly pursued."

Here I beg to differ from the findings of the Committee. The economies have been carried so far that it is dangerous to travel on the railways. The points of view of the legislators and of the administration differ. We want economy in the pay of the officers but the salary of the officers is only three per cent. of the salaries of the entire staff. Any economy in the pay of the officers will never lead to any real economy. You will never get the desired result unless the economy is carried throughout and that has never been the intention of Legislature. In this connection, I would like to point out one fact—that whenever the railway administration fix up the staff for any particular work, they do it with their experience and knowledge of the European railways, but they forget that in Europe, the work that can be done by one individual cannot be done here by one individual. The efficiency of the man in England is much greater than the efficiency of the man in India, but when you consider how much you pay for a particular work, you will find it very much cheaper here. Here you find that you require more men to do the same work that can be done in England by a smaller number of men. This economy has now gone to extremes and it is time to call a halt. We have already reduced the salaries to a dangerous position. We have reduced the minimum salary to 85 and 80 at which we cannot engage a person of good intelligence. We have stopped altogether the recruitment in upper subordinate and intermediate grade. The result is that whenever these men who are in the intermediate grade will retire, their places will be filled by unintelligent people, and God save us from future travelling on the Indian Railways.

The next point I would like to take up is the question of coal. The Committee say on page 6:

"Incidentally some of us would like to call attention to the fact that Railway finances are being made the instrument of Government policy towards particular industries with the result that burdens are thrown on the railways, which ought to fall on the general tax-payer. An instance of this is the reduction of the output of Railway collieries to help the Indian coal industry. We are informed that, if Railway collieries are worked to their full capacity, the Railways will be able to produce coal at least as cheaply as the market rate and thus avoid a loss in the working of the collieries amounting approximately to 12 lakhs."

Attention to the working of coal was first drawn by Sir A. H. Ghuznavi about five years ago when he proposed a cut on the occasion of the railway budget. We have since then been discussing this question off and on and in one Session we discussed the qualification of what we called the coal demi-God. This is a matter in which the attention of the Government has already been drawn by the Public Accounts Committee, and I hope that Government would treat it as a business concern. I do not see any reason why the Government should not run its own mines and produce coal at cheaper rates.

I next come to the question of auction on page 7. There they say:

"The Director of Railway Audit has brought to our notice a case in which the North Western Railway were unable to recover from the auctioneers about Rs. 44,000, being the sale proceeds of scrap metal auctioned. The decree obtained by the Railway Company could not be enforced as the debtors were paupers."

In this connection, I would draw attention to what is said on page 12:

"Some of the members of the Committee felt that the loss to Railways in this case was due to proper care not having been exercised in selecting auctioneers."

In this connection I would like to point out two things. Just at the time when the new auctioneers were being appointed, I drew the attention of the Railway Board to the undesirability of changing the auctioneers. Mr. Hight who was at that time temporarily in the Railway Board office was going to be appointed Agent of the North Western Railway. At that time they thought it was not necessary to take any action. They changed a reliable person for a person from whom they could not recover any money at all, for reasons which everybody understands very well. The difficulties have not ceased to exist. A series of questions have now come into our hands about the Stores Department of the North Western Railway, and the time has now come when the Government ought to make a proper inquiry into the matter, and I am very thankful to the members of the Committee for drawing attention to this particular matter. The next thing is about rate-cutting and railway freight. I think these are also matters that are over-due. The next thing is about unanticipated credits. I am glad attention was drawn to bad accountancy. I shall give an example. In one place, which I won't mention by name, the capital was invested in Government securities. After some time the securities matured and they gave some bonus. The bonus was considered to be the income of the University—not provided already in the budget but as extra income, it was spent in a careless manner, as if this was money thrown in by unforeseen hand for which no account is to be given to any person. So this system of unanticipated income and of ruthlessly spending it without giving a true account of the whole thing is really bad accountancy, and I am glad the Public Accounts Committee has drawn attention to this irregularity, and this wants looking into.

The next is about the question of freights. Honourable Members have also drawn attention to the fact that this question of rates of freight is determined more out of regard for the foreign tradesman than for the benefit of the people of India. I drew the attention of the Railway Board to one such discrepancy. The freight from Bombay to Calcutta for one particular article was three times the freight from Calcutta to Bombay on the same article. This was really very inconsistent but it was done in order to facilitate traffic from Bombay to Calcutta and to stop the traffic from Calcutta to Bombay. This was very undesirable, and this is a matter which requires the serious consideration of the Railway Department.

Now, I come to page 22 of their report, Vol. I, about local schools. Here the Public Accounts Committee says:

"The expenditure on railway schools proper should be provided in gross in the demands for grants, the amount received from Local Governments being deducted therefrom, provided the amount is received in the same financial year. Grants received after the close of the financial year should be treated as receipts and the same treatment should be accorded to fees recovered from the pupils."

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

Now, the Railway Administration maintains some schools of their own like Oakover, that at Dinapur and that at Tundla. In some cases, they give grants and in some cases they give some aid in the shape of fees to the students who are reading in other recognized schools. We ought to provide a lump sum under two heads, and give up the present practice. We set apart so much money for the maintenance of these schools, and let a committee arrange that, and then, so much money as grants-in-aid to schools, and then that should be distributed by a small committee under the direction of the Railway Administration. If there are no regular schools, they might give some money to the students reading in other recognized schools, but as far as the budget is concerned, I think we should only provide a lump sum, and the Administration ought to be left to a small committee in which we should have a person of the rank of a Deputy Agent as its chairman and two other Members, one being a non-official, and if the administration is conducted in this way, then probably the difficulties we are now experiencing will be avoided.

The next thing is about the electrification of the Great Indian Peninsula and the Bombay, Baroda and Central Indian Railway—*vide* page 83 of their report. We spent large sum of money on Kalyan Power Station on mis-calculation. It is not one case, it is one of a dozen cases in which we are asked to make a contribution to a particular undertaking and the expenditure incurred several times the estimate. Sir, they gave a solemn undertaking on the floor of this House that this particular undertaking would yield so much income but ultimately they found that the expenditure had increased or that the income which they had anticipated did not materialize, and that they got definitely less than what they had anticipated. This is what we have got from their own figures in Statement A on p. 33 about the Great Indian Peninsula Railway (last column). They expected a profit of 10·51, but the actual profit was only 4·4, that is, less than half of what they had anticipated. We gave them large sums of money on the supposition that they would get an output of 10·51 from the money. As far as the Bombay, Baroda and Central India was concerned, their anticipation did not fall much short of their expectations. It was 16·19 that had been anticipated, and actually they are getting 15·54, so that is not so very bad. But this question requires serious consideration at present. Sir, if we could utilize the Power Station at Kalyan to the fullest extent and thus enable it to give electricity to both the Great Indian Peninsula and the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railways, then that could make both ends meet. Sir, I had no opportunity of going into details in the matter, but I had some conversation with a person who knows the subject very well, and I gathered that if they tried to derive the maximum benefit out of the Kalyan Power Station then it can be made a paying concern. But Government will yield to the pressure of capitalists and will purchase electricity from local supply and damage the interests of tax-payers.

I come to the next point. Sir, a question was raised by my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, about the loan to Bahawalpur. Sir, there are two kinds of loans. One is a loan which I myself ask for, and for which I must pay full interest, and the other is a loan which is forced upon me. Now if a loan is forced upon me without my demand, then in that case the position is very different. In the case of Bahawalpur, that State did not

want a loan, but the Punjab Government forced it on Bahawalpur in order to complete their project of canals. So the position is different. Moreover, they diverted the course of the water to some other place, and they did not give water to Bahawalpur as promised. Therefore, my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, should consider these two particular things, that is, the loan was forced upon Bahawalpur in order to complete a certain scheme of the Punjab Government, and then we ought to see whether the scheme for which we forced them to take this loan was to Bahawalpur a really profitable concern. The last point which I would like to quote is from the evidence on pages 7 and 8; incidentally I may mention that I quite agree that the publication of the evidence is exceedingly useful:

“Chairman: I remember Mr. Winston Churchill as Chancellor of the Exchequer made the same point, and he was proposing to bring in legislation that the balances of the year instead of lapsing into the sinking fund should be available for general expenditure in the following year. But you require specific legislation, and that can be undertaken only at the initiative of the executive.”

Now I draw attention to this passage of the Chairman, and I think this is a very important thing. So if the balances are left for expenditure as opening balance in the next year, then that would really mean less taxation in the following year, because so much balance is wiped off

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: What if it is a negative balance?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Then taxation should also be negative, if this thing is left to the balances of the following year, then that benefit ought really to go to the tax-payer also; and I endorse the views expressed here by the Chairman.

Prof. N. G. Ranga (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to make a suggestion to start with to the House as well as to the Honourable the Finance Member that they ought to provide this Committee with a non-official chairman as is the case in England. Sir, it cannot be said that an official chairman, and especially the Finance Member alone, can make an efficient chairman. In fact, in England it is a non-official chairman who has been found to be of immense value by Government, the House of Commons and the Finance Members themselves. Even here we had some experience of it. Last year when the Honourable the Finance Member left for Bombay, we had the exceptional experience of three non-officials presiding over the deliberations of the Committee, and I can assure my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, and the House that they have done extremely well indeed. In fact, if I am not to be misunderstood as casting any aspersions on the Honourable the Finance Member who happens to be the Chairman of the Committee, I would like to say that it is quite possible to have a non-official chairman. It may be because of their comparative inadequacy of the knowledge of the financial matters and financial affairs of this country that these non-official Chairmen have succeeded in giving a bit better lead than our omniscient Finance Member himself. Therefore, I would like to suggest for his consideration and for that of the House that they ought to make a departure, and from now onwards, we ought to have a non-official chairman for this Committee.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of special funds. We raised the point that as far as the special funds are concerned including the rural development grant and earthquake funds and other similar funds, we ought

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

to be provided with more or less detailed and audited accounts just as we are provided with audited accounts for the other services and grants and so on. I think in regard to the Bihar Earthquake Fund, we were supplied with a report as to the manner in which that money was being spent by the Bihar Government. But as far as my knowledge goes, we have not had any report at all in regard to the expenditure of rural development grant or the other grants, especially the cess grant we are creating from time to time. So, I think, it is high time that Government should think of providing us with properly audited accounts for all these funds.

Then, Sir, it is a false idea of economy which is being effected in the railways and the posts and telegraphs by the Government trying to economise to a great extent in their expenditure on renewals, repairs, replacements and capital expenditure. It is very easy for Government to say that owing to economic depression they are unable to provide enough money under these heads, but I cannot at the same time see how and why they wish, first of all, to make provision for a certain amount of expenditure on these heads and then later on try to save as much as possible to make use of it, with the permission of the Finance Department, on other heads in the same Department. In fact, the budgeting in the Posts and Telegraphs and the Railway Departments is far from satisfactory, and it is only a conventional thing for anyone to say that their budget is fast improving and so on. We are not here merely to pay compliments to these Departments, but we are here to draw the attention of the House as well as of the public to the very serious nature of the bad budgeting that has been going on in the Railways and the Posts and Telegraphs. We have stated in our report for 1933-34 on page 4:

"We, too, are definitely of opinion that budgeting and control of expenditure in the Department were far from satisfactory and the Auditor General particularly brought to our notice the continuance of the over-budgeting under the repairs grant which had been the marked feature of the preceding ten years."

Then, Sir, there are some other Departments too which seem to be rather bad boys and they have been very troublesome Departments for the Finance Member himself. These are the Survey, the Central Publication Department, Postal Department and the Central Public Works Department. Last year somehow the Honourable the Finance Member gave me the impression that he was rather hard put to it to stand for them rather than join hands with my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, as he usually does, in trying to check these departments in their over-estimating first and then spending either too little or over too much and thus coming in for a lot of bad comments from the Auditor General himself. Now, these Departments will do well to improve their budgeting, and I hope the Honourable the Finance Member will not take very long in succeeding to see that these Departments behave a bit better than they have done in the past.

I was rather surprised to learn only the other day that the Anand creamery has not been able to spend all the money that was allotted to it, and that is how things are happening with respect to the departments on which we would like to spend more money. We would like to see more money spent on the Archaeological Department, the Council of Agricultural Research and other Departments. We would like to see that

money should be saved on every department and more and more of it spent on all those departments which really cater to the cultural and other progressive needs of the nation.

Then, Sir, I come to the Military Department. I find that on the whole the control of the Finance Department over the military finances is not quite so satisfactory or quite so strong as we would like it to be. The Honourable the Finance Member is known to be a very strong man *vis-a-vis* the other Departments, but I do not know whether even he can really say to himself when he is in his own study room that he is able to make these defence services effect as great economies as they ought to and spend the money as wisely as they ought to. I personally feel that he feels about them just as uncomfortable as most of us do. I am rather afraid that he finds somebody whom he finds it difficult to tackle, and, therefore, he is not able to give us a good account at all of the manner in which the military forces have been spending their funds. Here is a recommendation we made, and I do not know what action has been taken on it.

"We desire to lay special stress on the importance of codification of army regulations as soon as possible."

I would like to have some information on that. Later on in the next year we said that the Military Department should not feel so very free as it has done in setting apart the surplus that they have found under various heads for what are known as re-equipment purposes. We were told that the sanction that they have to obtain from the Finance Department is more or less formal, and we saw it fit to make a recommendation that they ought not to consider the sanction of the Finance Department so very formal and the Finance Department ought to go into these things as carefully as possible and see that the Military Department is kept in its proper place. Then, Sir, as my Honourable friend, Mr. Asaf Ali, reminds me, their estimate of the expenditure on re-equipment has gone up from ten crores to twelve crores. The only explanation they have given is rather flimsy, namely, it is due to the rise in prices, and a rise in the standard of equipment that is found necessary. I really do not think that the Honourable the Finance Member should let them go on increasing their own estimates and swallowing large sums of money, as much money as possible, when they are led to over-estimating their needs and utilise these savings for this particular purpose.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: In fact the military were originally promised their re-equipment in four years, it is now ten years and it has not yet been finished.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: That again supports my point, and it is for this reason. Why have they not done so? Is it because they could not get money from the Government of India? I am sure the Government of India would always be willing to oblige them.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Because the Government of India left back the money which they promised to give.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: In the meanwhile what they have done is this. I charge the Military Department for having failed to bring it to the notice of the Government of India that things were changing, and, therefore, if re-equipment was really necessary at all in the interests of efficiency

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

of defence forces, these things should be carried out first, and all other things should be given next preference. I am also credibly informed that money that was set aside for re-equipment was made use of for unnecessary campaign on the Frontier in which they have been indulging rather too often and too lightheartedly. Instead of completing their re-equipment policy and programme in four years, they have taken ten years and in the meanwhile, the defence forces have become less efficient. It has made it necessary for us to raise large sums of money as much as three crores or five crores this time next year. Is that the proper thing to do? Is that the way in which real economies can be effected? Is that proper control of military expenditure maintained by the Finance Department? I am afraid that if the Honourable the Finance Member had been a responsible Minister of this House, he would either have found himself pledged to resign his job or to put the defence forces in their proper place and see that they really do conform to the instructions that he had given on behalf of this House and the nation.

Now, I come to the railways. There I find that they are spending very little or almost nothing on the extension of railway services, specially mileage and also better provision of comforts and so on. I can assure them that they should not expect to save any money by cutting down the wages and salaries of low paid people only. If they were to concentrate more and more on provision of better facilities to passengers and by opening up new lines and extending them to different parts of the country, they would certainly be able to give a better account of themselves: But they do not want to do that. They want to follow the line of least resistance. While the railways are anxious to touch the salaries of low paid servants, they do not want to touch the Lee concessions that have been granted to many of these highly paid officials. I have in my mind even the successor of Sir Raghavendra Rau. All these people should have been forced to agree to a considerable reduction in their salaries; but no, the Government would not touch them, they would rather go and retrench the smaller people. As my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, has reminded the House, the Railways have retrenched nearly 160,000 people in the last four or five years. When I asked some of the witnesses who came before the Public Accounts Committee, they had to admit the fact that they found it easier and more possible to retrench these low paid staff than to tackle high paid officials.

Next I come to the various concessions that are being shown to the industrial interests and military authorities by the railways. I am not opposed to the State making various concessions to the various industries in the country in order to help them. I want them to give more concessions to my own section of the people, namely, the peasants and workers, especially for the conveyance of agricultural products from one part of the country to another. I am certainly opposed to the present method of expecting the railways to make this concession and losing money over them and then showing that the railways are losing all this money, instead of crediting all that money to the railways and debiting it to the general budget and thus giving us a true picture of the kind of concessions that are being made, and the reason why those concessions are thought necessary to be made. I think it would rather lead to better budgeting on the whole if the Honourable the Finance Member agrees with us in making this very necessary book adjustment. Even if I consider this to be mere book adjustment and no more, it helps this House

to have a better picture of the manner in which the finances of the country are being utilised and the manner in which the various industries in this country are sought to be protected or treated by this Government. I am told in the Public Accounts Committee that the railways lose nearly two crores per annum on this head alone. I want the Central Government to lose these two crores and even another crore in order to help the agriculturists and thus compensate them for the heavy taxation that they are made to bear from year to year.

Next there are the pensions and allowances for the States. I do not know why the Government of India are so free with the tax-payers' money. Owing to some sort of agreement that they have come to with the Indian States, why should the Government of India continue to spend 30 or 40 lakhs as pensions and allowances for the various Indian States especially when these Indian States are having large incomes? I would like the Government of India to re-examine this question. In conclusion, I wish to add that the Honourable Member will be good enough to give us an assurance that the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee will continue to be published as before, and, this would give us some satisfaction at least.

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Mr. Deputy President, being one of the old Members of the Public Accounts Committee, I would like to say a few words on this occasion. In the first place, I would like to point out that with a peppery Chairman of the Committee and with the hot Madras curry which we have in my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, it makes the whole thing too hot for my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das, to swallow, and for the last two years, we find that in spite of making several attempts to put in questions, he has to keep mum. I think that some device should be made in future that these spicy curries and peppers do not become too hot for my Honourable friend, Mr. B. Das. We know, of course, what Madras curry means.—I do not want to include my Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, in Madras curry, because I have seen very often that Prof. Ranga himself feels a bit embarrassed in the Public Accounts Committee and he cannot add his spices to the curry. Another thing to which I should like to draw the attention of the House is that the report of such an important Committee is being discussed this afternoon after two years, and that too at the fag-end of the Session. We have got certain committees elected by the House, but I can say, without fear of contradiction, that the Public Accounts Committee is the most important of all the committees elected by this House, and the work which is done by this Committee is extremely important. Of course, ours is a post-mortem examination but my experience of the last five or six years has shown that this Committee has been able to improve a great deal the system of accounting of the Government of India, and it has been able to put pressure upon the different departments to exercise better control over their expenditure. There are one or two points which deserve the serious consideration of this House, one of them is the general tendency on the part of the Departments of the Government of India to over-estimate their budgets. Year after year the Public Accounts Committee has drawn attention to this fact of over-budgeting, but we do not find any appreciable improvement in this direction; and the result is that the whole budget of the Government of India suffers from over-budgeting. The chief object of raising a discussion on the report of the Public Accounts Committee is

[Sir Muhammad Yakub.]

that the House should adopt some means by which the irregularities which are committed by the different Departments of the Government of India, and are pointed out by the Public Accounts Committee, should be rectified. The discussion on the report of this Committee should not degenerate into a general discussion, as we have on the Finance Bill, when we talk on all sorts of things. Something tangible ought to be done, and I think this House should devise some means by which this tendency to over-budget may be stopped.

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

Another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is the menace of supplementary grants. On several occasions, we find that some items which could easily have been included in the general budget are put in the form of supplementary demands, and the House is thus deprived of an opportunity of giving its opinion on the policy of that expenditure.

Then, another point which deserves to be considered very seriously by the House is that the result of inquiries into embezzlements or defalcations comes to light after three or four years of the occurrence; and when we want to know what punishment was given to the man who committed the offence we are told that the man has already retired or has gone to England on leave or on pension. This awful red-tape system of the Government of India Secretariat is responsible for huge losses of public money. It takes years and years before the inquiry is completed and the thing comes before the Public Accounts Committee. I think some system should be adopted by which these inquiries into misappropriations and embezzlements, particularly in the case of some railway engineers as we have found, should be expedited and the man should be brought to book before he leaves the shores of India and enjoys the fruits of his misappropriation in England.

Now, Sir, the attention of this House has been drawn to the control of expenditure in the Postal Department. On this point, I should like to say that last year we were perfectly satisfied with the manner in which the accounts of the Postal Department were placed before the Public Accounts Committee; and I think the control over expenditure which has now been, seriously, taken up by the Postal Department is such that it ought to be followed by other departments of the Government of India.

The control of expenditure in the Defence Department is still slack and requires a lot of tightening up. We find that the army officers are very slack in following the rules and regulations, and, therefore, the control of expenditure is slack. Then in the matter of transfers or appropriations from one fund to another, the system requires a great deal of improvement. These re-appropriations, we have found, are often done in a very hasty and irregular manner which has the effect of slackening control over expenditure.

Sir, these are the points which require the particular attention of this House. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, referred to the Bahawalpur loan. My Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, has pointed out under what circumstances this loan was given. In fact, the ruler of Bahawalpur was a minor at the time and an Englishman was the regent or the man who was carrying on the administration, and it was on his initiative that this burden was placed on the ruler of Bahawalpur. The water which was expected to come to his State on the completion of the Canal for which

loan was raised has now, mostly, gone towards Bikaner side. And, therefore, we can safely say that this money was not lent in order to please any Indian prince.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: And yet you trust these people!

Sir Muhammad Yakub: It is not a question of trusting or not trusting these people

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is now 4 o'clock.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIAN MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY MEDICAL SERVICES IN INDIA.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin (Punjab: Landholders): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the House do now adjourn."

I do so in order to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance and of recent occurrence namely, the racial discrimination against the Indian members of the Military Medical Services in India as set forth in Government communique of the 25th March, 1937. ^{4 P.M.} Sir, somewhere about the middle of the last century a promise was given by Queen Victoria that no person shall be debarred from any public office for which he would be otherwise fit, on account of his religion or the colour of his skin. This promise was heralded with great pomp and show, and it was made with great solemnity and has been so often repeated. As a matter of fact, in our school days, we were made to read this promise again and again in our text books. Today I am going to request the House to judge how far this promise is being kept by His Majesty's Ministers and the Government of India today, in the matter of the medical services. I have before me a communique issued on the 25th March, 1937, which reserves certain posts exclusively for the European members of the Indian Medical Service. Indians will be debarred from holding those posts, however high their professional qualifications may be, however fit they may be considered to render aid to humanity in distress and however invaluable their public service may have been: they are going to be debarred from holding those posts simply because they happen to be Indians; the sons of the soil. This is the respect that is to be shown to the Queen's words. One of the posts which is to be reserved for Englishmen in future is the civil surgeoncy of Lahore. I am mentioning this particular instance, because some two or three years ago this post was held by an Indian, a very eminent officer of the Indian Medical Service, Lt.-Col. Soudhi. This gentleman held this post with great honour and distinction with credit to himself and to his service; and as far as I know all communities, including Europeans, were perfectly satisfied with his work. After his term of office he was made the Inspector General of Civil Hospitals in Burma and I think he is still holding that post. Now, what reason have the Government to bring in this racial discrimination in the matter of postings? My Honourable friend, the Army Secretary, is very fond of using the word

[Mr. M. Ghiasuddin.]

“experiment”. I think at least here is a thing which has been experimented and proved a success. What justification can he have for excluding Indians at least from that post? It is further urged that Indians ought to be excluded from holding those posts on account of a demand made by the European community that they must be treated by their own nationals. Sir, I have too much respect for the intelligence of the European officials in this country to believe that they will put forward such an unreasonable demand. After all, if a man is not well, he wants to go to the best medical attendant, whatever his race or religion may be. I would not mind going to an Eskimo doctor if he was the best man available. But I regret to see that Government are putting forward this excuse of a demand from the European officials. I wish to bring to the notice of the Army Secretary that there happen to be some Indian officials in Lahore too: what if they too bring forward the same unreasonable demand—after all they are too very highly placed officials, high court judges and ministers—have not they got the same right to be treated by their own nationals? This principle is obnoxious in more than one way, because after all Indians enjoy the same status this reservation of posts will create jealousy among the members of the two races; and I am sure it will impair the efficiency of the service. And what about the Indian ministers who have to take office within the next eight hours? Will not their self-respect be greatly injured if they know that they cannot even post a particular man to a particular place? They will be helpless even to do such small things in matters of administration. I think myself that any self-respecting man will think twice before he accepts office under such humiliating conditions.

I will now come to another matter, and that is the reduction of the Indian personnel of the service. My submission is that racial discrimination has even been carried on in this matter, and I cannot do better than read for the information of the House the figures quoted by a newspaper. Taking the military side of the Indian Medical Service, at present there are 200 Britishers. In the future reorganisation this is to be increased to 220 Britishers. There are now 154 Indians and this number is to be reduced to 144. That means that the total will be 364 on the military side. On the civil side, there are 186 Britishers and that number will be reduced to 166; while the number of Indians which is now 109 will be reduced to 54, making a total of 220 on the civil side. If we add up the figures we find that the British personnel of the service is going to remain exactly the same as it is now, whereas the Indian personnel is to be reduced by 65 persons. My submission is that at the present time when we have so many fully qualified and efficient men, people holding the highest medical degrees prepared to accept posts on the minimum pay, it is nothing but sheer callousness to go on reducing the Indian personnel and leave the British personnel untouched. (“Hear, hear” from Congress Benches.)

Then, Sir, there is one other point which I wish to bring to the notice of the Defence Secretary. The Government of India want to be generous to the Indian Medical Department, but generosity at whose expense? At ours. Sir, with your permission, I shall read para. (3) of the part A. of this communique which relates to military postings. This is what it says:

“The future establishments of the Indian Medical Department for employment with British and Indian troops will remain unchanged for the present, but it is under

contemplation that a number of selected officers of the Assistant Surgeons' Branch of the Indian Medical Department, possessing the requisite qualifications shall in course of time undertake the duties of eight Indian and nine European officers of the Indian Medical Service. As an experimental measure, six qualified Assistant Surgeons have already been appointed to Indian Military Hospitals to carry out the duties of Indian Medical Service officers."

I wish to point out that the number of Indians is so small in the Military Branch that it will be a crime to reduce even a single one of them. And, Sir, so far as I know, the Indian Medical Department is not open to Indians at all. This is my information,—I speak subject to correction. It is manned only either by Europeans or by men of my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney's community

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham (Defence Secretary): They are all statutory Indians.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: I welcome them as such, but why not throw open that Department to all Indians, statutory or non-statutory? Of course, I do consider my friend, Sir Henry Gidney's community as Indians, but my only request to them is that they should be a little less Anglo and a little more Indian. Sir, this is the state of affairs. Then, Sir, these English Medical Officers have got a number of avenues open to them, in England and the Colonies. They have the panel system in England, they can go to the colonies and settle down and practise, they can find employment in any of the self-governing dominions; there are a good many shipping companies which will employ them as ship's surgeons, whereas all these openings are closed to Indians, and yet our Government come forward and try to reduce the number of Indians, because whenever retrenchment takes place, only Indians are retrenched. This is a state of affairs which I do hope no Member of this House will tolerate, and they will censure the Government.

Sir, I would just say one word to my friends the Members of the European Group. Sir, they have always held that racial discrimination should be completely abolished in other countries across the seas. Now here is a chance for them to abolish such racial discrimination in our own country. Let them walk with us into our lobby to censure the Government for perpetuating this racial discrimination. Sir, I move.

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

"That the House do now adjourn."

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, this House which heard the army debates for the last three years will not be surprised at the communique that has recently been presented to the public. For, Sir, what is our experience so far as the Indianization of the army is concerned? We started with the Indianization of the army, then we came down to a unit, and eventually the whole thing dwindled down to an experiment,—the experiment of admitting two men in a year to the Air Force at a time when Russia is training every child for the Air Force, at a time when more than two thousand volunteers are asked for in England for the defence of their country which is no bigger than a small province in India. These experiments are being done, they are being carried to such an extent that, I am afraid, suddenly the Army has turned into a research department, and instead of carrying out the Indianization

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

programme that was promised to this country several years ago, they are trying to camouflage the whole thing, they are trying to throw dust in the eyes of the world in general, and of Indians in particular. They are experiments microscopical in extent and geological in time; because, Sir, at the rate you proceed with the pace of Indianization, I am afraid it will take about 606 years to get rid of this disease of Europeanisation that is afflicting this country in all branches of administration. This is what is happening so far as the fighting side of the army is concerned, but I do not want to deal with it at present,—I shall come to that branch of the activity of the State which is called the Indian Medical Service. And what do we find here? We have the Indian Medical Service.—I do not know what this service really is. I am sure the Defence Secretary himself will find a great deal of difficulty to define this service. Is it a military service or is it a civil service? What is it? You have the R. A. M. C. Service in England. Have they got any civil service on the medical side? None whatsoever. And yet what was the experience of the war? We knew then that the R. A. M. C. covered itself with glory so far as the medical side was concerned, and yet what was the report about this highly praised, much boosted Indian Medical Service? Those who are in doubt, let them read the Esher Committee's Report. What do they say? That Committee said that "the Indian Medical Service lamentably failed so far as the war was concerned"; and we cannot be surprised at it, because it is a mixed service, it is a *khichurri* service. It is supposed to be military service, and yet you cannot get men into it unless you give them the lure of civil practice. That is why you find year after year their emoluments, pensions, and overseas allowances are increasing, and all kinds of temptations are thrown in in order to attract them to join this great military service. Well, Sir, is it a civil service? Can we call it civil service? If it is so, then they are not willing to call it as such, because the competition at the present day is so great on the part of my countrymen that I can assure the Government that an Indian of today, qualified as he is, can hold his own against any medical practitioner in the world. ("Hear, hear" from Congress Party Benches.)

Now, let us look into the history and see what are the chief grounds on which this hybrid Indian Medical Service is maintained at the present day? It is mentioned in this communique,—and I shall presently prove to the House that the communique will do credit to a fraudulent report of a company that is bent on swindling—and I do not want to go outside this communique;—in this communique four grounds are mentioned in order to provide a reserve of British officers. Now, let us look at the history of this reserve. During our lifetime, the greatest crisis that could happen in the life history of a nation has happened, and that was the Great War. Before the Great War, what was personnel of this I. M. S.? We are told that the cadre consisted of nearly 800 men in round numbers. Out of these 800 men, Honourable Members will be surprised to know that more than 60 per cent. were on the civil side. This is supposed to be the military service, and yet nearly 500 men were on the civil side and about 300 men only were in the military line. And during the war time when nearly every available man was requisitioned for service, what do we find? About 80 of these civil service of the Reserve, or nearly one tenth of the total cadre, never saw the war, and yet we are told about this war reserve. 140

of these 500 were never meant to go on to the military side, and the whole brunt of the War, I challenge any army man to deny it,—the whole brunt of the War, so far as this country was concerned, was borne by young men who joined the colours. Nearly 1,000, or 900 of them to be more accurate. All Indians joined the temporary commissions and tided this Empire over the crisis of the War so far as the medical service was concerned. Their services were returned and requited in the usual fashion. When I say in the usual fashion, those who are conversant with British history will not be surprised at it. After the crisis is over, they seem to forget all their obligations. During the war when the crisis is there, you are extolled to the skies. At that time, there is no difference between martial and non-martial races. A Sikh can be a martial race, a Mahratta can be a martial race, and even the Bengali can be a martial race.

An Honourable Member: What about the Sindhi?

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: It is a very small province. I do not attach any importance to it. (Laughter.) During the war time, I find that everybody can turn martial. All this distinction between martial and non-martial races is all nonsense. I say it is deliberately created to keep out the sons of the soil from joining the army. Well, Sir, during that war time, happy it was both for the Empire as well as for India that they did not make a division into medical and non-medical races. (Laughter.) In future, when the I. M. S. Department enters into the research, I am absolutely expecting that just as in the case of the fighting side, the races of India will be divided into medical and non-medical races, and it would be just as false as this distinction that exists at the present time. In this communique what is it we find? It is true that so far as the present report is concerned, whereas before the War the civil side was something like 60 per cent of the so-called military service, the civil side bears a proportion of 40 per cent. of the total cadre. I admit that, but the joy is very short lived. If you merely go by the figures, then you will get into a trap, and that is why I said that this report is no better than the fraudulent report of a swindling company. How has this percentage been reduced? It has been reduced by doing away with the Indian element altogether. Before this, in this cadre there were about 386 British officers in the I. M. S. I challenge anybody to say that even one British officer has been reduced in this 386. At the present time, the 386 British officers are there in this cadre. Then what happens? If the percentage is to be reduced, then it must be reduced in the case of the Indians. I know that the time at my disposal is very short. This is a vast subject, and I cannot deal with it in detail. I can, therefore, only take some of the salient points. The same mentality that was displayed when we were hearing the military debates is being maintained and being propagated on the medical side. On the medical side, what should be the object of the medical service? It should be service, it should not be anything else. And yet what do we find? You have the same mentality brought in by means of the civil reserve. If you want such a large civil reserve what is the good of calling this, military service? Call it by all means civil and be done with it. No. But they must have both; they cannot come down to this country and accept civilian appointments, because they want the glory of the military uniform. But then, join the military in the same way as the members of the R. A. M. C. do. No! They cannot do it. In that case they cannot have the practice

[Dr. G. V. Deshmukh.]

that is necessary for their coming to this country. That is the kind of service. I say you will never see the end of this till you get rid of this division of military and civil side and civil reserves. With one stroke, they have stabbed Indianisation as well as provincial autonomy. Out of these 886, 166 are supposed to go on the civil reserve. Very well. Is this military service? Out of these, 79 will never see military service in all their lifetime. They are supposed to be residuary. What is a residuary I do not know. I suppose it is something like a precipitate . . . (Laughter) . . . that settles down at the bottom of a test tube, does good to nobody. If out of the 886, 80 are never going to see the military side, with what affront can you say that this is military service? And yet that is made the basis of this communiqué! 80 will never see the military side. On the other hand, you have about 122 deputed to the provinces to look after the various works, to look after research, to look after jails, to look after lunatic asylums (Laughter), and I do not know what. One thing that has been adduced forward is attendance on the British members of the superior civil services and their families. I wish that this argument had not been used seriously. If it is not a humorous argument to deal with, it is, I do not know whether it is a parliamentary word,—it is a vulgar argument that has been brought forward; and I say for this reason that you cannot deal with that argument unless you lower yourself. Personally I should not like to say anything against a matter wherein women and children are brought in. If you look at the history and traditions of this I. M. S. service, you will find that you need not be surprised at it, because what happened? As soon as Indianisation came into force and as soon as it was thought that provincial autonomy would be coming, a cry was raised in England and everywhere, that the Indian Medical Service was in the melting pot. This body which should have the noblest sentiments before their eyes, of service and the sentiments of the medical profession,—the members of this body sent all kinds of representations, irregular, unconstitutional. They go over to England, make all sorts of representations, representations in the medical schools to say that all opportunities are being lost, and, therefore, no student from any of the decent colleges there should join the I. M. S. They sabotaged it instead of having the noblest sentiments of the medical profession, and they carried the bad methods of trade unionism into their working. And we are to have this service as the medical service of this country! I see there are only two minutes before me. I can assure the House that if there was time I would go into details. You have only to look at pages three and four of this report to know how everything has been done to cheat Indians out of their legitimate birth right, that is, to have a share of the wealth of the country. Besides the wealth that has been taken away, what experience we lose in this country by losing the medical men? Because it is not like the I. C. S. retiring. Unfortunately, politicians have given very little attention to this I. M. S. Besides the fat pay that they have taken and fees they take by way of practice the enormous wealth of the country that goes out of the country,—even that I do not mind,—but what about the experience that is taken away? The younger generations of this country have taken it upon themselves to educate the youth of the country and I can assure you—because I have gone through both kinds of education—I can assure you that the medical profession of India today is very much better than when the medical education was given by the I. M. S. service thirty years ago. This is called the

Indian Medical Service! I have pointed out to you that it is neither military nor medical. The only way you can call this service is the Indian Mercenary Service, because wherever any grub is to be had, like the ubiquitous and omnivorous creature, amaeba, it will put forward its hand wherever service can be had. Foreign Department, research,—as if research has anything to do with the service,—Foreign Department, research, asylums, jails, everywhere they can get service, they want it including inspection of drugs, of instruments

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh: . . . as if all that cannot be done by anybody else except those who are entitled to put on the military uniform. Sir, the main object of this service in this country has nothing noble about it. It has been selfishness and money. Lucre has been the main object and aim of this service and this House would be doing the proper thing by showing its condemnation of the report by carrying this adjournment motion.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): I join in this debate, not with the desire to emulate the Honourable Member who has just sat down, my legislative and professional colleague, Dr. Deshmukh, in indulging in a diatribe on the I. M. S., for like him, I and others in this House have much to be grateful for to this great Service, the Indian Medical Service, that has rendered India service second to none in the Empire. Sir, I find it difficult to use words adequately to express my personal gratitude to the I. M. S., not only for what it has done for me personally as a medical man, but for India, and I think Dr. Deshmukh was entirely wrong in his reference to the Esher Committee. The Esher Committee did not say that the I. M. S. had "lamentably failed". The Esher Committee, if it said anything, referred to the medical arrangements of the Mesopotamian campaign, *i.e.*, a very isolated section of that service employed in that area and not to the I. M. S. I am very very proud to say that the Mesopotamian exposures were more of an administrative than professional nature.

But, Sir, today I stand here as one who has personally suffered and has suffered cruelly from the perpetuation of this racial discrimination in the I. M. S. In giving expression to that feeling, I associate myself entirely with all those adverse criticisms that have been passed on this point by my Honourable friends who have spoken. I have no desire, nor is it necessary to my speech, to refer to any other matter, but racial discrimination; and so I shall go straight to the point. We are today discussing a matter which has been promised us for some time. The future of the I. M. S. has been in the melting pot for years. Committee after Committee has sat to solve this complex problem, with no avail, except to prove that "a Committee is a body of men who keep minutes and waste hours". But what do we see before us today? An order from Whitehall endorsed by the Government of India in the year 1937, a few days before provincial autonomy, whose chief feature is a perpetuation of this cursed racial discrimination. And what do we see in the order. Although it reduces the British and Indian elements in the civil cadre of the I. M. S. it increases the Lee

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

Concessions to the Britisher and reduces the basic salary of the Indian, and it cuts right across the traditions of the service and the avowed policy of the Government of India from Queen Victoria's time "No racial discrimination" as is being so rigidly observed today by Government in the subordinate services. Let me take my memory back to 1890, about 40 years ago, when I was a student in India. There was no racial discrimination then in our professorial staff then, for one of our finest physicians, who held a professorial appointment in the Calcutta Medical College, was Colonel Chandra. A finer physician never existed in this country, and now the Government, for reasons best known to itself, in the year 1937, asks this Honourable House to accept a scheme in which the chairs of Medicine, Surgery, Gynaecology (and in some cases) Ophthalmology in the three largest provincial towns and other important appointments are kept as a reserve for the British Officer only. Why this communal reservation? I consider this to be not only racial discrimination in excelsis but an acute perpetuation of it and at a time when racial discrimination should be killed, not encouraged. The Government of India, in operating this scheme for the I. M. S., are practising the very thing which they are demanded must be stopped, in the subordinate service. Did not the Railway Member use "No racial discrimination" as his reply to my demand for higher wages for Anglo-Indians serving on Railways? A sick man—Britisher or otherwise—does not want a white, black or brown doctor, he wants a skilled and experienced doctor, whatever be his colour, and to talk about this humbug—I call it nothing else but humbug—that you must have a Britisher doctor for a British patient is nothing but trash—absolute trash dished up to perpetuate racial discrimination. I repeat, when a man is dying, does he or his relatives want a white doctor or does he want a skilled man? If you apply this undeniable principle and practice to anybody, where does racial discrimination come in? But the British and Indian Governments think otherwise. Sir, I can readily understand, indeed I can sympathise and agree with the Britisher who wants a British doctor to attend his wife and family.

Mr. S. Satyamurti (Madras City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Why?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Why do you wear a white cap? (Laughter.) I say I can readily concede that demand, though facts do not support it in India. I have no quarrel with the Government desiring to supply a white doctor for a white patient, but I vehemently object to them reserving specific posts for Britishers and excluding Indians, Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans. This unjustifiable racial discrimination in the civil medical administration must be stopped, not encouraged. To continue to import British officers today, even in reduced numbers, and to continue giving them the Lee concessions is absolutely wrong and against the foundations of the Reforms. There should be no more extension of the Lee concessions to new entrants. Let the best doctors come from all countries. The I. M. S. still needs the best—none others—be he white or brown. I do not want to stop the Britisher coming in. I do not care whether the whole service is manned by Britishers, if he is the best man available. Let us kill this racial discrimination. It is the curse of India and it will always be a curse, as we witness it in this scheme. When I was a Member of the Services Sub-Committee, of the first Round

Table Conference, I submitted a Resolution, before that Sub-Committee and so did others. That Resolution, blended with two others, was accepted by the Committee. I shall not weary this House by reading it, but it is very significant. Possibly some of our demands are impracticable of acceptance, but granting that, that Resolution was one that could not, at that time, be carried out by the Government, even then I submit there is absolutely no reason or justification for the Government now to issue a communiqué in the year 1937—the one we are discussing—which perpetuates this cursed racial distinction, the chief cause of all discontent in India today. I would not mind, as a "start-off", even a 50—50 basis between Britishers and Indians, but this communiqué which, as I have told the House, is a perpetuation of racial discrimination. I am not interested in the question of communal percentages in the I. M. S. or in the R. A. M. C. What I am interested in is to stop any further racial discrimination. If the I. M. S. is to have a war reserve, and I say it, along with the I. M. D. must have a war reserve, let the Provinces be allowed to use that war reserve as it thinks best, whether British or Indian, but do not order the Provinces to exercise racial discrimination by compelling them to appoint a Britisher for the prize and lucrative posts, e.g., in Bengal at Chittagong, 3 or 4 Britishers for the most important posts at Calcutta, where a lot of money can be made, or order that only a Britisher must go to Lahore, etc., and, not only deprive Indians and Anglo-Indians from such jobs, but appoint them only to the smaller stations. On the one hand you ordain that an Indian must be medically treated by a Britisher, while on the other you say that an European must not be treated by an Indian, but by a Britisher only. This is arrant humbug and nonsense. You order that such and such a post must be reserved for a Britisher and you pack the Indian off to the smaller and unhealthy districts with no private practice. In short all fat appointments in the Provinces are reserved for the Britisher. Sir, this House should stoutly resist such a scheme. Sir, I have nothing else to say. To my mind, there is no difficulty and I do not see any reason why the Provincial Governments and the Central Government should not come to an amicable arrangement regarding the use and distribution of the I. M. S. war reserve both for the I. M. S. and I. M. D. on the lines of the Resolution which I moved and which was accepted by the Round Table Conference, or if that is impractical, why not adopt the amended scheme before the House today, but with *all* racial discrimination excluded from it, that is to say, treat Britishers and Indians as equals in all Provincial appointments.

There should be no hesitation to do this, because, as my friend, Dr. Deshmukh, has shown during the great war over a thousand youths of this country gallantly responded to the call of more and more medical men and they distinguished themselves, and the country is very proud of them (Hear, hear). This *can* be done and I know it can because, at one time, during the great war, I had twenty such men under me. Sir, I consider that we in this House should stoutly refuse to accept this insult, and we should demand from Government, in no uncertain voice, that this new scheme of the I. M. S. does not meet with the approval of this House and we should call upon them to re-shape it and offer us a scheme in harmony with an India on the eve of Provincial Autonomy (Laughter). Sir, in the present scheme, the control of I. M. S. officers in the Provinces is singularly peculiar, i.e., some will be under the control of the Minister, some under the Governor, and some under the Army which has the first and last say over

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

him. How can you possibly tell us you are giving provincial autonomy to the medical branch of the service when you know very well that you are not doing so and that is a huge camouflage—a humbug. You can, if you so want, let things remain in their present form, I have no objection to this but I say, Sir, we must, at all costs, eradicate this racial discrimination, the curse of India for years past and the curse of India for many more years to come. Sir, I protest strongly against this scheme. (Loud and Prolonged Cheers.)

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Sir, in the time at my disposal I shall only be able to deal with the broader aspects of the subject-matter of this adjournment motion. That being so, it is quite unnecessary for me to deal with the speech of my friend, Dr. Deshmukh, which I may say I was extremely sorry to hear. I think it was an entirely unworthy attack on a very fine Service. It certainly had nothing whatsoever to do with the subject-matter of my friend Mr. Ghiasuddin's motion. Dr. Deshmukh wished the whole of the I. M. S. to be abolished. He said not a word about the number of British or Indian officers inside the I. M. S., which is the subject-matter of Mr. Ghiasuddin's motion. Sir, the crux of the matter is whether it is necessary to have any British officers in the I. M. S., and if so, how many. There are, I know, many people in this House who think that British recruitment to the I. M. S. might cease at once and that it is unnecessary to have any British officers. With them, Sir, I am afraid it would be quite useless for me to attempt to argue. I must assume that there is a body of opinion which recognizes—as indeed was recognized by the Round Table Conference and by the leaders of the party to which the Honourable mover belongs who were present at that Conference, and also by the Honourable Member who has just spoken, Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, that the Army and the Civil Services must continue to require the services of a number of British officers, (*Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:* "I. M. S. officers?") of British officers—I said British officers, I did not say "I. M. S." That was their definite recommendation. The question therefore is how those officers are to be provided and in what Services. Now the Mover and Sir Henry Gidney approached the subject today on the basis of racial discrimination. That is a term I do not myself like, but I am prepared to accept it as a convenient description of the doctrine that British members of the services have some right to expect medical treatment from medical officers of their own race. (*Voices:* "Why? Why? What about Indians?") I say I am prepared to accept the phrase as a description of that doctrine, provided that Honourable Members opposite will agree that the same description might equally apply to their demand that the major portion or a particular portion of the I. M. S. should consist of Indians.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: But this is my country—not yours?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Let the Honourable Member go on. He has a very short time at his disposal.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: My point, Sir, is that if racial considerations did not come into this matter at all, nobody would care in the least how many Indian or British officers there were in the I. M. S. If there are racial considerations they are on both sides. Now the first main argument

I wish to use in connection with this motion is that, if there is this so-called racial discrimination at present in the I. M. S., the recent communique and resolution which has given rise to this adjournment motion has done nothing whatever to aggravate that position or to make it worse. On the other hand, the new scheme has improved the position (Voices: "Oh! Oh!") and therefore I maintain an adjournment motion cannot properly be moved on the score that anything of recent occurrence has taken place to make matters worse. (Interruptions.) If I may be allowed to go on, I should be much obliged.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should not be interrupted like this.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Let me illustrate my point by taking one or two examples of possible racial discrimination in the communique. One obvious accusation of racial discrimination is connected with the reservation of particular posts for British officers. Now that is not a new principle in any way. Posts have been reserved for British officers for many years. The point is—I cannot go into details—that the number of posts reserved for British officers under this communique is going to be reduced. Therefore, the only new fact before us as a result of this communique is a reduction in the number of posts that are to be reserved for British officers, and I submit that a reduction in the number of such posts is not in itself a reason for a motion of censure against the Government. I have tried to think myself whether there are any other points about this communique which might be regarded as being of the nature of racial discrimination. There is one point which Honourable Members have not mentioned and that is that we are introducing a short service system for Indian and not for British officers. You may say that that is racial discrimination. The reasons are explained fully in the communique. Again the point is that there is nothing new in that: even now, in the I. M. S. there is a difference between Indians and British, in that we recruit a large number of temporary commissioned Indian officers but we do not recruit any temporary commissioned British officers. The system of temporary commissioned officers has been the subject of criticism for many years. We are now replacing that system by this short-service system, and anybody who examines the details will, I think, agree that it is an improvement on the temporary-commission system. Therefore, again, the only fact of recent occurrence is that that particular feature has been improved. Another possible accusation of racial discrimination might be based on the differentiation in the rates of pay given to British and Indian officers. It is quite true that by this communique we have reduced the basic rates of pay for future Indian entrants and have increased the rates of overseas pay, which has the result of preserving the emoluments of British officers at much the same level as at present. That is, I admit, a fact of recent occurrence. But after all the talk we have heard recently about the necessity for reducing the standards of pay in this country and fixing Indian rates of pay more in conformity with Indian conditions and requirements, I do not see how any motion of censure can be based on that particular ground. Now, Sir, I will turn to what I think was the most important point in the mind of the Mover of the motion,—what he regarded as the worst part about this scheme, that is, what he called the reduction in the number of Indians in the I. M. S. I deny that this scheme of re-organization necessarily implies any reduction whatever in the number of Indians in the I. M. S. What it does do—and I shall revert to this several

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

times later—is to reduce, indeed to limit to an absolute minimum, the number of British and Indian officers whom the Provincial Governments of tomorrow will be under a statutory obligation to employ. That, Sir, is a very different thing indeed. What the communique means is that any Province can employ any number of Indian I. M. S. officers that it likes. All that we are concerned about here at the Centre is that a Province shall not employ *less* than a certain number. I will illustrate that later by quoting some of the figures, but first of all I should like to make a reference to what the Honourable the Mover said about the size of the military side of the I. M. S. At the last reorganisation which took place in 1928 the strength of the military peace establishment was fixed at 270 British and 132 Indian officers, that is, a total of 402 in a ratio of roughly 2 British to 1 Indian. Since then, as the House is aware, we have had a very drastic retrenchment in the army and the result of that was that the establishment was brought down provisionally from 402 to 354. The British portion of that establishment, on the same ratio, should have been 236 and the number of Indians should have been 118. Actually in practice, the retrenchment fell entirely on the British side and the numbers decreased from 270 to 200 British while the number of Indians increased from what was before 132 to 154. Now, Sir, under this new scheme the establishment is to be fixed at 364 of whom 220 are to be British and 144 are to be Indians. In other words, we are to have 50 British officers less on the army side than we had in 1928 and 16 less than our provisional establishment which was fixed a few years ago, and we are to have 12 Indian officers more than the establishment of 1928 or 26 Indian officers more than the provisional establishment fixed a few years ago. The net result will be that considerably more than one-third of the total cadre will be Indian. The ratio will be actually about 2 Indians to 3 British officers on the army side. Now, Sir, I admit that it might have been possible for us on the army side—in fact, we were prepared to do it—to employ a smaller number of British officers and a rather larger number of Indian officers. The result of that, however, would have been that we should have required a larger number of British officers on the outbreak of war, and the only result therefore would have been that we should have been compelled to make the Provinces employ a larger number of British officers in the War Reserve. That, however, is by the way. The fact remains that there has been no reduction in the number of Indians compared with the present authorised cadre on the military side, and therefore that part of the Honourable Member's contention is, I submit, simply untrue.

Now, Sir, I will turn to the civil side and I should like to remind the House, first of all, that the only justification for asking the Provinces to employ I. M. S. officers, British or Indian, lies in two facts. First, the necessity for a war reserve and, secondly, the necessity for providing medical attendance of a particular kind for the members of the Superior Civil Services and their families. Those are the only two possible justifications for continuing a civil branch of the I. M. S. at all. I would also remind the House that, if the recommendation of the Round Table Conference had been accepted, there would have been no civil branch of the I. M. S. and therefore no Indian officer of the I. M. S. would have been employed by the Provinces at all. Further, on a strict view, we in the army might have held that it was unnecessary to employ any Indians at all as a war reserve, because we could have said that we might hope to recruit the necessary number of Indian officers when the war broke out.

There is an ample number of Indian doctors in private practice in this country and obviously there are very few such British doctors. However, we did not take that line. We have provided a small war reserve of 50 Indian I. M. S. officers. The actual figures are that under the re-organisation of 1928 the civil branch of the I. M. S. consisted of 302 officers altogether, of whom 212 were to be British and 90 were to be Indian. Under that re-organisation, the Provinces were under an obligation to employ 164 British officers and 74 Indian officers. What they will now be under a statutory obligation to employ is 122 British and not less than 38 Indians, that is, a total of 160 against a total of 238. In other words, there is a possible reduction of 78 officers. Now, Sir, I admit that a portion of that reduction is due to the separation of Burma. But even allowing for that, the reduction is considerable and the whole point of my case is that in every post which is now reserved for an I. M. S. officer, either British or Indian, but which in future will not be reserved for an I. M. S. officer, either British or Indian, it will be possible for the Provincial Government of the future to appoint anybody it likes. It may appoint an Indian I. M. S. officer in a post now reserved for British officers, it may continue to appoint Indian I. M. S. officers in posts which are now held by Indian officers; or it may appoint members of its own provincial service. In this way I claim—and my claim is strictly correct—that so far from reducing the number of Indians in the I. M. S., this scheme at least renders it possible for the number of Indians in the I. M. S. to be increased. But even if that does not happen—and that is entirely for the Provinces of the future to decide—the scheme does necessarily produce a considerable increase of Indianization in the medical services of India taken as a whole, that is to say, in the Central Service and the Provincial Services combined.

Now, Sir, I should like to know whether the Mover of this motion before he brought it here took the trouble to consult the Ministers in his own Province on this subject. Can he assure the House that he is speaking on behalf of his Province? We on our side have at least taken the trouble to consult all Local Governments in this matter.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: I never said that I was speaking on behalf of my province

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: I was merely asking a rhetorical question which he need not answer. In any case, I am not giving way.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can give his explanation after he has sat down.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: All that I was pointing out was that we on our side have taken the trouble to consult all Local Governments in this matter before we reached these conclusions. I think I may say that it was the unanimous view of the Ministers of the Local Governments that the Provincial Governments of the future should be given the greatest possible latitude to appoint their own men and not be compelled to employ members of the I. M. S. either British or Indian. That was the unanimous view of the Ministers of the Local Governments of today. If the Punjab Government of tomorrow does not employ a greater number of Indian I. M. S. than it need do, if it refuses to employ more than it is required to do under this scheme of reorganization, I hope Mr. Ghiasuddin will move an adjournment motion in his Provincial Assembly and see what sort

[Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham.]

of reception it gets in that House. I do submit that the Honourable Member is wrong in attempting to censure the Government of India for giving discretion to the Provincial Governments of the future in this matter—for that is what it comes to.

Finally, I would ask the House to remember that the Indianisation of the I. M. S. has proceeded extremely rapidly during the last 5 P.M. 15 years. Just after the war, no less than 90 per cent. of the I. M. S. were British. In 1923, no less than 352 British officers of the I. M. S. were serving in the Provinces

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: May I have one minute more?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up, and he cannot have any more time.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: I wish to rise to a personal explanation.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot make a second speech. He can only give a personal explanation.

Mr. M. Ghiasuddin: The Honourable Member said that I claimed to speak on behalf of the Provinces.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): He did not say that.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, it is difficult for any Indian to speak with restraint on a subject of this nature. The fury and the vehemence with which my Honourable friend opposite, Sir Henry Gidney, spoke can well give an idea of our feelings over this subject. It is unthinkable to me that any man in this House should get up and say that it is necessary to import people from abroad in order to treat the people who are paid out of the taxes raised from Indians and who are imposed upon them for their service, and that these public servants cannot undergo the ignominy of being treated by the best medical experts who rise out of the soil of this country. That is insolence, that is brazen-facedness that no Indian can tolerate, no decent man can stand. Sir, it is a matter which again reminds us of our helplessness and of the insolence and the insults that are heaped upon us from day to day. You people come here, you impose yourself upon us, you keep our men out, our young men die for want of employment, deprived of the wherewithal even to keep their body and soul together, and then you use that as an argument for importing still more people from outside to treat these foreigners who come here unasked, unwanted and unsought. That is the defence which has been advanced. No Indian in this House can possibly hear it without feeling deep distress and without realising the agony of being under foreign domination. The arguments advanced by the Army Secretary are altogether lacking in

force and in substance. Not a word that he has said has any substance in it and I think that if he had not spoken his case would have been better. He has spoiled it. He asked us what has happened to day? What is it that you are condemning us for? He forgets the recent communique. What was the reason? Why did he issue this communique? The communique states that it had to be issued in order to prepare this country for provincial autonomy. We are told that it was necessary to give autonomy to medical administration in the provinces and it was with that object that these adjustments were being made. But all the changes made are for the worse. The Army Secretary had the audacity to quote the Round Table Conference report. Well, he quite forgot that his proposals are entirely in opposition to the recommendations of the Round Table Conference Service Committee. There has been a persistent demand in this country for the abolition of the recruitment of I. M. S. people for the civil services in this country, for the complete abolition of this system of recruitment. The Services Committee of the Round Table conference unanimously accepted that there should be no recruitment from the I. M. S. for the civil services. Still he continues that system, he cuts down the number of Indians but maintains the present number of Europeans and yet he says what is it you condemn. He has raised the salary of Europeans relatively to Indians, and made certain stations the exclusive preserve of Europeans. In every direction, he has taken a retrogressive and retrograde step and still says what he has done does not make the position worse. Of course, we have seen the mockery of provincial autonomy during the last week. We know very well what it means. We know what was intended and the farce today stands unmasked before the country and everybody has seen that the veneer and the veil which has been torn by the first breeze of fresh air that touched it. The ball of ashes had crumbled to dust at the first touch and the change that has been made in the matter of this I. M. S. is in accord with the spirit—or, is it the ghost—of this pale shadow of provincial autonomy (Hear, hear). (Applause.) Let us take the present figures. What is the present state of affairs. The number of Europeans in the I. M. S. is 386. Out of it, 200 are on the military side and 186 are on the civil side. Now, hereafter their numbers are to remain at 386, not that they will not exceed 386, but there is a minimum guaranteed which should not fall below 386. What about Indians? The present number of Indians is 263 and it is now going to be reduced to 198. That is the process of Indianisation, and yet the Army Secretary has the audacity to ask, what change is being made to your detriment! We are making things better for you. You reduce the figure for Indians from 263 to 198, and ask us what is the harm done to you? How do you suffer? We cut down only 65 out of 263. Again, the present proportion of Indians in this service comes to 40 per cent., that of the Britishers being 60 per cent. Hereafter the Indian proportion will be 32 and the British proportion is to be 68. That is again a change for our benefit. We must feel thankful to you for that. Then we find that in these provincial services—for above all we are mainly concerned today with the present number of Indians in the provincial services—they are 109 and now they are going to be reduced to 54, that is a reduction of more than one half. Instead of 109 they will be only 54.

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: Not necessarily.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes, not necessarily. In the case of Britishers it is 886 and it may go up to 886, but there is a minimum guaranteed of 886 for them. For me, I know what minimum guarantee means, it means the maximum for me. For you the minimum means, you may have double that or treble that or four times that number. You are right in saying not necessarily. Quite right. Not necessarily. Your number may go up to 686 or even more, but you are guaranteed a minimum of 886. But my number will never exceed 54, though it is the minimum prescribed for me. I agree.

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: You consult your Ministers in the Provinces. They will see to it.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes, what great care you have taken to have good Ministers! (Applause.) The Army Secretary tells us, well, he had the sanction and the approval of the Ministers. Why this precipitate hurry? Why did you not wait for another fortnight or a month? Why did you not take time to consult the *ad interim* Ministers even? You could have ascertained their wishes and found out if they agreed.

Sir, then, I am unable to understand what this system of residuary means. These residuaries are about 80. What does residuary mean? A residuary means a person who will never be mobilised for military services. Then why have him in the I. M. S. for exclusive service in the civil side. One can understand a pretext like this that men are needed for military services and they had to be provided for in the civil services so that one might fall back upon them in case of emergency. What about these eighty people? They are not to be touched. They are not to be used for Military purposes at all. Then why should they be recruited from among the I.M.S.? What is the reply? Why, I ask the Army Secretary? Has he any answer? It will not do for him to hang down his head. He must accept that it is a blunder. He must at least cut out this number. Then I ask the Army Secretary, if he has understood the moral of it. What is happening in other countries? He knows very well that in other countries persons holding foreign medical diplomas and foreigners cannot practice as medical experts without a special license from the Government. Here in my country, you are importing these people so that the Britishers may be treated by Britishers. Do you know what mischief is hidden there? Why should I purchase anything

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: Sir, on a point of order, is it not more correct for the Honourable Member to address the Chair instead of an individual Member?

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Yes, Sir, I am addressing the Chair throughout, and treating the Army Secretary occasionally as the occupant of the Chair also (Laughter). Sir, I should like to know whether he knows the mischief that he is doing. What is the lesson? The lesson is this. I should not purchase any goods from the shop of Sir Leslie Hudson; I should not allow myself to be treated by a British doctor; I should not pay my revenue to a British revenue collector; I should not allow a British shopkeeper to run his shop here; I should not live in a building owned by a Britisher; thus he cuts at the root of foreign exploitation of

this country. I thank him for this. Let us take the lesson to heart, and let us then remember that even in a matter of this type where humanity alone should count, in a profession which is the noblest on the face of the earth, where a man has the privilege of alleviating suffering and relieving pain, even there this racial canker has a place in their system; that even in a matter of this type where the Red Cross and other systems are supposed to be of an international character, even in a matter where relief of suffering is concerned, the Britisher is so exclusive in his outlook that he would not accept treatment from a man of the eminence of Dr. Deshmukh, because his face is not white! God save that race! I think their demoralisation and degradation could not have reached a lower limit, could not have reached a lower pitch than that.

Then, we were asked, after all how are the Indians prejudiced? Again see the Machiavellian scheme. They have reduced the basic pay but they have increased the overseas allowance. And what is the object? The object is that the Indian should get a lower salary but the European should get a higher one than he is getting today. And then look at their method of recruitment. The European members will be appointed by means of nomination through a selection committee. But why this method? Why not the method of competition? Because the Europeans would not come to this country if they were fit enough to find a footing in their own country. Those who can stand competition in their own country would not come here. They must have the dregs of the profession here so that they may feed liberally fat on our blood. But Nemesis must follow them very soon and they must be prepared for that. Then look at the scheme further. We were asked, what is the change? There have been such reservations of posts for the I.M.S. from before! Yes, there were. But it was not necessary that the I.M.S. man should be a Britisher. Now he should not only be a member of the I.M.S., but should be exclusively British in race. I do not know whether Sir Henry Gidney would come in. Perhaps he is a statutory Indian now; he will not get a place in Allahabad or in Jhansi. If you want to know the best stations in India, look at the appendix to the list, pick up the names there and you will see which are the best and the most thriving cities in this country.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant: Sir, I hope the time of subterfuges is up too and also the time of the benches opposite.

Several Honourable Members: The question may now be put.

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

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

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

"That the House do now adjourn."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—60.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.
 Chaliha, Mr. Kuladhar.
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra Nath.
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
 Chunder, Mr. N. C.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
 Ganga Singh, Mr.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry
 Giri, Mr. V. V.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.
 Hans Raj, Raizada.
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
 Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
 Khan Sahib, Dr.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
 Lalchand Navsrai, Mr.
 Laljee, Mr. Husenbbai Abdullabhai.
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Syed.
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
 Sant Singh, Sardar.
 Santhanam, Mr. K.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Sham Lal, Mr.
 Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib-
 Nawab.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.
 Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.

NOES—35.

Abdul Hamid, Khan Bahadur Sir.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab
 Sir
 Aikman, Mr. A.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bansidhar, Rai Sahib.
 Bartley, Mr. J.
 Bhide, Mr. V. S.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Chanda, Mr. A. K.
 Chapman-Mortimer, Mr. T.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Griffiths, Mr. P. J.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.

Lalit Chand, Thakur.
 Mackeown Mr. J. A.
 Mehta, Mr. S. L.
 Menon, Mr. K. R.
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Nagarkar, Mr. C. B.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Roughton, Mr. N. J.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sale, Mr. J. F.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Thorne, Mr. J. A.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Witherington, Mr. G. H.
 Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir
 Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 1st April, 1937.