

21st February, 1934

THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume II, 1934

(17th February to 10th March, 1934)

SEVENTH SESSION

OF THE

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1934



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1934.

Legislative Assembly.

President:

THE HONOURABLE SIR SHANMUKHAM CHETTY, K.C.I.E.

Deputy President:

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A.

Panel of Chairmen:

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

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

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

MR. N. M. JOSHI, 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 Public Petitions:

MR. ABDUL MATIN CHAUDHURY, M.L.A., *Chairman.*

MR. K. C. NEOGY, M.L.A.

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

MR. T. R. PHOOKUN, M.L.A.

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

CONTENTS.

VOLUME II.—17th February to 10th March, 1934.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
SATURDAY, 17TH FEBRUARY, 1934—		FRIDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1934—	
Messages from the Council of State	979	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1219—73
Presentation of the Railway Budget for 1934-35	979—86	Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	1219—73
MONDAY, 19TH FEBRUARY, 1934—		Importance of Road-Rail Co-ordination and of the Organisation of Communication Boards throughout the country	1219—39
Member Sworn	987	Maladministration of the Railway Board	1239—53
Questions and Answers	987—96	Muslim Representation in Railway Services	1253—73
Unstarred Questions and Answers	996—1001	Statement of Business	1273—74
Statements laid on the Table	1001—05	Appendix	1275
The Railway Budget—General Discussion	1005—64	SATURDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY 1934—	
WEDNESDAY, 21ST FEBRUARY, 1934—		Questions and Answers	1277—97
Questions and Answers	1065—91	Unstarred Questions and Answers	1297—1302
Short Notice Question and Answer	1091—93	The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	1302—64
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1093—96	Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i>	1302—61
Message from the Council of State	1096	Unreasonable Rates	1302—40
The Railway Budget—List of Demands	1096—1156	System of Appeals	1340—59
Demand No. 1—Railway Board	1097—1156	Condition of State Railway Press Employees	1359—61
Passengers' Amenities	1097—1118	First Class Railway Station for Cuttack	1361
Statutory Railway Board	1118—56	Demand No. 2—Audit	1361
THURSDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1934—		Demand No. 3—Miscellaneous Expenditure	1361
The Railway Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1157—1217	Demand No. 4—Refunds	1362
Demand No. 1—Railway Board— <i>contd.</i>	1157—1217	Demand No. 5—Payments to Indian States and Companies	1362
Statutory Railway Board— <i>concl'd.</i>	1157—96	Demand No. 6-A.—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Structural Works	1362
Indianisation of the Railway Services	1196—1217	Demand No. 6-B.—Working Expenses—Maintenance and Supply of Locomotive Power	1362

	PAGES.
SATURDAY, 24TH FEBRUARY 1934—contd.	
Demand No. 6-C—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Carriage and Wagon Stock	1362
Demand No. 6-D—Working Expenses—Maintenance of Ferry Steamers and Harbours	1363
Demand No. 6-E—Working Expenses—Expenses of Traffic Department	1363
Demand No. 6-F—Working Expenses—Expenses of General Departments	1363
Demand No. 6-G—Working Expenses—Miscellaneous Expenses	1363
Demand No. 6-H—Working Expenses—Electric Service Department	1363
Demand No. 7—Working Expenses—Appropriation to Depreciation Fund	1364
Demand No. 8—Interest Charges	1364
Demand No. 9—Temporary Withdrawals from Depreciation Fund	1364
Demand No. 11—New Construction	1364
Demand No. 12—Open Line Works	1364
MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY 1934	
Member Sworn	1365
Questions and Answers	1365—86
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1386—88
Statements laid on the Table	1388—96
The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	1397
The Salt Additional Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Introduced	1397
The Trade Disputes (Extending) Bill—Introduced	1397—98
The Cotton Textile Industry Protection (Amendment) Bill—Introduced and Passed	1398—99
The Reserve Bank of India Bill—Amendments made by the Council of State agreed to	1399—1400

	PAGES.
MONDAY, 26TH FEBRUARY 1934—contd.	
The Wheat Import Duty (Extending) Bill—Passed	1400—2
The Steel and Wire Industries Protection (Extending) Bill Passed	1423—33
The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1423
TUESDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1934—	
The Factories Bill—Presentation of the Report of the Select Committee	
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands	1435—36
Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways	1436—49
The Indian Navy (Discipline) Bill—Circulated	1449—87
Presentation of the Budget for 1934-35	1488—1538
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced	1538
FRIDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1934—	
Members Sworn	1539
Questions and Answers	1539—56
General Discussion of the General Budget	1556—1612
SATURDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1934—	
Questions and Answers	1613—16
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1616—35
General Discussion of the General Budget	1635—
TUESDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1934—	
Questions and Answers	1691—1
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1723—3
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands	1736
The General Budget—List of Demands	1736—85
Demand No. 39—Army Department	1736—97
Retrenchment in Defence Expenditure and Military Policy	1736
Demand No. 28—Executive Council	1767
Federal Finance	176

**WEDNESDAY, 7TH MARCH
1934—**

	PAGES.
Questions and Answers	1787—92
Message from the Council of State	1793
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1793—1845
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>contd.</i>	1793—1845
Reorganisation of the Public Services under the proposed Federal Constitution	1793—1821
Necessity of Expediting the Constitutional Reforms	1821—45

**THURSDAY, 8TH MARCH,
1934—**

Message from the Council of State	1847
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1847—1903
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>concl'd.</i>	1847—1903
Planned Economy	1847—1903
Statement of Business	1903—04

FRIDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1934—

Questions and Answers	1907—14
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1915—75
Demand No. 16—Customs	1915—49
Absence of Oriyas in the Customs Department	1917—19
Status and Salary of Assistant Preventive Officers at Madras	1919—23
Grievances of the Hindus of Sind in the Customs Department	1923—49
Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income	1949—54
Paucity of Oriyas in the Bihar and Orissa Income-tax Department	1950
Hearing of Appeals on Assessment by the same officers and not by Independent Judicial Officers	1951
Arbitrary Assessment by Income-tax Officers	1951—52
Policy of the Income-tax Department	1953
Demand No. 18—Salt	1954
Demand No. 19—Opium	1954

**FRIDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1934—
*contd.***

	PAGES.
Demand No. 19-A.—Excise	1954
Demand No. 20—Stamps	1954
Demand No. 21.—Forest	1954
Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage works	1954
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)—Paucity of Muslims in the services.	1955—75
Paucity of Muslims in the Services	1955—75

**SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH,
1934—**

Questions and Answers	1977—83
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1983—93
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	1993—2072
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)— <i>concl'd.</i>	1993—2058
Compensatory Allowance for Lower Division Clerks and Sorters	1993—96
Retrenchment Policy adopted in the Posts and Telegraphs Department	1996—2035
Condition of the Extra Departmental Agents	2035—40
Selection Grade Posts	2040—46
Grievances of Railway Mail Service Employees.	2046—50
Protest against the Appointment of the Postal Committee	2050—55
Measures of Earthquake Relief for Postal and Railway Mail Service Staff in North Bihar	2055—57
Wynad Allowances	2057
Demand No. 25—Interest on debt and Reduction or avoidance of Debt	2058
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2058

**SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH,
1934—contd.**

	PAGES.
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor-General	2058
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2058
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2059
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2059
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2059
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2059
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2059
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2060
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2060
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2060
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2060
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2060
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2061
Demand No. 43—Audit	2061
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2061
Demand No. 45—Police	2061
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2061
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	2062
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2062
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2062
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2062
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2062
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2062
Demand No. 53—Archæology	2063
Demand No. 54—Mines	2063

**SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH,
1934—contd.**

	PAGES.
Demand No. 55— Other Scientific Departments	2063
Demand No. 56—Education	2063
Demand No. 57—Medical Services	2063
Demand No. 58—Public Health	2063
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	2064
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	2064
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2064
Demand No. 62—Industries	2064
Demand No. 63—Aviation	2064
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	2064
Demand No. 65—Census	2065
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	2065
Demand No. 67—Emigration—External	2065
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2065
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	2065
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	2065
Demand No. 71—Currency	2066
Demand No. 72—Mint	2066
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2066
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	2066
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	2066
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	2067
Demand No. 76-A.—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue	2067
Demand No. 76-B.—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments	2067

	PAGES.
SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH 1934— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 77—Refunds	2067
Demand No. 79—Baluchis- tan	2067
Demand No. 80.—Delhi	2068
Demand No. 81—Ajmer- Merwara	2068
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands	2068
Demand No. 83—Rajputana	2068
Demand No. 84—Central India	2068
Demand No. 85—Hydera- bad	2069
Demand No. 85-A—Aden	2069
Demand No. 86—Expendi- ture in England—Secre- tary of State for India	2069
Demand No. 87—Expendi- ture in England—High Commissioner for India,	2069
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay on Security Print- ing	2069
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay	2070

	PAGES.
SATURDAY, 10TH MARCH 1934— <i>contd.</i>	
Demand No. 90—Irrigation	2070
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	2070
Demand No. 93—Capital Outlay on Currency Note Press	2070
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	2070
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	2071
Demand No. 96—Commuted Value of Pensions	2071
Demand No. 96-A—Expen- diture on Retrenched Per- sonnel charged to Capital	2071
Demand No. 97—Delhi Capital Outlay	2071
Demand No. 98—Interest- fee Advances	2071
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances bearing Interest	2072

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 21st February, 1934.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

TENDERS FOR THE RAISING OF COAL IN STATE RAILWAY COLLIERIES.

176. ***Mr. S. O. Mitra:** (a) When did Government accept the principle of asking for tender regarding the raising of coal in the State Railway collieries?

(b) For how many collieries did they ask for tender this year?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Government issued orders in 1933 that tenders should be called for in State-managed collieries.

(b) Five, *i.e.*, two at Giridih, one at Kargali, one at Bukharo, and one at Swang.

CONTRACTORS FOR RAISING COAL IN STATE COLLIERIES.

177. ***Mr. S. O. Mitra:** (a) Have Government any approved list of contractors for raising coal in State collieries?

(b) Do Government demand any deposit from the contractors before they are allowed to submit tenders?

(c) If not, how do they expect to bar out unreal and fictitious tenders?

(d) Do Government contemplate framing rules, demanding a deposit of a small sum as a condition precedent to the submission of a tender for contract like the Army Department?

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

(b) No, but Rs. 5 is charged for the purchase of tender documents.

(c) By careful selection based on past experience.

(d) This has not been considered necessary for the particular tenders under consideration.

ACCEPTANCE OF THE LOWEST TENDER BY THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

178. ***Mr. S. O. Mitra:** (a) Do Government in the Railway Department follow the general principle of accepting the lowest tender?

(b) Do Government follow the principle of stating reasons in all cases where they for any reason cannot accept the lowest tender?

(c) Do Government contemplate, in cases when they do not accept the lowest tender, making enquiries from the party concerned about the alleged reasons for non-acceptance of his tender?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The general principles regarding calls for tenders and selections from tenders received are contained in the rules regarding contracts which were issued last year. A copy of the rules is in the Library. Generally speaking, the position is that the lowest tender should be accepted unless such an acceptance would not be to the public interest; and the reasons for not accepting the lowest tender are recorded at the time by the authority making the selection.

MEMORIALS FROM THE TRAVELLING TICKET INSPECTORS OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY TO THE RAILWAY BOARD.

179. ***Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad:** (a) With reference to the reply to the supplementary question to starred question No. 1361, dated the 11th December, 1933, *vide* page 2928 of the Debates, will Government be pleased to state if "certain memorials" include those submitted by the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors of the East Indian Railway to the Railway Board in the last week of July, 1933, to which they have received no reply yet?

(b) If they have not been received yet by the Railway Board, are Government prepared to enquire from the Agent, East Indian Railway, and state as to what has happened to those memorials?

(c) Is it a fact that direct copies of these memorials were submitted to the Railway Board by the memorialists?

(d) If so, what action was taken by Government when they came to know the facts contained in the memorial?

(e) Is there any time limit for the disposal of appeals by the administration?

(f) Is it a fact that employees have a time limit of one month for the submission of appeals?

(g) Do Government propose to see that no employees are kept in the dark about their representations, appeals and memorials, and are informed what steps are being taken?

(h) If Government do not propose to do so, will they be pleased to state what means are left for an employee to draw the attention of the administration?

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

(b), (c) and (d). The disposal of any memorials regarding pay and allowances, etc., from non-gazetted staff is a matter which generally lies within the competence of the Agent. In matters regarding which, under the rules, no appeal lies to the Railway Board, the Board do not take part unless the Agent refers the matter to the Board for their orders.

(e) No.

(f) Yes.

(g) and (h). Government have no reason to believe that representations, appeals, and memorials are not being replied to by Railway Administrations but instructions are being issued to all administrations that the orders passed on every appeal should be communicated to the employee.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Will Government be pleased to say what are the sources which make them think that such and such a case is fit for interference?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have not made any statement of that kind in this case. I said that instructions are being issued to all administrations that the orders passed on every appeal should be communicated to the employee.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: What will be the remedy of the employee if he is informed of the reply and the judgment of the Agent?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The remedy is what is contained in the appeal rules. If there is an appeal to a higher authority, then he can appeal.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: If there is no appeal, can he apply to the Railway Board to exercise their powers of superintendence?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The appeal rules have been very carefully considered, and the Government do not propose to grant further powers of appeal.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: When were those rules considered?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I believe the rules were issued only a few years ago.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Then how is it that the Honourable Member is in a position to say that they have been considered and are being acted upon?

Mr. P. E. Rau: My Honourable friend is putting words into my mouth which I never used.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member how it is to be found if the rules require amendment?

Mr. P. E. Rau: A copy of the rules is in the Library. My Honourable friend can get them and study them at leisure.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Will the Honourable Member himself go through them and suggest the remedy?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I do not think any remedy is called for.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: In view of the fact that appeals have always got to be forwarded through the proper channel, may I know if any Officer refuses to forward the appeals altogether?

Mr. P. E. Rau: An Officer is not entitled to refuse to forward appeals that lie under the rules.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: He must necessarily forward it?

Mr. P. E. Rau: Yes.

DIRECT RECRUITMENT OF SOME OF THE EX-CREW INSPECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

180. *Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur: (a) With reference to starred question No. 1473 part (b) dated the 20th December, 1933, will Government be pleased to state the reasons for the necessity for the direct recruitment of some of the ex-Crew Inspectors¹ on the East Indian Railway?

(b) With reference to the replies to questions Nos. 1110 and 1399 (b), dated the 18th March and the 2nd April, 1929, laid on the table of this House on the 21st January, 1930, is it a fact that many Travelling Ticket Inspectors who could be conveniently spared by Accounts Department to work in the crew system on its inauguration were utilised on responsible posts and also imparted training to the crew recruits including those who claim themselves to be ex-Crew Inspectors?

(c) Can an employee claim seniority on the basis of his temporary or officiating service in which he was never confirmed?

(d) Is it a fact that all the posts of the Crew Inspectors were temporary and for a purely experimental measure and were offered under a clear agreement of 24 hours' notice of discharge?

(e) Is it a fact that the pay *plus* mileage, *i.e.*, the emoluments, reckoned as pay of the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors, exceeded by far the pay of the newly recruited Crew Inspectors?

(f) Is it a fact that the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors and the *ex*-Crew Inspectors both claimed to be classed as "Inspectors"?

(g) Is it a fact that the comparatively higher initial salary of Crew Inspectors was fixed because they were not given mileage allowance (reckoned as pay) like that given to the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors?

(h) Is it a fact that the maximum pay of a Travelling Ticket Inspector was also Rs. 200 like the Crew Inspectors?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have called for certain information, and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

SENIORITY OF THE TICKET CHECKING STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

181. ***Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur:** With reference to starred question No. 1474 (d), dated the 20th December, 1933, will Government be pleased to enquire and state if it is a fact that the Agent, East Indian Railway's interpretation of his circular No. 464 of the 26th January, 1927, as embodied in his letter No. O. P. E.-781, dated the 4th February, 1930, has distinctly laid down that officiating service followed by confirmation is not the factor for determining seniority?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have called for certain information, and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

SENIORITY OF THE TICKET CHECKING STAFF ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

182. ***Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether Railway Board letter No. 683-E. G., dated the 8th March, 1931, contained special rules to carry out the policy of retrenchment, or they were intended to interfere with the standing rules of the various Railway administrations on the subject of discharge, dismissal and promotions, etc.?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state if the letter in question is not *ipso facto* cancelled when the findings of the Court of Enquiry were adopted by Government?

(c) If the reply to parts (a) and (b) above be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state if the said letter of the Railway Board [para. (2) (c)] is held to supersede, cancel or modify the Agent, East

Indian Railway's circular No. 464, dated the 26th January, 1927 (para. 4) and the Agent's (C. P.) letter No. O. P. E.-781, dated the 4th February, 1930?

(d) If the reply to part (c) above be in the negative, why the pay and status of the ex-Crew Inspectors before the 1st June, 1931, are taken into account in determining seniority?

(e) Is it a fact that Railway Board letter No. 688-E. G., dated the 3rd March, 1931, does not apply in the case of the old Crew Inspectors?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information, and, on its receipt, will lay a reply on the table.

INAUGURATION OF THE CREW SYSTEM OVER THE DINAPUR DIVISION.

183. ***Maulvi Sayyid Murtuza Saheb Bahadur:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that on the inauguration of the crew system over the Dinapur Division in 1928, many Crew Inspectors and Assistant Crew Inspectors were recruited direct?

(b) Is it a fact that the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors drawing much higher emoluments and with long services were utilised in lower capacities?

(c) Is it a fact that after practical training of several months these newly recruited Crew Inspectors were subjected to a departmental examination in which they all failed and were subsequently reduced to lower capacities and their places were given to the old Travelling Ticket Inspectors?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I have called for certain information, and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

DISCHARGE OF SUBORDINATES IN THE RAILWAY SCHOOL OF TRANSPORTATION, CHANDAUSI.

184. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. P. R. Rau informed this House in reply to a supplementary question to starred question No. 1176 of the 27th November, 1933, that no new service code has now been devised under the name of retrenchment, that is, whenever an officer cannot prove a case against any subordinate and the officer finds it inconvenient to have any enquiry, the officer simply dismisses the subordinate on the ground of retrenchment? If so, are not the following letters from the Superintendent (Mr. R. F. Wood), Railway School of Transportation, Chandausi, East Indian Railway, against the Government's reply?

(i) Letter No. 64/1324, dated the 22nd August, 1933, reading:
"Voluntarily Retirement."

"A constant source of trouble both in the School and City but it would be difficult to give proper grounds for discharging, it is most desirable that they go."

(ii) Letter No. 64/1352, dated the 25th August, 1933, reading:
"Voluntarily Retirement."

"In absence of any orders regarding their retirement they were sanctioned 14 days casual leave as an urgent case and was recalled after expiry of 13 days on arrival of their relief."

(iii) Letter No. 54/1425, dated the 7th September, 1933, reading:
"Voluntarily Retirement."

"They are not willing to resign under the ordinary rules, their period of absence (compulsory 14 days casual leave) has been treated as leave without pay."

(b) If so, what action has been taken against the Superintendent (Mr. R. F. Wood)? If none, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. In regard to the second part, I am unable to understand what the extracts quoted are meant to prove; it is impossible to draw any conclusions from isolated sentences from various letters. My Honourable friend apparently does not realise that appeals against discharges, if any, can be made under the ordinary rules to the authority above the person issuing the orders of discharge. Government do not consider that their intervention is called for.

CONSOLIDATED ALLOWANCE OF THE TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

185. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. P. R. Rau informed this House in reply to part (c) of starred question No. 1272 of the 1st December, 1933, that on reconsideration it has since been decided not to subject consolidated travelling allowance for ticket examining staff on the East Indian Railway to the cut so long as the ordinary daily allowance is not subject to it? If so, will Government please state the length of period during which the ordinary daily allowance was subjected to any cut and to what extent?

(b) If the reply to part (a) be in the negative, what are the circumstances under which the said consolidated allowance was subjected to 12½ per cent. cut for twenty-nine months commencing from the 1st July, 1931, and ending on the 30th November, 1933, on the East Indian Railway ticket examining staff alone?

(c) Was it a uniform cut on all State Railways? If so, what are the circumstances under which it was not imposed on the consolidated allowance drawn by the ticket examining staff on the North Western Railway from the 1st December, 1932?

(d) Do Government propose to consider the exemption of the said consolidated allowance from the said cut with effect from the 1st July, 1931? If not, why not?

(e) Will Government please state whether the grant of a special rate of consolidated travelling allowance sanctioned as an *ex-gratia* measure is subject to any cut? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes. Ordinarily daily allowance was not subjected to any cut.

(b) As already stated by me in reply to question No. 1272, the cut was imposed generally on all compensatory allowances, including consolidated monthly travelling allowances as a measure of reduction in expenditure owing to financial stringency.

(c) Yes. Government are not aware that it was not imposed on the North Western Railway, but are making enquiries.

(d) No. Government do not see any reason to depart in this case from their usual policy of not granting retrospective effect to such concessions.

(e) The fact that an allowance is granted *ex-gratia* does not operate to exempt it from orders affecting other allowances of a similar nature.

SUPPLY OF RULES, RELATING TO THEIR DUTIES, TO THE RAILWAY EMPLOYEES IN THE MORADABAD DIVISION OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

186. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that under Rule 175 of the Government of India, Railway Department, Notification No. 1078-T., dated the 9th March, 1929, every Railway servant, whether supplied or not with a copy or translation of the rules relating to his duties shall make himself acquainted with such rules? If so, will Government please state the means, other than being supplied with a copy or translation, by which a Railway servant shall acquaint himself with the rules?

(b) Is it a fact that no translation of any description has ever been supplied to the railway servants working in Moradabad Division of the East Indian Railway? If so, why?

(c) What steps have now been taken to supply the translation to the railway servants of the said Division? If none, why not?

(d) Do Government propose to take action against the authority concerned in the said Division? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I am enquiring what are the arrangements on the East Indian Railway for ensuring that every railway servant makes himself acquainted with the rules relating to his duties. and shall lay a reply on the table in due course.

RAILWAY ARRANGEMENTS FOR MELAS HELD AT CERTAIN PLACES.

187. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that Mr. P. R. Rau informed this House in reply to starred questions Nos. 911 and 912 of the 18th September, 1933, that a copy of the questions had been sent to the Agent, East Indian Railway, for consideration in connection with future melas? If so, will Government please state the nature of suggestions made therein which require the consideration of the Agent?

(b) Do Government now propose to inform this House of the facts and figures asked therein? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Yes. I must leave it to my Honourable friend to study the questions and judge for himself.

(b) Government consider that the collection of the detailed information required is not likely to serve any useful purpose.

STATION MASTERS AND ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS HAVING DEFECTIVE EYE SIGHT ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

188. ***Mr. Goswami M. E. Puri:** (a) Are Government aware that on the North Western Railway, Station Masters and Assistant Station Masters who failed in eyesight examination, are either discharged or offered too low salary in other branches? If so, why?

(b) Do Government propose to take steps to provide such candidates who failed with the same salary which they were drawing before?

(c) Do Government propose to reserve certain percentage of commercial and other departmental posts for such failures? If not, why not?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are not aware of the particular facts that the Honourable Member is referring to, but their instructions are that staff who have failed in the eye sight test should be offered suitable employment as far as possible.

(b) and (c). No.

POSTING OF ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS AND STATION MASTERS AS GUARDS:

189. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** (a) Do Government consider guards better qualified in departmental abilities than the station masters? If not, how is it that only the guards are posted as assistant station masters at big junctions?

(b) If this procedure is to be continued, are Government prepared to post assistants and station masters as B and C class guards in their places?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are not prepared to express an opinion on the point raised in the first part of the question. They are not aware that the facts are as stated by the Honourable Member in the second part.

(b) This is a hypothetical question; Government are not prepared to interfere in the posting of station masters and guards.

PAY OF A TRAIN DESPATCHER AT DELHI,

190. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** (a) Are Government aware that the responsibilities of a train despatcher at Delhi and other junctions are greater than those of out-door assistant station masters? If so, why is the former paid Rs. 95 while the latter Rs. 260 and over?

(b) Is it a fact that when this work is done by Europeans, they are designated as assistant station masters and are paid Rs. 260 to Rs. 300, but when the same work is done by Indians, they are called train despatchers and paid Rs. 95 only?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) I am informed that the reply to the first part of this question is in the negative and the second part does not arise.

(b) So far as I am aware, this is incorrect. The pay of a post is not liable to alter according to whether the incumbent of it is a European or an Indian.

LOW SALARIES OF ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

191. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** (a) Are Government aware that the assistant station masters are responsible for the duties of the station masters in his absence, as per working rules? If so, why are not the assistants of the same grade as that of the station masters?

(b) Is it a fact that on certain big stations like Ghaziabad, etc., the assistant station masters performing the same duties are on different grades and getting different salaries?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) The duties of an Assistant Station Master, in the absence of the Station Master, are confined to only such matters the disposal of which cannot, in the interests of the safety and expeditious working of traffic in and through the station, be deferred for the Station Master to deal with personally. The second part of the question does not, therefore, arise.

(b) I presume my Honourable friend is referring to the North Western Railway. I have called for certain information and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE STATION MASTERS AND THEIR ASSISTANTS.

192. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** Is it a fact that the responsibilities of the station masters or assistants are far greater than those of other clerks? If so, why are they in the same grade in which the other clerks are?

Mr. P. E. Rau: The duties of station masters and clerks vary to such an extent that it is impossible to compare their responsibilities class by class.

The scales of pay for each class of staff are framed after consideration of the duties and responsibilities attached to the post.

LEAVE TO SICK STAFF ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

193. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** (a) Is it a fact that on the North Western Railway even the staff reporting sick and unfit for duty are forced to attend hospitals after travelling from 10 to 15 miles?

(b) Is it a fact that the Railway authorities refuse to grant them sick leave, allow them to attend civil hospitals when they are nearer than the railway hospitals and to accept the certificates other than those issued by the Railway doctors and also refuse to countersign them? If so, why?

Mr. P. E. Rau: I have called for certain information, and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

ACCIDENTS OCCURRED DUE TO SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS OF THE STAFF.

194. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** (a) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a list of accidents which occurred due to short-sightedness of the staff?

(b) What is the necessity for medically examining them every third year?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Government are not aware of any cases of accidents which occurred due to defective eyesight of the staff.

(b) Provision for periodical medical examination of staff in the rules is made in the interests of public safety.

REST TO THE STAFF ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

195. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** (a) Is it a fact that North Western Railway staff is forced to perform under-rest and double duty, in order to get weekly rest?

(b) Is it a fact that the 12 hours' night continuous duty was considered objectionable before and has now become legal?

(c) Are Government aware that the East Indian Railway is giving proper rest by engaging extra staff? If so, why is not the same procedure adopted on the North Western Railway?

Mr. P. E. Rau: (a) Periods of under-rest and double duty may occur at varying intervals in the case of certain categories of staff. This practice was in vogue before the Act was passed and is not contrary to the provisions of the law.

(b) The question of avoiding continual night duty has been discussed by the Supervisor of Railway Labour, in paragraphs 39 to 41 of his Annual Report on the working of the Hours of Employment Regulations on the North Western and East Indian Railways for the year 1931-32, a copy of which is in the Library of the House. I might add for the information of the Honourable Member that the Agents, North Western and East Indian Railways, have been addressed by the Railway Board stating that the Board considered it desirable that active steps should be taken to reduce to a minimum the number of employees who are continually on duty at night.

(c) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to part (c) of his question No. 179, on the 1st April, 1933.

OVERTIME ALLOWANCE TO THE LINE STAFF ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

196. *Mr. Goswami M. B. Puri: (a) Are Government aware that on the North Western Railway 90 per cent. of the line staff is still not getting casual leave on important occasions in time? If so, are Government prepared to allow the staff to perform extra duties-hours for this purpose, sanctioning overtime allowance? If not, what steps do Government propose to take to enable the staff to get leave in time?

(b) Are Government aware that the over-time allowance rules are so framed by the North Western Railway authorities that it is impossible for the staff to get any, even though they perform over-time duties?

(c) Will Government kindly lay on the table a complete list of the over-time allowance sanctioned and the over-time slips received up to November, 1933, from the time the amended Railways Act has come into force?

Mr. P. B. Rau: (a) and (b). Full powers with regard to these questions have been delegated to the Local Railway Administration and the staff who feel they have a grievance can bring it to the notice of the responsible authorities. Government do not consider that their intervention is called for.

(c) Government regret they are unable to supply the information required as the time and labour involved in collecting it will not be justified by the results.

GRANT OF INTERMEDIATE CLASS PASSES TO THE SUPERIOR STAFF ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

197 *Mr. Goswami M. B. Puri: Is it a fact that on the North Western Railway the superior staff entitled to travel in the intermediate class have to travel in third because the provision passes are for third class? Are Government prepared to either issue one third and one intermediate class pass separately or make the same available by intermediate class when used by superior staff?

Mr. P. B. Rau: A provision pass is intended for servants; and is always issued in the lowest class. Government see no reason to alter this practice.

INELIGIBILITY OF PASS HOLDERS TO CHANGE THE CLASS OF THE TICKETS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

198 ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri**: Is it a fact that on the North Western Railway, pass-holders are not entitled to change into higher class even on payment of difference of fares? If so, why?

Mr. P. R. Rau: With your permission, Sir, I propose to reply to questions Nos. 198 and 199 together. The practice on the North Western Railway is as stated by the Honourable Member. I might add that the suggestion that pass holders or those holding privilege ticket orders should be entitled to travel in a higher class on payment of extra fares was recently made by the All-India Railwaymen's Federation and is at present under the consideration of the Railway Board.

INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVILEGE TICKET HOLDERS TO CHANGE THE CLASS OF THE TICKETS.

†199. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri**: Is it a fact that the tickets issued to railway staff on privilege ticket orders are not treated as fully paid tickets, as regards a change to higher class on payment of difference of fares? If so, why?

POSITION OF RAILWAYS IN THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

200. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri**: In the new Award, is railway to be reckoned as a central department and are all State Railways to be under one Crown proprietor?

Mr. P. R. Rau: So far as I can see, the White Paper proposals, to which I imagine my Honourable friend refers, make no change in this respect from the present position.

GRIEVANCES OF THE GUARDS IN THE JUBBULPORE DIVISION OF THE GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY.

201. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri**: (a) Is it a fact that on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, Jubbulpore Division, the C class guards are representing their very serious grievances since the last nine years to the Railway Board, but no action has so far been taken?

(b) Is it a fact that the staff is gagged and is not allowed by the Divisional Superintendent to make any correspondence on the subject?

(c) Is it also a fact that they were refused permission to appear before the Royal Commission?

(d) Why is the lower grade introduced for guards only? Are the officers and any other staff working on lower grade than in force in other divisions?

(e) On whose authority was such lower grade introduced?

(f) Is it a fact that outsiders were directly appointed in "B" class, debarring old "C" class guards?

(g) Are Government aware that Anglo-Indian Ticket Collectors are still directly promoted to "A" class from Rs. 70 to 180? How many

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 198.

Anglo-Indian guards are working in "C" class on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway? If not, is it not a colour distinction?

(h) Is it a fact that the vacancies of "B" class guards are not filled? If so, why?

(i) Is it a fact that the above action of the Divisional Superintendent, Jubbulpore, is against the General Traffic Manager's Order No. C. W.-635 (iv) of 1917? What action do Government propose to take to redress the long standing grievances of the "C" class guards in Jubbulpore Division?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) Government are not able to trace any such representations having been made to them.

(b) and (c). Government are not aware that this is the case.

(d) to (i). Full powers have been delegated to the Local Railway Administration in the matters complained of in the question and Government do not consider their intervention is called for, but a copy of the question has been sent to the Agent, Great Indian Peninsula Railway, for his information.

ABSENCE OF A BOOK ACCESSIBLE TO THE STAFF ON PERSONAL MATTERS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

202. ***Mr. Goswami M. R. Puri:** Is it a fact that on the North Western Railway there is no book accessible to the staff on personal matters? Do Government propose to compile one, or if there is any, supply a copy of the same to each station?

Mr. P. R. Rau: I regret that I have not been able to follow the Honourable Member's question or to understand what book he refers to.

SALE OF NEWS SHEETS TO PASSENGERS TRAVELLING BY THE GRAND TRUNK EXPRESS AT NAGPUR AND ITARSI.

203. ***Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it a fact that the Railway authorities sell news sheets to passengers travelling by the Grand Trunk Express at Nagpur and Itarsi and some other Railway stations?

(b) Is it a fact that they are supplied to second and first class passengers free?

(c) Will Government please state since when this innovation has been introduced?

(d) Will Government please state whether any sanction from the Railway Board or Railway Finance Committee was obtained for this arrangement?

(e) Will Government please state what is the reason for making this arrangement?

(f) Will Government please state if they propose to put the financial burden of this arrangement on the Railway Budget?

(g) Is it a fact that a newspaper system as Daily News of Nagpur has complained against this arrangement and encroachment on the profession of journalism?

(h) Do Government propose to take steps to remove the complaints?

Mr. P. R. Rau: (a) No. The news sheet which is a registered newspaper is distributed free.

- (b) Yes.
- (c) The first news sheet was issued on the 1st January, 1934.
- (d) No such sanction was necessary.
- (e) It is an ordinary publicity arrangement for popularising travel.
- (f) I am informed by the Railway Administration that the cost of production of the news sheets is negligible.
- (g) Government have no information.
- (h) I have reason to believe that this service is much appreciated by the travelling public. In any case, this is a matter of detail affecting the publicity arrangements of the Railway in which Government do not feel it necessary to interfere.

RECRUITMENT OF MEMBERS OF MINORITY COMMUNITIES IN THE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, DELHI.

204. *Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: (a) Will Government please state whether the order in which certain officials have been confirmed as lower division clerks during the period commencing from January, 1932 in the office of the Deputy Accountant-General, Posts and Telegraphs, Delhi, is the same as shown in the list sent by me to the Department concerned?

(b) If so, will Government please state:

- (i) the circumstances in which every third vacancy was not given to a member of the minority community, and
- (ii) whether the fact that the members of the minority communities have not been offered every third vacancy reflect on their position in the seniority list for future promotions in service?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: With your permission, Sir, I will deal with this and the next question together.

Enquiry is being made and complete replies will be laid on the table in due course.

LOSS OF OFFICIAL RECORDS FROM THE POSTAL AUDIT OFFICE, DELHI.

†205. *Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim: (a) Is it a fact that certain official records were lost during the last year from the S. B. Branch of the Postal Audit Office, Delhi?

(b) If so, will Government be pleased to:

- (i) give a description of the records lost, and
- (ii) state whether the same have since been recovered?

(c) Will Government please also state:

- (i) what action was taken to find out and punish the real culprits, and
- (ii) whether the matter was reported to the police for necessary action?

(d) If the reply to part (c) (ii) above be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state their reasons for doing so?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 204.

(e) Is it a fact that following the loss of records referred to above, the head of the office in conjunction with the Union of the office formed a "Vigilance Committee" to investigate the matter and find out the mis-chief-makers?

(f) If so, will Government be pleased to state:

(i) whether this Committee succeeded in performing its functions, and

(ii) if not, what were the reasons under which the Committee could not work?

MUSLIMS IN CHARGE OF ESTABLISHMENT OR ADMINISTRATION SECTIONS IN THE ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT OFFICES.

206. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** Will Government please state the number of Muslims who have been put in charge of the Establishment or Administration Sections in all the Accounts and Audit Offices under the Auditor General in India from the 1st April, 1919, to the 31st March, 1933, and how does this number for each financial year compare with the total number of Muslim employees in those offices?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: The posting of officers and superintendents is regulated with reference to their aptitude and abilities and other administrative considerations, and not on a communal basis. No useful purpose would, therefore, be served by collecting the information asked for by the Honourable Member.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE POSTS OF GAZETTED OFFICERS AND SUPERINTENDENTS OF ESTABLISHMENT AND ADMINISTRATION SECTIONS OF THE OFFICES UNDER THE AUDITOR GENERAL AS TENURE POSTS.

207. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to resolution No. (5) of the All-India Accounts and Audit Offices Employees' Union, Delhi, published in the *Weekly Mail* of the 21st August, 1933, demanding that the posts of gazetted officers and Superintendents in charge of Establishment and Administration Sections of the various offices under the Auditor General in India should be classed as tenure posts and that the personnel for those appointments should be selected in rotation from different communities?

(b) If the reply to part (a) above be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state if they are prepared to adopt the suggestion? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) Yes.

(b) As postings are regulated in the manner indicated in my reply to the preceding question, Government are not prepared to adopt the suggestion.

INADEQUATE REPRESENTATION OF THE MINORITY COMMUNITIES IN THE ACCOUNTS AND AUDIT OFFICES.

208. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the resolutions passed by the All-India Accounts and Audit Offices Employees' Union, which were published in the *Weekly Mail* in its issue of the 21st August, 1933?

(b) Is it a fact that the Resolutions *inter alia* demand the appointment of a Committee of Enquiry to investigate into the continued inadequate representation of the minority communities in the Accounts and Audit Offices?

(c) Are Government prepared to institute any such enquiry? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) and (b). Yes.

(c) No. The question of removing communal inequalities in the Indian Audit Department is receiving the constant and careful attention of the Auditor-General. The rules regarding the recruitment of members of minority communities to the clerical grades are being enforced. In the grades filled by departmental promotion from the clerical grades, the rules laying down recruitment ratios do not apply. The Auditor-General is, however, taking what steps he can to increase the representation of minority communities in the Subordinate Accounts Service from which the subordinate gazetted staff is selected.

FIXATION OF PERCENTAGE FOR EACH COMMUNITY FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICE.

209. ***Mr. Muhammad Anwar-ul-Azim:** Is it a fact that the question of fixation of a definite share of representation for each community in the various Government appointments is under consideration of Government? If so, will Government be pleased to state what progress has been made in that connection and when the result may be expected to be out?

The Honourable Sir Harry Baig: I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the replies I gave on the 23rd August, the 30th August and the 27th November last to starred questions Nos. 19, 189 and 1213. I regret that I am not in a position to add anything to those replies at present.

ABSENCE OF MUSLIM EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, CALCUTTA, ON THE ID DAY

210. ***Haji Chaudhury Muhammad Ismail Khan:** (a) Are Government aware:

- (i) that the Muhammadan employees of the office of the Deputy Accountant-General, Posts and Telegraphs, Calcutta, have been called upon to separately explain the cause of their absence on the 17th January, 1934, the day when Id was observed;
- (ii) that the Deputy Accountant-General has threatened to take disciplinary action against the Muhammadan employees for not taking necessary previous permission to absent and to observe the Id holiday and for not attending office on the Id day after the Id prayers;
- (iii) that the Muhammadan duffries and menials have been threatened with dismissal for their attending office after 12 A.M. on the Id day;
- (iv) that in all the Government offices Muhammadans were granted a sectional holiday on the 17th January, 1934, as the moon was visible on the previous day and that the action of the Deputy Accountant General, Posts and Telegraphs, is unprecedented?

(b) If the replies to parts (a) (i) to (iv) be in the affirmative, what action, if any, do Government propose to take against the person or persons responsible for this behaviour towards the Muhammadan employees of that office to guard against a recurrence of such unfortunate situation in future? :

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Enquiry is being made and a complete reply will be laid on the table in due course.

REDUCTION OF FIVE POSTS OF CLERKS IN THE PUNJAB TELEGRAPH CIRCLE.

211. ***Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya:** (a) Is it a fact that five posts of ordinary time-scale clerks in the Punjab Telegraph Circle are to be reduced as a measure of retrenchment?

(b) Is it a fact that all senior or superannuated men of the ordinary time-scale have already been retrenched and that men of comparatively shorter length of service are now left in the cadre?

(c) Is it the recognised rule that junior clerks of the ordinary time-scale should be reverted to the lower division and that reduction should start from the most junior men in the latter grade?

(d) Is it also a fact that the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, has ordered that for the purposes of retrenchment lower selection grade, ordinary time-scale and lower division should be considered as one cadre?

(e) Is it also a fact that the Postmaster-General, Punjab and North-West Frontier Circle, Lahore, contemplates retrenching, in violation of the Director General's orders, the most junior men in the ordinary time-scale instead of reverting them to the lowest class of clerks, i.e., the lower division clerk?

(f) Is it also a fact that while making retrenchment among the telegraph clerks previously the lower selection grade, the ordinary time-scale and the lower division were considered as one cadre?

(g) If so, will Government please state the special grounds on which the previous procedure is not followed by the Postmaster-General, Lahore, and what action do Government propose to take in the matter so as to safeguard the interests of the unfortunate junior clerks in the ordinary time-scale in preference to those standing most junior in respect of service in the entire clerical cadre?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) to (g). Information has been called for and will be laid on the table in due course.

RECRUITMENT OF TEMPORARY CLERKS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA OFFICES.

212. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Are Government aware that the Public Service Commission issue certificates to those candidates whom they have declared suitable for temporary employment in the Civil Secretariat and its Attached Offices on the results of the Third Division Ministerial Service Examination held in 1982? If so, are the Public Service Commission issuing similar certificates to outsiders who never sat for any competitive examination? If so, why?

(b) How many certificates in all have been issued so far and under what circumstances? Who recommends to the Public Service Commission the grant of such certificates to outsiders?

(c) Are Government also aware that the Public Service Commission circulated to all the Departments of the Government of India a list of candidates who had obtained 40 per cent. or more marks for temporary employment in the respective offices? If so, will Government please state the number of candidates appointed out of that list by each of the Department and the number of those who never appeared in any of the examinations?

(d) Are Government aware that the Departments of the Government of India have already got discretionary powers to appoint whomsoever they like in temporary vacancies and under that provision they generally appoint those who never appeared at any examination, thus shutting the doors for the passed men? If it is not so, why are outsiders being allowed to work in some of the offices?

(e) In view of the above revised procedure adopted by the Public Service Commission, do Government propose to insist that the recruitment even in temporary or officiating vacancies is made only out of those who appeared at competitive examinations held by the Public Service Commission and whom they have declared qualified for such employment and not from amongst the outsiders?

(f) Do Government also propose to replace the unqualified outsiders now working in different offices of the Government of India by those whom the Public Service Commission have declared suitable for temporary employment? If not, on what grounds?

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: (a) The Public Service Commission issue no such certificates.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) In accordance with the instructions in clause IX of paragraph 1 of the Home Department Office Memorandum No. F.-452/27-Establishments, dated the 8th December, 1928, a copy of which is in the Library, the Public Service Commission supply each of the Government of India offices, which recruit through them, with a list of candidates at the last examination whom they consider qualified for temporary employment. The information asked for in the second portion of this question is being collected, and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

(d) I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to clause IX of the Office Memorandum referred to above from which he will observe that Departments have discretion to appoint candidates from outside the list prepared annually by the Public Service Commission. The latter part of the question does not arise.

(e) and (f). These matters are under consideration.

**RECRUITMENT OF SIKHS IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL,
POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.**

213. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) How many permanent, temporary and officiating vacancies occurred in the office of the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs in 1930, 1931, 1932 and 1933, respectively, in each of the

grades and how many were given to Hindus, Muhammadans and Sikhs, belonging to different provinces?

(b) Are Government aware that after many years' representation that office appointed a Sikh in 1933 only in a permanent vacancy, though the orders regarding the recruitment of minority communities exist since 1928?

(c) Are Government aware that that Sikh was later on declared qualified for the First Division of the Secretariat and as such was offered an appointment in another office in the First Division?

(d) Are Government further aware that the vacancy caused by the transfer of this Sikh has been given to a non-Sikh, and the claims of the Sikh community have been ignored? What were the reasons for not recruiting a Sikh in the vacancy caused by the transfer of a Sikh when there was no other Sikh in a permanent post in that office?

(e) How many unqualified Bengalis are at present working in temporary or officiating vacancies and what are their qualifications? What are the special reasons for their appointment and is it a fact that they already overwhelmingly predominate in that office?

(f) How many unqualified Muhammadans are at present working in temporary and officiating vacancies and what are their qualifications? What is the total number of Muhammadans at present employed permanently in that office as against Hindus and members of other communities belonging to different provinces?

(g) Do Government propose to order the recruitment of Sikhs in future vacancies to give that community its due share on the staff of the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) It is presumed that the Honourable Member requires information as to appointments to the grades of assistants and clerks in the Director-General's office, as these are the only grades, other than that of inferior servants, to which appointments were made direct. A statement furnishing the information is laid on the table.

(b) The facts are substantially as stated by the Honourable Member, but two unqualified Sikhs were appointed in officiating vacancies in 1932, as the Public Service Commission were unable to nominate a qualified Sikh candidate until 1933.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes. The Public Service Commission were asked to nominate a member of a minority community for the vacancy and selected a Muslim. As they did not select a Sikh, they have recently been asked to nominate one for an existing vacancy. It is not a fact that at present there is no Sikh holding a permanent appointment in the Director-General's office.

(e) Three. They hold permanent appointments as record lifters and have been given temporary promotion as they were considered fit for it. As regards the last part, Bengalis are in a majority.

(f) One. He is a good typist and has a fair knowledge of stenography. With regard to the latter part, a statement is laid down on the table.

(g) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply just given to part-(d) above.

Statement of permanent, temporary and officiating vacancies in the clerical grade in the Office of the Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs and how filled up.

Year.	Number of permanent vacancies.		Communities of different Provinces by which filled up.		Number of temporary and officiating vacancies.		Communities of different Provinces by which filled up.		Remarks.
	Assis- tants.	Clerks.	Assis- tants.	Clerks.	Assis- tants.	Clerks.			
1930	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil			
1931	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	2*			*In Stenographer's grade.
1932	Nil	15	2 Anglo-Indians from the Punjab. 1 Christian from Bengal. 3 Muslims from the United Provinces.	Nil	8	2 Hindus from Bengal 2 Christians from Madras. 2 Sikhs from the Punjab. 2 Muslims from the United Provinces.			†Permanent record lifters of the office. ‡Retrenched official of the office.
1933	Nil	13	9 Hindus { 5 from Bengal. 3 from Madras. 1 from the Punjab. 3 from Madras. 3 from the United Provinces. 1 from Bengal. 1 Sikh from the Punjab. 5 Muslims { 3 from the Punjab. 2 from the United Provinces.	Nil	8	3 Hindus from Bengal. 2 Sikhs from the Punjab. 2 Christians from Madras and the Punjab. 1 Muslim from the United Provinces.			§4 retrenched officials of the office.

Number of Muhammadans, Hindus and members of other communities belonging to different Provinces employed in the Office of Director-General of Posts and Telegraphs.

Province.	Muslims.	Hindus.	Other communities.
Bengal	7	135	..
Bihar and Orissa	4		..
United Provinces	5	3	..
Punjab	9	2	5 (including 1 Sikh).
North-West Frontier	1		..
Delhi	2	..	
Madras	6	..
Total	28	146	5

Sardar Sant Singh: May I know how many Sikhs there are in the Director-General's office?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: There is one permanent Sikh in the Director-General's office.

RECRUITMENT OF SIKHS IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR GENERAL, INDIAN MEDICAL SERVICE.

214. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) How many permanent, temporary and officiating vacancies occurred in the office of the Director General, Indian Medical Service, in 1932 and 1933, respectively, in each of the grades, and how many were given to Hindus, Muhammadans and Sikhs?

(b) Are Government aware that that office appointed a Sikh some time back in a permanent vacancy after many years' representation?

(c) Are Government also aware that that Sikh was later on transferred to the Home Department, and since then he has been made provisional permanent?

(d) Are Government further aware that the vacancy caused by the transfer of the Sikh has been given to a non-Sikh, and that the claims of the Sikh community have been ignored? What were the reasons for not recruiting a Sikh in a vacancy caused by the transfer of a Sikh when there was no other Sikh in a permanent post in that office?

(e) Do Government propose to order the recruitment of Sikhs in future vacancies so as to give that community its due share on the staff of the Director General, Indian Medical Service? If not, why not?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: (a) A statement giving the information required is laid on the table.

(b) A Sikh clerk, who had been employed in the office of the Director-General, Indian Medical Service, for 18 years died in 1931 and another Sikh was appointed to a permanent vacancy in 1932.

(c) Yes.

(d) and (e). As the clerk in question has not been yet confirmed in the Home Department and still holds a lien on his permanent appointment in the office of the Director General, Indian Medical Service, the vacancy caused by his transfer could be filled only on an officiating basis. If the vacancy becomes permanent, the question of appointing a Sikh permanently will receive due consideration.

Statement.

	Number of vacancies.			Communities by which filled.		
	Perma- nent.	Tempo- rary.	Offici- ating.	Hindus.	Muham- madans.	Sikhs.
Superintendent	{ 1932
	{ 1933	*1			
Assistants	{ 1932	4	3	9	..
	{ 1933	8			
Clerks	{ 1932	1	8	11	6	3
	{ 1933	3	8			

* Filled by a European.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Are Government aware as to what is the percentage of the Sikh community in India?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Government are quite aware of that.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Will Government kindly note that in appointing men to jobs, the numerical strength of a particular community should also be taken into consideration?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: Well, Sir, I am not prepared to make a general statement on that subject, but so far as the minority community of Sikhs is concerned, their numerical population is taken into account.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Do I take it that the numerical strength of all minority communities is taken into consideration when making appointments, or only in the case of the Sikhs?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: The composition of the staff of a Department is taken into consideration first, the percentages of the various communities are considered, and then decisions are taken, in the event of minority representation being required, as to which minority community should be given representation.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Do Government propose to take into consideration the numerical strength of all the minority communities in making appointments to public services?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: No, Sir.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Why?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if, on account of these discriminations, Hindus have become a minority community in India, or not? (Laughter.)

Mr. G. S. Bajpai: I am not aware that, so far as the composition of the various Departments with which I am concerned is concerned, that has happened.

RECRUITMENT OF SIKHS IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INFORMATION.

215. *Sardar Sant Singh: (a) How many permanent, temporary and officiating vacancies occurred in the office of the Director of Public Information in 1930, 1931, 1932 and 1933, respectively, in each of the grades, and how many were given to Hindus, Muhammadans and Sikhs?

(b) Are Government aware that there is not a single Sikh in a permanent or temporary post in that office even though the orders regarding the recruitment of minority communities were issued by the Home Department in 1928? What measures do Government propose to adopt to safeguard the Sikhs' interests in that office?

(c) Are Government also aware that whenever a temporary or officiating vacancy occurs it is generally given to a Madrasi? If so, why?

(d) Will Government please state the total number of Madrasis already employed in that office and their qualifications?

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: (a) A statement giving the information is placed on the table.

(b) The position is as stated by the Honourable Member, but I assume that he is referring to the general orders issued in February 1926. As to the latter portion of this question, I would invite his attention to my replies to parts (b) and (c) of unstarred question No. 332 on the 14th December last and to part (b) of starred question No. 936 on the 15th September last.

(c) No. Out of the 15 vacancies that occurred during the period in question only three, covering a period of 2 months and 11 days in all, were given to Madrasis.

(d) No Madrasi is at present employed in the office of the Director of Public Information.

Statement.

Year.	Nature of vacancy.	Community to which recruit belonged.
1930	3 temporary in II Division. 1 permanent as stenographer.	Two Hindus and 1 Muslim. Indian Christian.
1931	1 officiating as stenographer.	Hindu.
1932	2 temporary in II Division. 2 officiating in II Division. 1 officiating as stenographer.	One Hindu and 1 Muslim. Two Hindus. Hindu.
1933	2 officiating in II Division. 1 temporary in I Division. 1 temporary in I Division. 1 officiating as stenographer.	Two Hindus. Muslim. Hindu. Hindu.

Mr. K. P. Thampan: Are Madrasis precluded from being appointed to this Department?

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: No, Sir. It is only an accident that Madrasis have not been appointed.

Mr. K. P. Thampan: In view of the fact that there are not any Madrasis occupying permanent posts in that Department, will Government be pleased to consider the desirability of appointing a few Madrasis permanently in that Department.

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: I think Madrasis are quite capable of looking after their own interests. (Laughter.)

Mr. K. P. Thampan: In view of the discontent prevailing among the Sikhs as voiced by my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, will Government devise some means by which the Sikh community will be in a position to hold their own intellectually as against Madrasis and to pass the Public Service Commission examinations as efficiently as the Madrasis?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know if Madrasis are classed as a minority community?

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: No, Sir.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudallar: Is there a cross division also, according to provinces, in addition to communities? Do Government recognise that cross division?

The Honourable Sir Harry Haig: No, Sir. I hope the position is quite clear to the House that there is no question of provincial representation in the services.

RECRUITMENT OF SIKHS IN THE OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER, INCOME-TAX, DELHI CIRCLE.

216. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) What is the total number of permanent, temporary and officiating non-gazetted appointments under each category in the office of the Assistant Commissioner, Income-tax, Delhi Circle, and all its subordinate offices? How many of them are held by Hindus, Muhammedans and Sikhs?

(b) How many vacancies under each category occurred during 1932 and 1933 and how many were given to the Sikhs in accordance with the Home Department orders regarding the recruitment of minority communities?

(c) Are Government aware that the Sikhs are very poorly represented in this particular Circle, and that the area is mostly populated by Sikhs?

(d) Do Government propose to order the recruitment of Sikhs in all the future vacancies under each category, so as to give the Sikh community its due share? If not, why not?

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

(c) The representation of various communities is considered for the Department as a whole and not by Assistant Commissioner's Divisions separately.

(d) The Government do not propose to take the course suggested in this part of the question, since such action would be in contravention of the general orders on the subject which they have issued.

Statement showing the total number of permanent, temporary and officiating non-gazetted appointments under each category in the office of the Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, East Punjab Division and Delhi and all its subordinate offices by communities.

(a)

	Anglo-Indians.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Sikhs.	Others.	Total.
Inspectors		11	7	4	2	24
Clerical establishment	1	66	37	7	5	116

Statement showing how vacancies of temporary Inspectors and Clerks in the East Punjab Division and Delhi were filled up during the financial year 1931-32

(b)

	Anglo-Indians.	Hindus.	Muslims.	Sikhs.	Others.	Total.
Inspectors		7	3	2	1	13
Clerical establishment		17	25	9	4	55

No new posts were sanctioned during the financial year 1932-33.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: May I know why merit alone is not recognised as the sole test for being appointed to Government services so as to get rid of this communal and other representations?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: So far as possible, of course, merit is the determining factor, but my Honourable friend is quite aware of the policy of the Government of India in the matter of securing a certain representation of minority communities.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: Will Government be pleased to state whether there is any mechanical machinery to test the merit and efficiency of a candidate.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: "Public Service" examinations.

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I would suggest that my Honourable friend, who has asked the question, might ask my Honourable and learned friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, to devise a piece of machinery for that purpose. (Laughter.)

SCALES OF PAY FOR THE INDIANS IN THE ARMY AND ROYAL AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS.

217. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) What are the reasons for creating a very low scale of pay for the Indians in the Army and Royal Air Force Headquarters as compared with the Europeans, and what are the comparative scales for both the nationalities?

(b) Are Government aware that the new scale of pay, particularly that of Third Division, is much lower than that of the Secretariat and its Attached offices?

(c) Is it a fact that Government's policy to eliminate the racial discrimination has been in vogue ever since the new Reforms? If so, why have Government now decided to revert to the policy of racial distinction in respect of the recruitment in the Army and Royal Air Force Headquarters?

(d) Are Government further aware that Indians with higher academic qualifications enter these offices by hard competitions and the proposed scale of pay does not give them even living wage at Simla?

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: (a) The scales are (1) for soldiers, and (2) for civilians, not for Europeans and Indians. The scales are laid down in paragraph 84 of Part I and Appendix III of Part I, Special, of Pay and Allowance Regulations, except that 20 per cent. is added to the pay for civilians.

(b) Army Headquarters pay generally has always been less than Secretariat pay, but if the Honourable Member will examine the scales, he will find that the pay for the lower division in Army Headquarters is not less, but more favourable than the pay for the routine division of the Secretariats.

(c) There is no racial distinction. The distinction is between soldiers and civilians of all nationalities.

(d) Government are aware that entry is by competition. The minimum pay for Army and Royal Air Force Headquarters is the same as for the Secretariats, and Government cannot accept the suggestion that it is inadequate.

ABSENCE OF SIKH CLERKS IN THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF RAILWAY AUDIT.

218. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) How do Government account for the total absence of Sikh clerks in the office of the Director of Railway Audit?

(b) Are Government aware that this demand has been made by the Sikh community since its creation but no action has so far been taken?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: (a) This office is mainly manned by persons transferred from other offices at the time of its inception. Only six new recruits have been taken in, and one of them is a Sikh.

(b) I do not recollect any representation with regard to this particular office.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is the Honourable Member aware that some persons try to pass off as Sikhs while they are not?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: Would my Honourable friend repeat his question?

Sardar Sant Singh: Is the Honourable Member aware that the person who is represented to be a Sikh is not really a Sikh, but passed off as a Sikh when he applied for the job, and that the office knows that fact?

The Honourable Sir George Schuster: I have no knowledge that this is so—that any person passes off as a Sikh who is not a Sikh. If my Honourable friend has any information to give me on the subject, I shall be glad to receive it.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: If people find it convenient to pass off as Sikhs, does this not show that it is easy for Sikhs to get jobs in the Government of India?

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Are Government aware of the opposite fact of Sikhs passing into the services as non-Sikhs and Hindus? I can give several illustrations?

**ABSENCE OF SIKH READERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS,
NEW DELHI.**

219. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that there is not a single Sikh Reader in the Reading Branch of the Government of India Press, New Delhi?

(b) Is it a fact that the Manager has refused to consider the application of Sikh graduates for appointment as Readers? If so, why?

(c) Is it a fact that all posts of Proof Readers are being filled by bringing Bengali copyholders who are neither graduates nor possess any other University qualifications? If so, why?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes.

(b) No: the latter part does not arise.

(c) No. Three Bengali copyholders have recently been promoted as Readers after a qualifying examination; but entrance to the grade is not confined either to copyholders or to Bengalis.

**READERS AND COPYHOLDERS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS,
NEW DELHI.**

220. ***Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) What are the scales of pay of readers in the Government of India Press, New Delhi, and how many readers are graduates, intermediates and matriculates?

(b) Is it a fact that there is not a single graduate reader in the New Delhi Press and the Manager of the Press is determined not to admit any graduate as reader?

(c) What is the number of copyholders in the Reading Branch, and how many are Bengalis?

(d) How many Bengali copyholders were in employment on the 1st November, 1933, and how many more Bengali copyholders have been recruited since that date?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) The scales of pay of the Readers (excluding the Head Reader) are:

Old scales Rs. 200—10—250, Rs. 160—10—200, Rs. 110—8—150
and Rs. 60—4—100.

New scales Rs. 100—5—150—10—200 and Rs. 55—3—85.

No Reader has graduated or passed the Intermediate Examination.
 Nine are matriculates.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative, and, to the second part, in the negative.

(c) 27 and 11, respectively.

(d) 11 and 3, respectively.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION AND ANSWER.

LOWERING THE STATUS OF INDIAN OFFICERS HOLDING KING'S COMMISSIONS IN THE ARMY.

Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarda: (a) Are Government about to take measures in the Army Department which would in practice comparatively lower the status of Indian officers holding King's commissions in the Army?

(b) Are these measures going to result in the disappearance of messes for these officers, in the lowering of their pay, and inferior quarters being assigned to them for residence?

(c) Is it a fact that they will under these measures be entitled only to three months' furlough, while British officers of the same rank will be entitled to six to eight months' furlough?

(d) Is it a fact that those who successfully pass the Indian Military Academy will get a starting pay of Rs. 250 per mensem, which is lower than that given to the men passing through Sandhurst?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: (a), (b) and (c). I assume that the Honourable Member is referring in the first three parts of the question to those Indian officers who have received the King's Commission after passing through a training college in England. I can assure him that no alteration is contemplated in the pay or general conditions of service of these officers. The only question that is under consideration is whether they really require the same amounts of leave as are provided for British officers serving in a country other than their own—but no decision has yet been reached on this point. In every other respect they will certainly continue to be treated in exactly the same way as British officers.

(d) New terms and conditions of service, more appropriate for officers serving in their own country, are being evolved for the future Indian Commissioned officer, who will receive his Commission after passing through the Indian Military Academy at Dehra Dun. It has already been announced in a communiqué issued so long ago as July 1932 that the pay of these officers will be lower than that hitherto drawn by British officers in India and Indian officers who have passed through Sandhurst and that the new starting pay will be Rs. 300 not Rs. 250. The complete scales have not yet been finally settled but they are being based on the pay of British Army officers serving in their own country.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I ask, Sir, why is it that a difference is going to be maintained? Why is it that those who come out from the Academy in India will get lesser pay than those who come from England although they may be Indians?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: As I said just now, we are preparing rates of pay and conditions of service which we consider to be more appropriate for a national army. When the entry to the Indian army was through Sandhurst, the entry was small and we did not consider it necessary to make any discrimination at all between the pay of Indian and British Officers. But if the Indianisation of the army is to lead to economy, which is one of the main arguments, it is obviously necessary that the pay of the Officers of the national Indian army of the future should be lower than the pay of the present Indian army, which contains a number of British Officers who are serving in a country other than their own.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Do I understand that the Indian Officers who pass through Sandhurst will continue to draw the lesser amount of pay which Indian Officers passing out of the Dehra Dun Military Academy will receive?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: The Honourable Member is not to understand that. If he had understood my answer, he would have realised that the Indian Officer who has passed through Sandhurst will continue to draw exactly the same pay as the British Officer who has passed into the Indian army through Sandhurst and there is to be no alteration of any kind in this respect.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Why is it, then, that Indian Officers, who pass through the Dehra Dun College, will receive lesser pay than the Indian Officers who come from Sandhurst?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member has explained that point.

Diwan Bahadur Harbilas Sarda: May I ask, Sir, if there is going to be any other discrimination except what the Honourable Member has just stated with regard to the conditions of service against those who pass from the Dehra Dun Military Academy?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That is another and a much larger question. There will be certain alterations in the general conditions of service for the Indian Officer who passes through Dehra Dun. That is to say, he will have a different set of leave rules and there will be other alterations of that kind. If the Honourable Member wants further information about that, I would be glad if he would put down a question on the paper.

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: May I ask the Honourable Member whether, for the sake of economy, he proposes to revise the service conditions of the British Officers?

Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham: That would be impossible. The existing Officers have certain rates of pay which cannot be interfered with.

Sir Hari Singh Gour: May I inquire if it is the intention of Government that Indians will continue to be qualified for military service from Sandhurst even after the establishment of the Military College at Dehra Dun? And, if so, will not a distinction still exist between Indians

coming out from Sandhurst and those coming out of the Dehra Dun College, as regards pay?

Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham: No, Sir. As soon as the Indian Military Academy was started, it took the place entirely of the education of Indian Officers by the Training Colleges at home. No more Indians will proceed either to Sandhurst or to Woolwich for training now that we have our own national institution in India.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: May I draw the attention of the Chair to the fact that in connection with these short notice questions, we hear those questions just on the floor of the House. Will it not be better if copies of these short notice questions are sent to us along with other papers?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The answer to the Honourable Member's question is contained in the nature of the question itself. It is a short notice question.

Mr. M. Maswood Ahmad: My question is that copies of these short notice questions may be supplied to us along with other papers.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): That is not possible, otherwise it ceases to be a short notice question. The very idea of these short notice questions is that notice is generally given just a day in advance and the Honourable Member for Government undertakes to give an answer, and there is not sufficient time to enable Honourable Members to get copies of these questions.

Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur: May I suggest, Sir, that we may follow the procedure of the Madras Council where copies, even of short notice questions, are supplied to the Honourable Members?

Several Honourable Members: Copies of short notice questions are not supplied.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

76. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if they are not going to regard a sepoy's discharge certificate, given during the War, under section 17 of Indian Army Act, VIII of 1911, showing the cause of discharge as 'By Medical Board' as amounting to an evidence to show that he was discharged on 'Medical grounds' for the purpose of Recommendation No. XII of the War Pensions Committee?

(b) In what way the discharge of a sepoy under A. G. in India letter No. 23418/20/A. G. 6-R., dated the 6th July, 1915, as medically unfit for active service 'proves the Pension Controller's (Lahore) view taken in his letter No. G.-3/2463, dated the 29th November, 1933, as medically unfit for active service and not on account of any bodily injury'?

(c) Does the Indian Army Act recognize some other documents, apart from a discharge certificate, to be handed over to a sepoy on discharge?

(d) What sort of proof under Recommendation No. XII of the War Pensions Committee did Government contemplate to be taken from the sepoys when the discharge certificate as in (a) above is regarded to be an insufficient proof for establishing the facts that (i) his disability was contracted on field and foreign service, and that (ii) he was discharged on medical grounds and that (iii) the cause of his discharge was either wound, injury or illness?

(e) Does the assumed acceptance of the Pension Controller's disposal, by the Adjutant General, in pre-Committee period, offer ground for not revising the case in the light of Government officers on Recommendation No. XXI? If so, how?

(f) Are the medical history sheets, and the proceedings of the original Medical Board in (b) above not available in the Record Offices? If so, how the decision of the Controller in face of the discharge certificate as in (a) above and in face of the Adjutant General in India letter referred to in (b) above, is justified?

Mr. G. B. F. Tottenham: Enquiries about question Nos. 76 to 80 have been instituted, and replies will be laid on the table in due course.

DISABILITY PENSION TO MILITARY EMPLOYEES INVALIDED DURING THE GREAT WAR.

†77. **Sardar Sant Singh:** (a) Is it a fact that family pension claims have taken over ten years in investigation, despite scores of petitions, appeals and reminders?

(b) Will Government be pleased to refer to letter No. G4/8511, dated the 20th December, 1933, of the Pension Controller, Lahore, and state what further delay the office formalities would still need before the starving mother and a minor son of the deceased can expect to receive a family pension?

(c) Is there no provision for expediting the investigation where the deceased left old parents and minor children?

(d) Do Government propose to expedite decision in the claim?

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WAR PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

†78. **Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) With reference to their orders on Recommendation No. VII of the War Pensions Committee, will Government be pleased to state why the Government of India ordered the revision of a pension with effect from the 20th April, 1932, as per information contained in letter No. 987/843/P., dated the 24th November, 1933, from the Officer-in-Charge, I. A. S. C. Records, Daghshai?

(b) Do they intend that Recommendation No. XVII of the War Pensions Committee should have effect from the 20th April, 1932?

(c) What is the significance of this particular date—the 20th April, 1932,—in the case? How is it arrived at?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 76.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WAR PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

†79. **Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it a fact that it has been decided by the D. C. M. P., Lahore, in his letter No. G. 3/180, dated the 18th December, 1933, that Government orders on Recommendations Nos. VI, VII and XXI, of the War Pension Committee do not contemplate revising the claims for arrears of war pensions in which the pensionary award was made with effect from a date later than the one of the preferment of the claim either by the Officer Commanding or by the individual?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for excluding such revisions as mentioned in part (a) from the province of their orders on Recommendations Nos. VI, VII, and XXI?

RELATED CLAIMS FOR FAMILY WAR PENSIONS.

†80. **Mr. S. G. Jog:** (a) Is it a fact that in family pension claims, which were once admitted with strict regard to paragraph 44 of the Financial Regulations for the Army in India, Part I, full arrears to the pensions are not allowed, when the pensioner for some reasons or other including those of her ignorance and illiteracy, fails to draw her pension for over three years? If so, why?

(b) Have not Government declared in Army Instructions that family pension claims are not time-barred?

(c) Is there any specific rule in the Army Regulations for disallowing arrears beyond three years in such cases as mentioned in part (a) above?

CLOSING DOWN OF THE CENTRAL BOOK DEPOT IN CALCUTTA.

81. **Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** With reference to the reply to Mr. S. C. Mitra's unstarred question No. 216, dated the 27th November, 1933, will the Honourable Member in charge of the Department of Industries and Labour be pleased to state whether any decision has been arrived at by the Government of India regarding the closing down of the Central Book Depot in Calcutta? If so, what is the purport of the decision?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: The Government of Bengal have since withdrawn their proposal to undertake the agency for the sale of the Government of India publications.

HARDSHIPS OF THE STAFF OF THE CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH.

82. **Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Are Government aware that during the heavy outbreak of monsoon one young man, typist, of the Central Publication Branch, named Tulsi Ch. Mukherji, who was suffering from illness of serious type, had to be removed in a stretcher from the 'E' type quarters allotted to him to another place owing to the room he was occupying having been inundated with water from the leaky roof?

(b) Are Government aware that the poor shelter against rains had already aggravated his illness?

(c) Are Government aware that the slender billet he was left with after various deductions did not enable him to obtain proper medical treatment?

(d) Are Government aware that when he was asked by the attending physician to leave for Calcutta, he could not go as he was penniless?

†For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 76.

(e) Are Government aware that as a last resort he had to pawn his wife's jewellery to scrape together only the expenses of the journey?

(f) Is it a fact that the poor man has of late breathed his last, leaving a young widow?

(g) Are Government aware that one permanent record supplier named Nurul Huq of the Central Publication Branch died of pneumonia in the Balok Ram Hospital? Are Government aware that he was reduced to such straits that his burial expenses had to be borne by subscription?

(h) Are Government aware of the hardship of the staff?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Information to this effect has been furnished by a friend of the deceased since this question was tabled.

(b) No.

(c) No: he was entitled to free medical treatment.

(d) and (e). No. He applied for an advance of Rs. 100 from his General Provident Fund on the 7th July, 1933, but withdrew his application on the 19th July.

(f) A report was received from the widow of the clerk that her husband died at Joyrampore on the 27th December, 1933.

(g) The reply to the first part is in the affirmative, and, to the second part, in the negative.

(h) This part of the question is too vague to permit of a definite answer.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

Secretary of the Assembly: Sir, the following Message has been received from the Council of State:

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State has, at its meeting held on the 19th February, 1934, agreed without any amendments to the Bill further to amend the Indian Tariff Act, 1894, for certain purposes, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting held on the 15th February, 1934."

THE RAILWAY BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The House will now take up the Demands for Grants under the Railway Budget. It has been represented to the Chair that the various Parties and certain representatives of unattached Members have come to an informal agreement with regard to the procedure to be followed in discussing the Demands for Grants. The Chair has been told that the Parties would like the order to be varied, so that each Party might have an opportunity of discussing a particular cut motion. This practice has been adopted in the past, and the Chair has no objection to adopt that practice if it is the desire of the House. The Chair takes it that it has been correctly informed with regard to the understanding arrived at by the Parties. If that understanding is to be given effect to, it necessarily follows as a corollary that there ought to be a time-limit on speeches. The Chair would, therefore, suggest, in accordance with the practice which was followed last year, that the Mover of a cut motion may have 20 minutes and other speakers 15 minutes each. It is hoped the House would agree to this.

What the Chair then proposes to do is this. This morning the Independent Party will have its turn and move the motion of which notice has been given by Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar (motion No. 133) to discuss the passengers' amenities. In the afternoon we shall take up a cut motion to discuss the Statutory Railway Authority. It has also been represented to the Chair that the House would like to have a little more time to discuss this than the other subjects. Therefore, what the Chair suggests is that the motion relating to the Statutory Railway Authority may be discussed this afternoon and continued for an hour tomorrow morning also, that is, from 11 to 12 o'clock, because there are no questions tomorrow. From 12 to 1-15 the Nationalist Party will have their turn, and in the afternoon the Centre Party will move their motion. On Friday morning, the European Group will have their turn, and, on Friday afternoon, one of the representatives of the unattached Members may take a particular motion, and, on Saturday, the discussion will be resumed in the natural order in which it appears in the Order Paper. Does that meet the convenience of the House?

(All the Honourable Members signified their consent.)

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated Non-Official): In view of the fact that we have to discuss very important questions such as the Statutory Railway Board, may I ask whether it is possible for you to sit longer than five o'clock on these days, that is, today, tomorrow and the day after.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair will certainly sit longer if it is the desire of the House. In fact, the discussion on the Statutory Railway Board will commence this afternoon, and the Chair will be glad to sit till 5-30 today.

Kumar Gopika Bomon Roy (Surma Valley *cum* Shillong: Non-Muhammadian): When will my cut motion come up?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): In the natural order.

DEMAND No. 1—RAILWAY BOARD.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore (Member for Commerce and Railways): Sir, I move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of the 'Railway Board'."

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 8,45,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of the 'Railway Board'."

Passengers' Amenities.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 100."—*Passengers' Amenities.*

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

Mr. President, I have been told from more than one quarter that this is a hardy annual and that very little useful purpose will be served by discussing a question of this kind. If you will go through the notice of cut motions that have been given by various Honourable Members from all sections of the House, you will find that a large number of these motions relate to travel facilities and passenger amenities over all the railways. It seems to me clear that however much this question has been discussed year after year, it still requires a solution and that most Honourable Members of this House are anxious that a proper solution should be found for this question. I may at once state that I have no intention by this motion to censure the Railway Board. My anxiety is more to bring certain facts to the notice of the Honourable the Railway Member and the Railway Board in the hope that fresh facts that have been placed before them will enable them to adjust their policy and, what is more necessary, to make the Agents of these railways readjust their policy with reference to this very important question. I am aware also that in the reports that have been supplied of the working of the railway system in this country year after year, there is a ponderous and a very elaborate enumeration of various travel facilities and passenger amenities which have been promoted in the course of the year by the different railway systems. If still, I venture to discuss this question, it should not be presumed that I have not gone through this list very carefully.

My Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bore, complained, and, I think, to a certain extent legitimately, that while the grievances were multiplied and put forward before this House very constantly, the number of facilities that were being given to the travelling public and the improvements that had been made from year to year were not sufficiently stressed. I am here this morning to stress both on the improvements that have been made during the last ten years and also to point out the omissions that are yet to be rectified. I know that during the last ten years, there have been many railway systems which have made some improvements with reference to the travelling public. But, Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member is aware, and none better, that the demands of the public have been growing apace, that the consciousness of their rights has increased from year to year, and that people are now asking for more comforts, more elaborate comforts than they had in the spacious days when to enter a railway carriage was in itself a luxury, that travel by railway carriage was something of an adventure in many a man's life. Those days are past, and now people are beginning to realise, with larger experience of the working of the various systems of railways in other countries, that greater comfort should be given to them and that greater facilities should be afforded to the public. I plead, therefore, that the time has come for a re-orientation of the policy with reference to the amenities that should be provided to the travelling public. We have continued under the old system and have tried merely to patch up here and there what may be called acute discontent of the railway passengers, but I venture to think that the time has now come to re-examine the whole question and so settle the policy with reference to the amenities that may be gradually given to the travelling public.

Let me take one instance, and, in this, I disclaim any consideration of racial prejudice or any other kind of prejudice. You take any railway guide and you see there the timings of the various railways and you find

opposite the timings, particularly with reference to mail and express trains an indication where creature comforts may be obtained by the travelling public. *Chota Harri* at 6-30 at such and such a place, breakfast at 9-30 at such and such a place, lunch between 1 and 2 at such and such a place, evening tea at 4-30 at such and such a place, and dinner at 7-30 at such and such a place. Now, my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, must know that these timings and these facilities at these particular places can only be availed of by a very small, may I say, a microscopic, section of the travelling public. Some of us, who have accustomed ourselves to western ways, may have our breakfast at 9-30, lunch between 1 and 2, and dinner at 7-30, but my Honourable friend knows, none better, that the vast majority and the bulk of the travelling public cannot with any comfort utilise these hours for their meals. They want different hours altogether. They are not accustomed to breakfast at 9 o'clock, they are not accustomed to lunch at 1 o'clock. It seems to me that the facilities are so organised, the timings are so adjusted and the interval so given that it can only suit a very small section of the upper class passengers of the travelling public and that it has merely ignored the comforts or the necessities of the vast majority of the travelling public. We had occasion to refer to the severe competition of the bus with railway traffic and my Honourable friend, the Leader of the European Group, has, I understand, tabled a motion with reference to that question and suggesting ways and means by which this competition may not be aggravated without detriment either to the railway company or to the bus companies. Here is a case where the vast majority of the travelling public feel that their conditions of life are not recognised by the railway companies. It may be that in the early days, when these systems were first evolved, when the timings were first made, they were appropriate, but they are not appropriate at the present day. I am not here asking that any facilities should be taken away from the upper class passengers. In these days, when facilities can be given to these classes, without having those stoppages at that particular time, it does not mean any deprivation of the creature comforts of the upper class passengers at all. Let us imagine for a moment what would be the nature of comforts that would be required by a vast majority of the Indian public who are third class passengers, who, let me point out, are the very people that resort to bus traffic. The facilities that are necessary for these classes of passengers are that they should have their meals at the time at which they are accustomed to take their meals, and there should be sufficient interval for these meals and at those places there should be more elaborate arrangements for Indian refreshments and more space where they can sit down and have their meals between 11 and 11-30 with half an hour's interval. What is far more important is, that at important places, they should have facilities for bathing, say, a quarter of an hour. Let us imagine, if these facilities are given to the third class passengers, how comfortable these classes of passengers would feel in travelling. It must often be a sight for the Honourable the Commerce Member when he goes about in his tours to see a passenger having a small vessel and rushing off to a tap and trying to cleanse himself and to have a bath and his ablutions all performed within five minutes time when the train is about to start. If, on the other hand, you were to give these facilities to third class passengers, I venture to think that railway travelling will be much more popular than it is at the present day. Not only that, but the train timings and the way in which the trains travel from place to

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

place require revision. In England and in other places, where the competitive system of railway traffic exists, one is constantly struck by the fact that each system of railway tries to outbid the other in the sharpness with which it takes its passengers and the quickness with which it performs the journey. Nothing strikes one more than the competition between the various railway systems in England in their journey, for instance, from London to Edinburgh,—the Flying Scotsman, the Royal Scotsman and various other trains who try to compete with each other in a journey covering a distance of just over 300 miles; and yet a difference of 15 or 20 minutes makes all the difference between the manner in which they get their traffic and the manner in which they get passengers to travel by these railways. Here, where the railways are monopolists, except for rare occasions and in rare cases like the travel from Bombay to Delhi, the railway companies have their own timings and have their own rates of mileage and travelling. I am aware here also that timings have improved during the past and that railways make quicker journeys now than they used to do. Several trains have come into existence like the Madras Bombay Express train or some of the Express trains in the northern part of India where these timings have been speeded up. But, I venture to think that, still more can be done and has to be done.

To revert to an old subject which is so constantly stressed on the attention of this House, the Grand Trunk Express completes a journey of 1,350 miles or so in 49 hours. No other decent train on the broad gauge in this country takes so much time to complete so short a journey. The G. I. P. Railway does it in 36 hours, the B., B. and C. I. Railway does it in less time, the East Indian Railway takes almost the same time, but it has been left to this Grand Trunk Express to take an inordinately long time to complete this journey. The one Express train or Mail train or both combined which makes the journey from Madras to Delhi takes such an inordinate time that people find it much more easy and much less troublesome, and to a certain extent much quicker, to do the journey through Bombay rather than take up this straight journey from Madras and come to Delhi. The same thing is the case with the Calcutta Mail from Madras to Calcutta which takes 38 hours to do a distance of just over a thousand miles. It seems to me that these things also require revision.

I have been told that in these matters of time tables and speeding up of trains, the Local Advisory Committees have got various powers of advising these railway systems and that the Local Advisory Committees are the proper bodies and the meetings of the Local Advisory Committees are the proper forum where such questions may be discussed. I venture very humbly to make a suggestion. The Local Advisory Committee concerns itself only with the traffic in a particular area so that through trains are really outside their control and outside their ken. It is not possible for a Local Advisory Committee to adjust the time table when the train runs through many areas which concern different Local Advisory Committees. And I venture to suggest that the services of the Central Advisory Committee may be requisitioned where the train runs through many areas concerning many Local Advisory Committees, and that with reference to the timings of such through trains at least the advice and the suggestion of the Central Advisory Committee may be helpful to the various Railway Administrations.

Then, again, Sir, take the question of courtesy extended to railway passengers. My Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, very rightly

and very indignantly protested against the insinuation that discourtesy was a marked feature of the railway servants all over India. I agree that there are many hundreds and perhaps thousands of officers and staff of the Railway Department who are courteous to passengers, and not merely of the upper class but also the third class passengers. But there are a few who show marked discourtesy. I am not on the question of courtesy or discourtesy, but I want to suggest that there are ways and means by which what little discourtesy there may be can be negatived or eliminated. Take, in the first place, the question of a poor, ignorant and illiterate passenger going to a ticket window at the third class office in a railway station, specially a crowded station and perhaps a junction station, and trying to get his ticket. It is a phenomenon if he gets it in time and if he gets back his change in proper form. I do not want to make a very serious suggestion but more than once a passenger at any rate feels that he has not got back his proper change and that some one or other has done him down,—it may be that it is a fellow-passenger who has come up to help him in getting the change. Supposing at these places, where there is a rush at a large station, you employ one railway official who undertakes to get the ticket and the proper change on behalf of these illiterate passengers from the ticket window or, at any rate, supervise it from time to time, I venture to think that some at least of the difficulties of these railway passengers, who are unable to count their change or to find out whether the proper change has been given, will be to a certain extent minimised. It must be the experience of many who travel on these railways to find an unfortunate woman or even an illiterate man come up to you, place a ticket in your hand and the change, and say, "Please let me know whether I have got the proper change or not". Why should not the railway employ some man of its own staff to supervise these things in places where it is crowded and where it is easy for some one or other,—I do not directly suggest the railway ticket giver,—but some one or other to cheat these poor unfortunate people?

Take, again, the question of adequate travelling facilities by way of accommodation. My Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, has made a special study of this question and time after time he has pointed out that whereas the upper class passengers get a certain accommodation much more than what is due to them, the lower class passengers get what is very much less than that. I do not propose to have understood these somewhat mystical calculations of Mr. Joshi. I am at once prepared to concede that overcrowding is not a peculiar feature of the Indian railways, that in many railways overcrowding cannot be obviated at all and that in many railways overcrowding is a common feature of not merely the third class, but even of first class traffic. One has to travel on Continental railways to find that men with first class tickets travel all through the night in the small corridor standing, without any sitting space whatsoever, in all the cold and in all the discomfort of European travelling, particularly in winter. And, therefore, I recognise that no railway system in the world can mitigate the evils of overcrowding at particular times.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhamadan Rural): I hope the Honourable gentleman is aware that third class passengers on the Continental railways can get sleeping accommodation, and the sleeping compartments are different, while you have not got such a facility on the Indian railways.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I thought I had already answered that question. Passengers of no class in a Continental railway or in English railways or in American or in any other railways that I know of

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

gets sleeping accommodation automatically. They have got to buy a supplemental ticket for sleeping accommodation, whether they are third class passengers or first class passengers or second class passengers. It is only in this country that upper class passengers claim the right for sleeping accommodation and get that sleeping accommodation along with their ordinary ticket.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Is the Honourable gentleman prepared to recommend that the same facility can be provided, not automatically, but in the same manner in which it is provided on the Continental railways, for third class passengers with regard to sleeping accommodation?

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: Let me get on with my speech, specially as I am aware

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): No deduction will be made for these interruptions.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I am sorry I gave way out of courtesy to my esteemed friend. I hope my Honourable friend will realise that want of time and not lack of courtesy makes it impossible to pursue the very interesting suggestion that he has made.

I was suggesting that overcrowding is not an abnormal feature of Indian railways, but, taking all that into consideration, I still venture to think that more accommodation can be and ought to be provided for third class passengers.

Take, again, the question of fares which I raised the other day, fares which are abnormal in one system of railway as compared with another system of railway, fares which are very great in the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway and which are comparatively small in the North Western Railway, and fares which preclude passengers from taking advantage of travelling by these railways, because they are so exorbitant and because it is so much easier to travel by bus and avoid the discomforts of a railway journey. Now, it seems to me that it is a very short-sighted policy to stick to these high fares in these days when it is not possible to maintain such high fares to attract a certain amount of travelling public which is essential if the railways are to pay at all. I do not see why on the Company-managed railways there ought to be allowance made for such high fares, and why on the State-managed railways the Railway Board is in a position to reduce the fares from time to time.

I have already adverted to the fact that return tickets are unknown in many of these railways which are Company-managed—the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway and the broad gauge section of the South Indian Railway in particular, while such return fares are given on constant occasions very often and sometimes as a matter of perpetual routine in many other systems in North India. It seems to me that if railway travelling is to be made enjoyable and if railway travelling is to be made popular resort should be had to these things and I venture to express a very uneducated opinion on this subject when I say that, by reduction of these fares and by resort to a system of return tickets, the railway company will not lose, but will in the end gain. I hope the point will be borne in mind by the Railway Board and by the Commerce Member and that they will be able to do something in this direction also.

Now, Sir, however much we may plead for decentralisation of authority to the various Agents and to the various systems of railways, the Railway Board is peculiarly situated in this country and has a responsibility which it cannot divest itself of. The system is such that Agents of Company-managed railways play a very minor and very inferior part in the railway administration of this country. That is not properly appreciated when questions of administration come up. What, after all, does a Company-managed railway do? What is the money that it puts into the working of the system? The whole line is owned by the State; all major repairs are made by the State; the cost of renewal of stocks is borne by the State; the entire capital is furnished by the State. What the Company does is merely to manage the system and, to that extent, it puts in a very limited amount of capital. I have no desire at all in any way to depreciate the splendid work that Company-managed railways do; but I venture to think that Company-managed railways cannot be allowed to have their own way in many of these matters. May I say, while on this point, that there are Company-managed railways which have also seen to it that passenger traffic is properly regulated and that some conveniences are given to passengers? We are told that these are commercial concerns. But for the fact that this is reiterated time after time on the floor of this House, I would like to ask any Honourable Member whether, in travelling by these railway systems, he at any time is impressed with the fact that it is a commercial undertaking. Do you find on the part of any of the authorities that run these railways or of the staff any anxiety to see that the commercial concern prospers, an anxiety to see that the commercial concern attracts the necessary clientele, an anxiety to see that that clientele is satisfied, because it is a commercial concern? We have to remember that it is a commercial concern on paper, but, in the actual working, there is little difference between this concern and any other bureaucratic system of Administration; and I venture to say that, in spite of my friend, Mr. Dudhoria, it is the same whether it is a Company-managed system or whether it is State-owned and State-managed. Therefore, I plead for a re-orientation of policy as I began my speech . . .

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: I plead, therefore, for a re-orientation of policy, and I venture to reiterate that it is not by way of censure that I am moving this motion, but with a view to bringing large questions of policy before this House and for the consideration of the Railway Board, so that the passenger traffic will have further amenities given to them and the railways run merely as commercial concerns, attracting clientele and satisfying their clientele.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I wish to take part in this debate so that I may be able to draw the attention of the railway officials to certain matters with regard to the inconvenience experienced by poor Indian passengers. It is an admitted fact that almost all the railways in India allow concession in railway fare for all classes on the occasion of Christmas; but the same

[Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin.]

concession is denied in the case of pilgrims for Hedjaz to the Indian ports, pilgrims on the occasion of *Urs* to Ajmere, Delhi and certain other places. I think great injustice is being done to these pilgrims, because these gatherings are in no way less important than *Kumbh Melas* at Allahabad and Hardwar. In spite of the fact that no concession is allowed to these pilgrims, it is a matter of common knowledge that, with a view to disposing of the exceptionally strong rush of visitors, the railway authorities sometimes provide these third class pilgrim passengers with goods wagons and, on certain occasions, attach to the third class waiting rooms a few enclosures, very much like cages, without any water or urinal, where these passengers are locked up for hours to await the arrival of the next train. May I ask, if this practice is not highly objectionable and a disgrace to the Railway Board? For instance, I will quote the case of the Benares Cantonment Station which lies in my own constituency. Benares is a city where there is more or less a rush of Hindu passengers all round the year and the Cantonment Station is the one which is generally the most crowded: yet, in this important station, where there is commonly a preponderance of Hindu women passengers, all the platforms are quite open excepting a small nominal shed on one of them, and thus the pilgrims have perforce to be exposed to the scorching heat of the summer or get wet during the rains without any sort of protection provided for them by the railway authorities concerned. It is the third class pilgrims who suffer most in almost every season of the year. Another source of inconvenience to them in the Benares Cantonment Station is that though the down platform is provided with three exits, still, except on special occasions, however great be the rush, only one exit is opened in charge of a solitary Ticket Collector, with the result that the rush is greatly intensified and people have to suffer great discomfort and sometimes even actual physical pain on account of having to wait for a long time with their luggage and baggage before they can go in or come out. Yet another serious drawback is that on this very station there is hardly any arrangement on these platforms, none at least on the down platform, for cold drinking water and the sufferings of the general public, especially the women pilgrims can readily be understood without much elaboration. With your kind permission, Sir, I will quote a few sentences from the report submitted by Mr. Muhammad Ekram Khan, Magistrate, who was on duty at the Benares Cantonment Station on the 20th and 21st August, 1933, on the occasion of the solar eclipse:

"I reached there at about 12-45 A.M. and saw a great rush of pilgrims pouring into the station from all directions. The bridge gates on the top were locked up and there was a crowd gathered there. The right top gate of the bridge facing towards the Parcel Office was once opened to pass some passengers with the result that it was at once rushed by the gathering crowd, and as there is a slope in coming down, the women who were in front of the crowd fell down and the entire crowd passed over them resulting in serious injuries to their faces and side of the ribs. They were removed to the Railway Hospital by the Samiti people, but unfortunately there was nobody there to attend to them, and so I phoned to the Health Officer to arrange for their removal to any other Hospital and requested one of the Samiti people to look after them and see that they were removed to a City Hospital

Between 4 and 5 P.M., it began to rain. The pilgrims were entirely wet and wanted to enter the platform towards the side where the Police office is for sitting under shade, but they were driven back by the Ticket Collectors and on my questioning one of them he replied that he could not allow them to come to the platforms by such illegal entrance. On the whole the arrangements at the Cantonment Station were entirely unsatisfactory."

The Railway Administrations are largely dependent on third class passengers for their earnings, and, in spite of the fact that these poor passengers are their golden customers, the railways do not take proper care of their comforts. If I mistake not, ninety per cent. of the income is derived by the sale of third class tickets, but I am sorry to say that the third class passengers are almost ignored everywhere. I hope the House will agree with me that these poor passengers are the main pillars of the Administration on which the railways of India stand, and so they deserve to be provided with adequate comforts and other advantages in every respect.

In this connection let me invite the attention of the railway officials that, during summer months, it is very necessary to have one or two fans provided in each third class compartment. Sir, electric energy is not very costly, because the railways themselves produce this energy on the train at almost a nominal cost, while, on the other hand, the proposed improvement in the third class carriages will attract the travelling public to patronise the railways more liberally in preference to the rival concern, I mean the motor transport. Apart from adding to the comforts of the travelling public, it would no doubt make the railways more popular, and so more paying. It is a business proposition, Sir,—“A satisfied customer is the best asset”.

In conclusion, I wish to make an appeal to my Honourable and esteemed friend in charge of the Department to consider these comments sympathetically and do his best to have the inconvenience removed as soon as possible.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Sir, the Honourable the Mover of this motion, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, said that he did not propose this motion as a censure upon Government. I propose to speak in order to censure Government. My friend, Mr. Ramaswami, also said that Government should now adopt a new orientation in their policy. I ask the Government of India to do the same. I feel that the policy which they had followed in the matter of the passenger traffic was a wrong one, and it requires a new orientation.

Mr. President, I have been placing certain figures before the Legislature year after year. My friend, the Diwan Bahadur, said that they were mystical. There is no mystery in those figures at all. These figures are given in the Reports which are circulated to us every year, and I shall quote some of them again. There is only one seat for 12 first class passengers, or we may say that one first class seat is used 12 times in a year. There is one seat for 90 second class passengers, or we may say that one second class seat is used 90 times in a year, while there is one seat for 400 third class passengers, or we may say that one third class seat is used 400 times in a year. It must be admitted that a first class seat is used longer,—the average travelling of a first class seat is each time 180 miles, that of the second class seat is 60 miles, and that of the third class seat is 35 miles. In order to give advantage to first and second class seats of longer travelling, I shall change the figures giving them that advantage, and we shall then find that a first class seat is used 60 times instead of 12 times, a second class seat is used 180 times, and a third class seat is used 400 times. This fact clearly shows without the slightest doubt that either we have a smaller number of third class seats or we are

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

overstocked with first and second class seats. A first class seat is not used more than 60 days in a year,—it is not used for 365 days, but only for 60 days in a year, and that too, at the rate of 35 miles per day. This fact clearly shows one thing that the Government of India pay greater attention to the higher class traffic than they should pay to third class traffic, and I ask the Government of India not to do this, not merely on humanitarian grounds, although they are good, but on commercial and business grounds. Now, what do the Government of India get from each third class seat, each second class seat and from each first class seat? I shall give the result presently. The Government of India get Rs. 208 per first class seat. There is no mystery about it. They get from each second class seat Rs. 236, and from each third class seat they get Rs. 241. This is the average for the year. It is true that an individual first class passenger pays more, but there is absolutely no doubt that the Government of India get less on the whole from a first class seat than they get from a third class seat. A first class passenger pays only Rs. 208 per seat, while the third class passenger pays Rs. 241 for the third class for the accommodation which the Government of India provide. I shall go into one more commercial fact

Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural): Are Government officials included in the first class seats?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Yes. Now, what does a first class seat cost? The Government of India have got bogies . . .

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: They have got many bogies.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: A bogie of 12 first and 18 second class seats costs about Rs. 50,000 and 114 third class seats cost Rs. 30,000. So one first class seat and 1½ second class seat will cost the Government of India about Rs. 4,000. Now, the money made out of one first class seat and 1½ second class seat is 562. The Government of India make Rs. 562 by investing Rs. 4,000, while, by investing Rs. 260 on a third class seat, they make Rs. 241. Now, one fact is clear that it is a good proposition to increase the number of third class seats and reduce the number of first class seats. I do not wish to go any more into these figures.

Mr. President, after having gone through these figures and considered them carefully, what I feel is that if the Government of India are really bent upon making the railways a commercial concern, they must pay greater attention to that part of their customers which pays them the best. Unfortunately, we find that they give greater attention to those people who really do not deserve attention. Whatever attention you may pay them, it will not pay you at all. My own view is that, in this poor country of ours, there is no need for a first class. First class will never pay, whatever comforts you may give the first class passengers. The number of people who can travel first class in India is very small indeed. Let us see who will travel first class in India. I generally estimate that people whose monthly income is more than Rs. 1,000 may travel first class, I do not say that all of them will. How many people are there in India whose annual income is more than Rs. 12,000? Let us go into the

income-tax figures, and we will find that there are not more than 25,000 people in this country whose income is more than Rs. 12,000 a year. Take the agriculturists who have got large incomes of, say, Rs. 10,000. Their total number will not be more than 5,000 in the whole of India—people who can afford to travel first class. My estimate is that, in the whole of India, the number of people who can travel first class is not more than 30,000 or 40,000. It is for these 30,000 to 40,000 people that we are providing 40,000 seats. How are these 40,000 people going to give you much traffic whatever attention you may give to them? My feeling is that, if the Government of India are bent on making the railways a commercial proposition, they should abolish first class. That is the best remedy, because first class in India will never pay. If first class is to be maintained at all, it must be maintained out of the money which is given by the third class passengers. I, therefore, think that on the whole Government should give greater attention to that traffic which is likely to pay, that is what the commercial people do, that is what our industrialists have done. Take, for instance, the cotton textile industry. What sort of custom do they cater for? They cater for the masses in this country, because they know that it is the masses that will purchase their goods and not the small number of aristocrats in this country. There is one more point to be remembered in the matter of the first class, and that is, who is maintaining the first class? Not the private people generally. I can say that, out of the 40,000 people who can travel in first class in India, nearly half of them are paid by the Government themselves. The first class is maintained by people who are paid by the Government. What is the use of Government taking away money from one Department, that is, the Finance Department, and paying it into the other Department, namely, the Railway Department? I, therefore, feel that the time has come when the Honourable Member in charge of the Department and the Members of the Legislature themselves should pay serious attention to the question of reorganising our passenger traffic system. They should make an examination and see what traffic in India will pay, what traffic will not pay, and they should give their attention to that traffic which is likely to pay.

Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar (Nominated Non-Official): Won't you suggest a Committee, to travel the whole of India, of the Members of the Legislature?

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I will seriously propose to the Government of India that the problem is so important and so urgent that they should certainly appoint a Committee to investigate this matter. I have been speaking on this subject for many years. It is a misfortune that it does not receive the attention that it deserves, either from the Government or even from this Legislature. I do not blame anybody. I feel that the Government of India consist of people who make use of the first class, who get the benefit of travel by first class, at least to some extent at some cost of the third class passengers. We who form the Legislature are also those who get some benefit by travelling first class at the expense of the third class passengers, and it is, therefore, quite natural that we should neglect that problem. I shall give you a small instance.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member should now conclude.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I shall not, therefore, give you any instance, but what I shall do is this. I shall certainly urge upon the Government the appointment of a Committee to go seriously into this matter and find out what traffic will pay them and what traffic will not pay. If they find that the first class and second class traffic does not pay, let them abolish that traffic, there is no harm in it. Let them, as good commercial men, pay attention to that traffic which will pay, and I have no doubt that if the Government of India are good business men, they will canvass third class traffic by giving them greater comforts, by doing them mere justice, they will make the railways successful. Mr. President, I have done.

Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak soon after Mr. Joshi's able speech. He has given us a treat this morning which we should all remember. It is such figures that stagger the minds of mere politicians, that show with what force the cause of third class passengers can be pleaded if one has got the mind to do it. I hope that the Honourable the Railway Member will give very serious attention to what has fallen from the lips of my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, in this connection.

There are quite a big catalogue of grievances of the third class passengers but I am not going to deal with them. I shall only speak on one very important matter today, and I hope that the Honourable Member will seriously consider it, I mean, the running of trains between Lahore and Howrah and Delhi and Howrah. Before October last, the trains used to run between Delhi and Calcutta and Lahore and Calcutta in a manner which gave satisfaction to people generally. But when the talk went on that there was going to be made some alteration in the running of trains between Delhi and Calcutta, I remember very serious agitation took place in the capital of Bihar. The Bihar Chamber of Commerce came out with a very strong protest in this connection. They did not like that the fast train between Delhi and Calcutta should be diverted through the Grand Chord *via* Gaya which comparatively is not so important to Bihar as the main line is. Thereafter, we found public meetings being held in order to protest against any diversion of the train. The Muslim Chamber of Commerce came out with a resolution on the subject soon after that. So, practically all bodies in Bihar protested against the diversion, but the result was that it was not listened to, and now what we find is this. Two fast trains from Lahore run up to Calcutta and two fast trains from Delhi run up to Calcutta every day. Both the fast trains from Lahore to Calcutta run *via* the main line, that is, *via* Patna, the capital of Bihar, while the two fast trains from Delhi to Calcutta go *via* Grand Chord through Gaya. I do not know what wisdom there is in running the fast trains *via* the same route. It would have been easy to provide that one of the fast trains from Lahore to Calcutta should go *via* the main line and the other fast train *via* the Grand Chord, and similarly in the case of the two fast trains from Delhi to Calcutta. It was a very simple suggestion. I think some other influences were working behind the change proposed that this simple request of the people of Bihar was not attended to. Even here, when the Assembly sat, we tried to bring it to the notice of the higher authorities in Delhi, but we were not listened to. I had written a letter to the Chief Operating Officer at Calcutta, pointing out the difficulties of the third class passengers going from Delhi to Patna, but in reply he ignored the very ground on which I wrote my letter. He said that facilities had been provided for higher class passengers, because there was a bogie attached at

Patna which ran up to Delhi and from Delhi to Patna in the other direction, and that that was quite enough for those who travelled in the higher class, while I had pleaded the cause of the lower class passengers, and there was no reply to that. It appears that there is determined opposition to looking to the interests of third class passengers even when pressure is brought to bear upon the E. I. R. authorities. That is my grievance and I hope that my views, which have been expressed here, will not go in vain. I hope that the Honourable Member—and there are so many others also who are looking into these affairs—would consider this question very seriously and see that the third class passengers are not put to trouble.

The Honourable Member may know that fast trains run between Delhi and Patna in only 16 or 17 hours, while the other trains take no less than 21 hours. Now, mark the difference of time if one takes the other trains. I hope that this matter will be seriously considered by the authorities and that no time will be lost in diverting Nos. 7 and 8 Express trains, which are generally known, on account of their speed, as *Tufan Mails*, to Calcutta *via* the main line, through the capital of Bihar, I mean Patna, and divert the other fast train from Lahore which goes *via* the main line to the chord line through Gaya. That will serve the purpose of the railway authorities.

There is one other suggestion I should like to make on that account. If the Railway Authorities give third class bogies in the Calcutta-Delhi Mail trains, the third class passengers get the advantage of having fast trains from Calcutta to Delhi on that Mail, but the other Mail, which runs from Calcutta to Lahore *via* the main line has not got that advantage, I do not know why should that train not offer the same advantage which the Calcutta-Delhi Mail has got. Some third class bogies might be attached to the Calcutta-Lahore Mail, so that the same advantage may be gained by the people travelling *via* Patna. There should be no more trouble in that too if it is possible to attach third class bogies to the Calcutta-Delhi Mail. There is no reason why the same convenience should not be given to the lowest class passengers on the Lahore and Calcutta Mails.

Besides this, I have got one more point to add. It is in regard to the B. N. W. Railway. On that railway, we find third class passengers are generally treated as cattle even now. I was very much surprised to hear our friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, saying that overcrowding was not an abnormal feature of the railways in India. It appears that he has been in a part of the country where people are treated like human beings. On the B. N. W. Railway, even now I find that people have got to remain catching the handle of the trains while travelling. That is the sort of thing that is going on even now. So few trains run between certain stations, although the traffic is very large. Complaints into this matter are not looked into by the Agent of the B. N. W. Railway. I have complained about this to the Advisory Committees, but they plead helplessness. Their advice is not listened to by the authorities.

Again, what do I find at Sonepur, a very important station, on the B. N. W. Railway? The stall keepers are at the mercy of some of the contractors. I know of a Pathan stall keeper who used to supply us with tea and some small refreshments. He has been shoved aside, simply because he refused to pay very exorbitant rates by the contractors. I asked him what was the rate that was charged, and he said that he was asked to pay five times more than he was paying before. I do not know how such a large sum could be demanded from a stall keeper in order that he might provide good tea and small refreshments to the people on the platform. That state of things is simply surprising to us. These hawkers on the

[Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi.] |

platform are meant for the convenience of the public. They are not meant to be squeezed by the contractors who are in the good books of the railway authorities. That practice should be abandoned at once. I hope that the authorities would try to see that the stall keepers on the B. N. W. Railway, so far as I know anything of that railway, are not squeezed in the manner in which they are being done at the Sonepur Railway Station.

These are the points to which I want to draw the attention of the Honourable the Railway Member. I have confined myself to these points, so that attention may be drawn to them.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): I should like to say a few words on this motion. I would like, in the first place, to remind Mr. Joshi that in recent years there has been considerable improvement over most of the railways in the rolling stock available. Any one, who has travelled within the last ten years, cannot but realise the fact that improvements have taken place in the rolling stock relating to all classes of railway travelling. At the same time, I do recognise the great force in his plea for continued improvement, particularly in the lower class accommodation. I should not be expected, of course, to go as far as he did and suggest that the upper class accommodation should be abolished.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: I did not say it should be abolished. I said "If it does not pay its way".

Mr. F. E. James: I think it would be a mistake on commercial grounds to cut out any form of traffic at the present moment. I think there is a very strong case for the most drastic measures in regard to cutting out obsolete rolling stock. Today is a time when this can be done probably more cheaply than at any other time. In my recent travels about the country, I have seen lower class compartments which are really a disgrace to any Railway Administration. I won't specify the railways, but I am quite prepared to give the information to my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, and it seems to me there is a very strong case for much more drastic action in regard to cutting out a great deal of that which now exists in favour of improved and better and new accommodation and, as far as that plea is concerned, I would certainly join my friend, Mr. Joshi, in urging that the Railway Board should give increased attention to that matter in the near future. I think it is the experience of those who travel extensively, that in recent years the number of Indian passengers using intermediate and second class accommodation shows a very great tendency to increase, and I would enter a very strong plea for an increase in the accommodation of most trains which are likely to be used by middle class Indian passengers. I have not made the exhaustive study of the figures which Mr. Joshi has made. I am merely speaking from my own personal experience as one who has travelled a great deal throughout India during recent years, and I do know that nowadays on many of the important trains in the country second class accommodation is over-crowded with Indian passengers. I think it is a mistake not to recognize that, with the increase in the standard of living, with the increase in the tendency of the Indian public to travel, there is, naturally, a desire for better class accommodation, and that desire has constantly and to a very large extent, as far as my experience goes, been for more intermediate and particularly second class accommodation. I think that is a matter which might be given special attention to by the Railway Board.

There is one small matter which I should like to mention, and that is the question of servants accommodation on some of the Company-owned railways. I have had recently bitter experience of that. I am aware that the matter has been largely attended to as far as the State railways are concerned, and I believe also that some of the Company-owned railways are now careful to provide adequate servants' accommodation for upper class passengers; but there are Companies, particularly in the South of India, where there is practically no accommodation provided even on important mail trains for servants. I speak from personal experience. On two successive journeys which I recently took on mail trains, although the number of upper class passengers was considerable—I think in one case there were about 17 or 18 passengers (with servants) in the upper class compartments,—there was not a single servants' compartment, and it was only on representations made at the station itself that I was able to secure accommodation for my servant and the servants of some of my colleagues who were also travelling on the same train. I suggest that it should be compulsory that, where upper class accommodation is provided, servants' accommodation should also be provided in the same train.

Sir, there is one general observation I should like to make. I am not sure whether it should come in here or it should come up later when we discuss the general question of road-rail competition, but it really relates to a suggestion made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi. He seemed to think that the appointment of a Committee might focus the attention of the authorities on the desirability of increasing the amenities of a certain class of travel. I have no faith in committees, particularly in regard to this matter, but what I do suggest—it may have been under consideration, I do not know—is that a leaf should be taken out of the book of the English railways, who, in the last three or four years, have devoted considerable attention to what I may call the "marketing of the commodity of travel". We are having marketing schemes in regard to various commodities: travel is a commodity in the sense of every other commodity, in that it is a thing which you want to sell on an increasing scale.

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): They do it better here than they do it in England, because they push them all into goods wagons here!

Mr. F. E. James: My Honourable friend has misunderstood what I am saying—for which he is, of course, not to blame. My point is that there should be some method whereby an attempt should be made to push travel among the classes of Indians who take particularly the third class accommodation. That can only be done if the amenities are increased. It can only be done if there is some attempt to deal with overcrowding, which takes place to a most distressing extent on many of the important trains; and it can only be done if, in the attempt to sell this form of travel, attention is paid to the rival salesman who is selling his travel most successfully in buses. Now, it is the well-known experience of everybody in this House that if you travel by bus, you find that not only you are treated with the greatest respect, but you are put down at places where sometimes you ought not to be put down, the buses stop for your convenience, and whenever you go to a stopping place in a village or in a town or a square, immediately both the driver and the conductor join in a magnificent advertising campaign inviting people to travel on their buses and very often offering the most alluring inducements. I do not, of course, want the railways really to follow them in exactly the same way. But here you have a form of travel which believes in pushing its own way among the people who form the

[Mr. F. E. James.]

bulk of the passengers. My friend Mr. Joshi, suggests that a Committee is required. I would rather put it that "salesmen" are required to go into the whole question of lower class accommodation—its appeal to the people, the travelling capacity of various districts, the question of special rates and concessions, and in fact the whole field of marketing. If an experiment were tried in that connection on one railway, if a suitable person could be found to make an inquiry along those lines, it might be of very great value to the railways generally. Of course the kind of selling by advertisement is not the kind which I saw in the cinema last night. I was watching the advertisements with interest. I suddenly saw an advertisement to the effect that as from the 1st April—I think it was—the old enhanced fares will come into force on the Kalka-Simla line. It occurred to me that that was a very inappropriate announcement in view of the references to that line which were made two or three days ago. The railways have got to meet increasing competition and they can only meet that competition successfully by offering wares that are at least as attractive as the wares which are offered by the other forms of transport.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I approach this question first from the point of view of policy. It appears to me that the issue involved in this cut is a most important one for which the Railway Board should be responsible. Sir, every year we are raising the same points that have now been raised or will be raised, and the question is—why is it that they are not being attended to, or why amenities on the railways are not being improved upon, and why is it that conveniences are not going to be increased? The reply I find is only of the type that we get every day in the House, namely, when these cuts are discussed in the House and debated upon, the speeches are merely transmitted to the Agents and the Agents do what they like without any responsibility. When we come again to raise the same question, the reply is that it is the responsibility of the Agent, with which the Railway Board has nothing to do. Sir, if this is the procedure by which the Railway Board want to increase these amenities, I do not think it redounds any credit on them. Sir, it is the responsibility of the Railway Board to call for reports in detail on those points which are placed before them at a time as this. In the answers to questions from day to day we are simply told, for instance: "We cannot interfere, there is no appeal, or, if there is an appeal to the Agent, we cannot do anything more." Sir, while we are putting all these points before the Railway Department at the time of this Budget, it is their duty to take note of them, and unless the Agents are asked to make a report on each and every point raised in this House, there will be no improvement worth the name in the required amenities.

Now, coming to the question of inconveniences, the first point I would make is that there are not many direct trains. If you have direct trains, then the question of competition with motor buses will also be solved. Let me ask if there is a direct train between important places like Karachi on the one side and Delhi on the other. There is none. People have to go via Lahore, to have many transshipments, and then reach late. Is it not necessary that a train of that nature should run between the capital city of Delhi and the most important port, Karachi? Now, that question has been raised often here, but with what result? No result at all. I am in possession of certain facts given to me by some members

of the Local Advisory Committee at Karachi that they and the commercial communities of Karachi had asked for a direct train and had also shown the necessity for it between Delhi and Karachi. Yet the train has not been introduced on that line. What we find is this that, in order to make a show, the Agent was enacting his own machinations. He put a direct composite carriage from Karachi to Delhi to be run only during the Christmas time. That is only adding insult to injury. Then, what did they do subsequently? I find that now there is a compartment going from Delhi up to Samasatta only, and it consists of intermediate and third class only. I do not object to the classes, but why not take that compartment right up to Karachi? Why should there be this transshipment at Samasatta? Further on, even this compartment, which is now being run, is threatened to be stopped. Is not this, Sir, playing with us? Now, as I was coming from Sind, I found that at Samasatta they were taking the census of persons who were travelling by the intermediate class. There may be a few passengers who go direct from here to Karachi, but on the way we see that that compartment becomes full with intermediate class passengers getting in from intermediate stations. The same is the case with third class passengers. Now, if, on the basis of this census, they stop that convenience also, it will be wholly unjustifiable. Sir, unless the Railway Board are going to introduce direct trains and afford greater facilities to the travelling public, the Board should not exist. I submit that the Railway Board would be doing yeoman service to the country if they look into these points themselves and not that when they are brought to their notice they should only pass them on to the Agents. We know how these Agents do their business. Because of the duplication of work and other difficulties, they leave these matters to smaller clerks, who generally make time-tables, etc.

The second point is that trains should run swifter. I would give an instance of that too. It was an idea that the Karachi Mail from Karachi to Lahore should run swifter so that passengers might not be inconvenienced and they might take lesser time. What they did was that between Lodhran and Khaneval they built a chord which cost them 30 lakhs of rupees. For several years the Mail train was run by that shorter cut, thus saving an hour and a half. But since lately the chord line has been abandoned more or less for Mail and Express trains, and only very slow trains are running *via* the Chord. Now, why is this done? I came to know from a member of the Advisory Committee that the Mail and Express trains have stopped running by that Chord, because the officers do not want to travel by that route, owing to its dusty condition. Is this the proper reason to take away the Mail train from the shorter route and lose all the money that they spent on the Chord line? These things should be considered properly.

I next come to the convenience of the third and intermediate class passengers. Sir, the Agent who travels in his saloon sees nothing and thinks that matters are getting on all right. But if Members of the Railway Board were to look into the condition of travel of third and intermediate class passengers, they will find out the defects. This time I came *via* Samasatta, and I went to see the toilet room in the intermediate class. There I found a hole, something like the Black Hole. Its length was three feet or so and the width was about two feet. They have put up a looking glass there in that rickety carriage and also a commode, but there was hardly any space to stand. Sir, this is the convenience which they have provided in the intermediate class. The same

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

is the case with the closets of third class passengers. There is not space enough even to stand. These are the points which should be looked into by the Railway Board. Then, in the third and intermediate class toilet rooms there are no lights, absolutely no lights. Then, again, there are no fans in the third and intermediate class carriages. We are told from time to time every year that there will be fans, but they have not yet been introduced. The fare of the intermediate class has been increased, but the fans have not yet been provided for in those carriages.

Then, with regard to waiting rooms for intermediate class passengers. I do not grudge the waiting rooms for passengers who travel by higher classes and I do not agree with my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, that the first class carriages should be done away with. But the convenience of all the passengers should be equally met with. The third and intermediate class passengers, being in the majority, should be given more convenience. For a very very long time there has been the demand that there ought to be waiting rooms for intermediate class passengers. Has that demand been put into execution? Only at one or two stations we find intermediate class waiting rooms, but they are intended only for ladies. The ladies go to these waiting rooms, but the gentlemen have to walk about on the platforms. But in the case of the first and second class passengers, there are waiting rooms, both for ladies and gentlemen. My point is this that these inconveniences have been felt for a long time and they must be remedied. Here is my learned friend on my side who points out to me that there are fans even in the first class latrines. Now, Sir, is that a necessity? But the point is that if the policy of the Railway Board is changed, then the Agents will also learn a lesson. But if you are just going to leave everything to them, they become bad boys. Sir, if we ask the Divisional Officer to do a certain thing, he refers to the Agent. The Agent gives him orders just in the manner he is dictated to in his own headquarters. He is, therefore, not in a position to realise the local conditions, and so I agree with the suggestion that was made that the Central Local Advisory Committees should be taken into confidence on these questions. Coming to the point of the Local Advisory Committees, what powers have you given to them? They make only suggestions, the Agents receive them by one ear and let them off through the other.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member should now conclude.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I will conclude presently. I submit that there are many inconveniences to the intermediate and third class passengers, and it is the duty of the Railway Board to look into them. I, therefore, hope that, next time, unless the ill-constituted Statutory Board comes in and even the little power that we have got of ventilating our grievances is gone, it will not be necessary to discuss the same grievances now pointed out.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: Sir, I must begin by thanking my Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, for his very fair criticism and, above all, for the constructive suggestions which he has made. I can assure him that the Railway Department welcome and are always grateful for such suggestions, for, I believe that we are both working to

the same end and nothing is to be gained on the one side by carping criticism, or, on the other side, by treating fair criticism as if it deserved no attention whatsoever. I do not believe that there is any very great difference between most Honourable Members opposite and ourselves so far as theory and principle are concerned, but the real question is, how far we can actually go in practice. Honourable Members are aware that we have inherited a system from the old days and it is impossible to make a radical alteration in a year or two. Alteration can only come gradually and what I would like to impress upon the House this morning is that we have never stood still, there has been a steady improvement from year to year, and I hope I will be able to show by reference to figures that that claim is fully justified. The first point that I would ask the House to bear in mind is this, that there must be some relation between the fare that is charged and the amenities and the conveniences that are provided.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: By all means.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré: I should be glad if the House would bear with me and listen to certain information which I have just had handed to me. It is a statement compiled from the Railway Statistics of the United States of America for 1930. The figures represent average fares, but I think this will give the House some idea as to comparative fares here and elsewhere in the world. These charges are shown in American cents. In Norway, the charge is 3.04 cents per mile, per passenger; the Canadian railways 2.756; Argentine 2.31; Great Britain 1.46; France .75; China 1.80; Italy 1.61; Germany 1.154; Japan .93 and India .61. There are only two countries in this list, namely, Czecho-Slovakia and Belgium where the charge is less, namely, .58 and .59, respectively. I do hope that Honourable Members will realise that we have constantly to decide between the conflicting claims of lower third class fares and the provision of extra amenities. But Honourable Members will, I hope, also realise that there has been steady progress from year to year in this matter. Take, for instance, the question of rolling stock and seating accommodation for third class passengers. I would point out that while I frankly admit that in regard to the older stock, complaints are fully justified, definite steps are being taken to improve third class rolling stock. All the new stock is mounted on standard under-frames, and the result is that there is practically no difference whatsoever in riding between lower class and high class stock. The under-frame is exactly the same in first class bogies as in third class bogies. That, I think, Honourable Members will admit, is a step in the right direction. Then there is another point. In the old stock, provision was made in a single vehicle for 132 passengers and two latrines. In the new stock, there is provision for four compartments with 114 passengers only and five latrines. I shall be happy if I can get the opportunity to show to Members of the Central Advisory Committee, who may be interested in the matter, the new stock, so that they can satisfy themselves that there has been some definite progress in the plan and construction of the new bogies for third class passengers.

Then, Sir, take the question of accommodation provided for individual passengers. We provide something like 19½ inches for each passenger and that compares with just under 20 inches provided for third class passengers on the railways of the United Kingdom. I think Honourable Members will admit that the comparison is by no means to our discredit.

[Sir Joseph Bhole.]

When we come to the question of over-crowding, we are, of course, dealing with a very difficult matter indeed. So far as the space provided is concerned, I do not think there can be any legitimate ground of complaint. It happens that passengers, for their own reasons, often desire to travel by a certain train and in very many instances in a certain compartment. The question is whether it is doing a kindness to these people to keep them back for a later train or permit them to undertake the journey under conditions of a certain degree of discomfort. Honourable Members will realise that it is not always possible to add additional carriages especially where a train is loaded to full capacity, nor is it always possible to duplicate trains, because there may not in all circumstances be sufficient passengers to fill the additional train. I hope that Honourable Members will be satisfied that in this matter of over-crowding, we are doing what we can. We are taking a periodical census to ascertain whether there is habitual over-crowding, and I can assure the House that the figures that we have received do not support the suggestion that over-crowding is a normal feature of third class travel on Indian railways. My Honourable friend, Mr. Mudaliar, quite rightly pointed out that over-crowding was not peculiar to the Indian railways. That, however, I frankly admit, is no argument why we should not attempt to improve matters if they are really found to call for improvement. (Applause.)

Then, Sir, the question of civility to passengers has been raised. I can assure my Honourable friends in this House that the most stringent orders have been issued from here in relation to that matter. I have every reason to believe that complaints of incivility are less than they used to be, and, I am sure, that conditions in this particular direction will continue to improve. We have also advised railway administrations to see that special care is taken to select Enquiry Clerks and we have suggested that they should be men who are imbued with a spirit of social service.

My Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, made a very valuable suggestion in regard to affording aid, specially to ignorant ^{1 P.M.} third class passengers. May I inform the House that we actually already do have at certain important stations guides whose duty it is to assist and advise passengers, mainly third class passengers? Unfortunately, Sir, the state of our finances has not enabled us to increase their number, but the matter will be borne in mind, and I can assure the Honourable Member that, if more can be done in this direction, we shall certainly endeavour to do so.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Navalrai, offered a panacea for bus competition with the railways. He said that if we had direct through communication between Karachi and Delhi, the question of bus competition would be solved. I am quite well aware of the fact that unfortunately there is no direct communication between Karachi and Delhi, but I was not aware of the fact that there was direct bus connection between Karachi and Delhi.

Sir, I think that a statement of what we really have done in regard to matters which are of vital interest, so far as third class passengers are concerned, over a period of years, will help to emphasise the statement that I made at the beginning of my speech that we really are endeavouring to do what we can to secure improvements. Honourable Members will realise that in the last five or six years we have necessarily

been hampered by the limited funds at our disposal, and the expenditure on these objects has, therefore, had to be cut down. Nevertheless, I think the figures that I shall give to the House will assure them that the matter is being steadily pursued and is being prominently kept before our eyes. During the last nine years we spent on improving the water supply at various stations, 42 lakhs; on providing waiting rooms and halls, 82 lakhs, ;

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): For which class of passenger?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: For all classes of passengers. My Honourable friend must surely know that first class passengers do not as a rule go and take water from the taps provided at the railway stations.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: No, I refer to waiting rooms.

The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore: I beg your pardon. Waiting rooms were mainly for third class passengers. Then, for Indian refreshment rooms, 25 lakhs, latrines and sanitary arrangements, 21 lakhs; raised platforms,—and I am sure this will be of interest to my friend, Mr. Gopika Romon Roy, from Assam,—45 lakhs. In the total, we have spent something like 242 lakhs on these items which are all directed towards improving conveniences and amenities. And I may also bring to the notice of the House that we have provided in the coming Budget, despite the fact that we are facing another deficit, a sum of something like 38 lakhs to be spent on improving amenities for passengers, mostly third class passengers. I think a sum of something like 25 lakhs is to be spent on improving rolling stock and providing suitable third class vehicles.

I hope, Sir, that I have said sufficient to satisfy Honourable Members that we are endeavouring to do what we possibly can in this matter. As I said, I think their object and ours is the same, to secure as much popularity as we can for the Indian railways and to make conditions,—and I include, of course, conditions for third class passengers,—as comfortable as we possibly can. We on our side welcome practical suggestions from all quarters, and I can assure this House that while it is not possible for me to refer to every suggestion that has been made in the course of the debate, every suggestion will subsequently be carefully examined in the Railway Board's office. I hope, Sir, that, in view of what I have said, my Honourable friend will not press his motion.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: Sir, as I said at the very beginning of this debate, I have no intention of pressing this to a division as I do not look upon this as a censure motion. I had only intended to bring prominently to the notice of the Honourable Member and the Railway Board certain specific suggestions to improve the travelling facilities and amenities to the public, and specially the third class passengers. I had a feeling that my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, thought that in the course of my speech I suggested that overcrowding for all classes of passengers was not an evil and that it should not be mitigated. I did nothing of the kind. I only suggested that overcrowding was not a peculiar feature of the Indian railways and that overcrowding existed even with reference to higher class passengers in Continental railways. At the

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

same time, if I remember aright, I wound up by suggesting that more accommodation may be provided for third class passengers, so that some of the worst features of overcrowding may be mitigated in their case.

Sir, I am thankful to the Honourable the Railway Member for the sympathetic reply that he has given, and I say that not in an ordinary sense of formal courtesy extended to him, but as I am firmly convinced that he does mean to treat the whole question sympathetically. If the House will permit me, I should like to withdraw my motion.

The cut motion was, by leave of the Assembly, withdrawn.

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

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

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair has been informed that the Centre Party do not wish to move a cut motion of their own, but that the discussion on the Statutory Railway Authority might be carried over. So the discussion on the Statutory Railway Board will commence now and we shall continue it over tomorrow till the luncheon interval.

Mr. K. C. Neogy (Dacca Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I make a suggestion, Sir, that in view of the extreme importance of the subject, that you will be pleased to relax the time limit on occasions, having regard also to the fact that we have got more time at our disposal?

Raja Bahadur G. Krishnamachariar: And one more hour after lunch, Sir; you were kind enough to tell us that you would also give us time till 12 Noon tomorrow.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty). The Chair will close the discussion at 3-15 tomorrow afternoon.

Raja Bahadur G. Kishnamachariar: And will you also kindly enlarge the time limit?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Of course the mere fact that the subject is very important would mean that a great many Members would like to take part, and, therefore, Honourable Members should impose a time limit upon themselves; but in very exceptional cases the Chair will relax the limit.

Statutory Railway Board.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg to move:

‘That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced by Rs. 100.’—
Statutory Railway Board.

I have put down this motion with the object of discussing the policy underlying the proposed creation of the Statutory Railway Authority. In discussing this question, I am anxious to secure a dispassionate consideration without the importation of heat or other extraneous matters into the debate. I will proceed straight to give very briefly the history of how this proposal came before the public view.

We find that the Federal Structure Committee in para. 9 of their report have made the following recommendation:

"In this connection the sub-committee take note of the proposal that a Statutory Railway Authority should be established and are of opinion that this should be done if after expert examination this course seems desirable."

This little paragraph has been pitchforked into the report without a full discussion in that Committee and without the consent of all the members. I am in a position to prove my statement when I refer to certain members of that Committee who made strong protests against the way in which this proposal was embodied in that report. I find that Mr. Jinnah, when the draft report of the sub-committee was under discussion, said as follows:

"I do not think that that subject was at all discussed, and yet I find it is in the report."

Then the Lord Chancellor, who presided, said:

"The subject was discussed: His Highness of Bikaner made a great number of remarks about it on one occasion and discussed the Statutory Board and gave a long account of his own railways."

To this, Mr. Jinnah said:

"We definitely make a recommendation here and I doubt whether we discussed whether such a recommendation should be made."

Then the Chairman said:

"Very well, I will make a note of that."

This point was again taken up by the Rt. Honourable Mr. Sastri who said as follows:

"I agree with Mr. Jinnah as to the proposition he laid down with regard to the proposal made here upon the subject of railways. When we constituted a Railway Finance Committee and it was proposed to separate it from the general finances of the Government of India, it was distinctly understood that it was not to be regarded as a derogation from the powers of the Legislative Assembly, and I think it was very necessary to safeguard the rights of the Legislative Assembly even upon railway administration, and I should think it a wrong provision to make that a Statutory Authority should be established."

Mr. Jayakar also joined in this protest with these words. He said:

"I am opposed to giving a statutory basis to the Railway Board or any more recognition than it has at the present moment. I want freedom to be left to the future Minister of Railways to adjust the constitution, the powers and the affairs of the Railway Board in any way which he likes and which he thinks is suited to the requirements, and the growing requirements, of self-government in India."

Then Sardar Ujjal Singh said as follows:

"I feel that question was not discussed in detail in the sub-committee, and I was rather astonished to find it given such great prominence in the Report. I do not exactly remember, but I think it was probably mentioned by His Highness of Bikaner or some other speaker that a statutory authority ought to be established so far as Railway administration is concerned."

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

Then, what happened? His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner, who was present on the occasion, said:

"I never used the words 'Statutory Authority': I referred to the Railway Board exercising the functions it does now."

So, the very foundation on which this recommendation was based falls to the ground. I do not know on what basis this Committee, which was established in London, was constituted. However, as the Committee was constituted and it made its report, it is necessary for us to find out how far the recommendations of the Committee meet with popular demands.

People of this country have invested over 800 crores of rupees in building the railways: they have a right through their representatives to see that this magnificent property of theirs, which they possess at such immense cost and expenditure, should be under their control and should perform its function properly. It has been stated—and I may refer the House to the memorandum of the Secretary of State in which he says:

"The constitution of this Railway Authority on a Statutory basis is to ensure that it is in a position to perform its duties upon business principles and without being subject to political interference."

This very plea was advanced in the case of the Reserve Bank. Now, if this House is competent to legislate on the question of the Reserve Bank, I fail to see why it should be deprived of the power of constituting the Statutory Railway Board or whatever other Authority might be substituted in place of the present Railway Board. As I find from the sketch proposals, this Railway Authority will consist of seven Members: the President of the Authority, who shall have a right of access to the Governor General, will be appointed from the Members by the Governor General at his discretion. I should like the House to note the words "Governor General at his discretion". The present procedure is, the President of the Railway Board, who corresponds to the Chief Commissioner, is appointed by the Governor General in Council, but, with the advent of the Federal Government, this power is going to be taken away from the Federal Government, which means the Minister in charge of Communications, and the Governor General is to be given the sole responsibility of appointing the President of the Railway Board . . .

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: May I explain, Sir, the President of the Railway Authority is quite a distinct person from the President of the Railway Board or the future Chief Commissioner, and the President of the Railway Authority is to be nominated by the Governor General at his discretion, but the President of the Railway Board or the Chief Commissioner is to be appointed by the Railway Authority subject to the approval of the Governor General.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I understand that with the establishment of the Statutory Railway Authority, the present Railway Board will cease to exist, and therefore, the question of the present Railway Board does not arise at all. However, my only point is, so far as the remark of my friend, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar, is concerned, why should the President of the Railway Authority be appointed by the Governor General at his discretion, and not by the whole Cabinet working together and coming to a decision? That is my comment on this part of the recommendation of the Committee.

Sir, this is not the only occasion on which the function of the Federal Government has been sought to be usurped by substituting the Governor General at his discretion, for the next recommendation runs as follows:

"Any Member of the Authority may be removed from office by the Governor General at his discretion if in his opinion after consultation with the Federal Government there is sufficient cause for such action."

I claim, Sir, that the power of appointing the Members of the Railway Authority and for dismissing the Members of the Authority should be vested in the Federal Government which ultimately means the Federal Legislature. Their emoluments also are to be fixed by the Governor General at his discretion after consultation with the Federal Government:

"At the head of the railway executive there will be a Chief Commissioner appointed by the Railway Authority subject to the confirmation of the Governor General."

Here also we find in this recommendation that the Governor General, and not the Governor General in Council, but the Governor General acting solely in his discretion will be the authority for the appointment of the Chief Commissioner:

"The Financial Commissioner will be appointed by the Governor General on the advice of the Federal Government."

In this connection I note that my friends, Mr. Joshi and Mr. Ranga Iyer, hold that "in his discretion after consultation with" should read "on the advice of the Federal Government".

Then, again, Sir, I find that provision will be made for the Statutory Railway Authority for safeguarding the existing rights of Companies working under contracts with the Secretary of State in Council, and, later on, I also find that even the authority of the Governor General in Council in connection with the administration of Company-managed railways is sought to be vested in the Secretary of State.

Now, Sir, I will refer to another recommendation of this Committee. It is contained in para. 7 of the Report. It says this:

"Revenue estimates will be submitted annually to the Federal Government which will in turn submit them to the Federal Legislature, but these estimates will not be subject to vote."

I would ask Honourable Members to ponder over this carefully. Even the little power which we exercise now in controlling the expenditure of the Railway Administration is sought to be taken away from us:

"If the revenue estimates disclose the need for a contribution from general revenues, a vote of the Legislature will, of course, be required."

Sir, we are spending about 90 to 100 crores annually over the Indian railways, and whatever control we have over the expenditure is sought to be taken away from us; but only in rare cases, when the general revenues will be called upon to bear a portion of the burden of the expenditure in connection with railway administration, then only that portion of the expenditure will be sought to be placed before this House.

Then, Sir, the next paragraph runs:

"The programme of capital expenditure will be submitted to the Federal Government for approval by the Federal Legislature."

This is another little thing that has been given to us as a sop. What is the ratio of capital expenditure in proportion to the whole expenditure on the railways? It is a very small fraction.

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

The next recommendation made by this Committee runs as follows:

"The Railway Authority will be empowered, subject to the powers of the Governor General in the exercise of his special responsibilities, and subject to the safeguarding of the rights of all officers in the service at the time of the establishment of the Railway Authority, to regulate by rules or by general or special order the classification of posts in the railway services on State-worked lines in British India, and the methods of recruitment, qualifications for appointment to the service, conditions of service, pay, and allowances, Provident Fund benefits, gratuities, discipline and conduct of those services, or to make to authorities subordinate to it such delegations as it thinks fit in regard to the creation of new appointments."

Sir, at one sweep we find that the Governor General, in the exercise of his special responsibilities, is going to be clothed with almost all the powers that are necessary to keep away everything connected with the railway administration from the purview of this House. Even the question of appointments, dismissal, leave, pension, pay, gratuities, and so on, even such little matters,—if I have read this portion of the recommendation correctly, is being taken away from the purview of the Federal Legislature:

"Any powers in regard to matters dealt with in this paragraph at present exercised by the Government of India over Company-managed Railways shall in future be exercised by the Railway Authority."

Whatever control the Government of India exercise at present over the affairs of the Company-managed railways will be taken away from the Federal Government and it will be solely exercised by the Railway Authority which will be independent of the Federal Government or the Federal Legislature.

In para. 10 of this Report, we find that a Commission will be appointed by the Governor General:

"to ascertain the views of all the interests concerned and to report, with recommendations, to the Federal Government, whose decision shall be final. The Commission shall consist of one independent expert of the highest standing and experience in transport matters, with whom will be associated, at the discretion of the Governor General, two or more assessors."

Now, in the composition of this Commission the Federal Government will have no controlling hand. It is the same old tale of the Governor General acting at his discretion.

These are some of the points, Sir, that occur to me in reviewing the report. I note, Sir, that very able men constituted this Committee, and amongst those, who represented this House, were Mr. N. N. Anklesaria, Mr. N. M. Joshi, Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer, Sir Muhammad Yakub, Mr. Yamin Khan, and the last, but not the least, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad. No, Sir, my friend, Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, when he was here, and before he went on that important errand to London, made a speech on the 6th February, 1933, in which he stated:

"In the new Federal Assembly we may have a special Statutory Railway Board which will be responsible to the Indian Legislature."

I do not know how my Honourable friend forgot to bear in mind his views on the subject when he was here.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: If I may inform my Honourable friend,—the Honourable gentleman, Dr. Ziauddin, did not forget to bear in mind his quotation, but in fairness to him I must say that he sank his own personal opinion to support the collective wisdom of his own colleagues.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I am glad that my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, who is sitting here, has got a stalwart champion in my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer. There is a saying in Hindustani *mudai sust, gawah chust*, which means that the plaintiff is unwilling to proceed, but his witness is very active.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Divisions: Muhamadan Rural): May I just say that my time has not yet come?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Then, my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, should have waited for giving my Honourable friend, Dr. Ziauddin, an opportunity of explaining his change of views. These are the proposals embodied in this report. There is a covering memorandum of the Secretary of State in Council; I need not refer to it more specifically beyond mentioning one or two points in connection with it. In paragraph 4 of this memorandum, it is stated:

"The Sketch Proposals refer specifically in paragraph 8 to the special responsibilities of the Governor General in so far as they may extend to the recruitment and service conditions of railway personnel."

Later on, it says:

"... where defence requirements may be concerned the authority of the Federal Government will reside in the Governor General by virtue of his special responsibility in respect of any matter affecting the administration of the Reserved Department of Defence."

In the concluding paragraph of this memorandum, it is stated:

"It would be necessary to preserve in the Constitution Act the existing rights which the Indian Railway Companies possess under contracts entered into with the Secretary of State in Council."

In the first place, I should like to know how this idea came to take the field, namely, that the Railway Authority should be constituted by an Act of Parliament and not by an Act enacted by this Legislature, I mean the Central Legislature. I am glad that my Honourable friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, says that he never accepted this proposal of a Statutory Railway Authority independent of the Federal Government

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: May I explain that my Honourable friend is entirely misrepresenting his own point? He said just now that he was surprised to see how the idea came to occupy the field of a Statutory Railway Board being constituted by Parliamentary legislation instead of a legislation by this House. I said that so far as we were concerned, Members of this Legislature, who were on the London Committee, none of us accepted that position of Parliamentary legislation enacting a Statutory Railway Board.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I believe that the wording of the Federal Structure Committee, from which I have read out, refers to a point of time which is previous to the date on which this Committee was appointed. In the report of that Federal Structure Committee, there is mention of a Statutory Railway Board being appointed. These gentlemen, who formed the Committee, were appointed at a later date. I should like to know from my Honourable friend—I am speaking only to correct any misapprehension which may have arisen—whether in this report, which they have

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

recorded, there is anything to show that they are opposed to the proposal of the Federal Structure Committee, namely, that the Statutory Railway Board should be enacted by an Act of Parliament and not by an Act of this Legislature.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: If I may tell my Honourable friend

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Order, order. Interruptions are allowed only as a matter of personal explanation and not for the purpose of replying at every stage to the points raised by a speaker. When the Honourable Member gets his turn, he can reply to the points raised.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: If the Honourable Member gives way, I am perfectly entitled, Sir, especially when he puts a direct question and wants an answer and sits in his seat. I stood up after his sitting, and if I follow the proceedings of this House aright, when an Honourable Member sits down asking for an answer, it is a proper thing for another Honourable Member to stand up and reply, and I propose to exercise my right if you will permit me to do so.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): If the Honourable Member will refer to the Rules and Standing Orders, he will understand that interruptions are permitted only to give personal explanations and not otherwise. Of course, as a matter of courtesy, when an Honourable Member gives way, certainly the Chair has no objection to another Honourable Member getting up and giving information. But it is becoming a regular practice for Members, in the course of their speeches, to put a series of questions and various others getting up to answer the points raised. That will not conduce to the smooth working of the discussion at all.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: I want to submit to you that when I stood up, I first looked at the Honourable gentleman. He said "I want information on this subject", and then, as he sat down, I rose to answer him, not with a view to permanently interrupting him, but to enlighten the proceedings of this House, especially as we are working to time. This is an important motion and as we are working to time, he definitely wants to know, in order to enable him to proceed, whether there is a single line in that report to show on a matter of fundamental importance that we have opposed this British Parliamentary scheme of legislation. I was just going to say to him whether, if he has read the report, he can show me a line in which we have supported the British Parliamentary legislation, in which case I shall bow to him.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: My Honourable friend has entirely misunderstood the point which I was making. It was out of courtesy to my Honourable friend that I gave way, and I am willing to give way if you will permit me in the exercise of your discretion in controlling the debate.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair does not propose to allow this discussion to take the form of a series of catechisms.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Quite so. What I was submitting was that this Committee was appointed at a time when they knew or they ought to have known, if they had exercised their discretion properly, that there was a proposal in the Federal Structure Committee's report wherein

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Where is that mentioned?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:

"In this connection the Sub-Committee take note of the proposal that a Statutory Railway Authority should be established, and are of opinion that this should be done if after expert examination this course seems desirable".

This is from the Report of the Federal Structure Committee.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Where is Parliament mentioned?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I am quite willing to put a charitable construction upon the action of my friends. For the first time they knew of this proposal to establish this Railway Authority from the note indited by the Secretary of State for India. Some of my friends, who were on the Reserve Bank Committee, were hard put to it when they were confronted with certain inconvenient questions on the floor of this House, and my Honourable friends, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar and Sir Cowasji Jehangir, were rising up in their seats every time in order to explain or explain away their conduct while in London.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: To explain, not to explain away.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: It is not for me to pursue this unpleasant matter any further.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member should now conclude.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: My time was interrupted by the Honourable Member, Mr. Ranga Iyer. However, Sir, I am concluding my observations with this remark

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: It has been the practice of this House—and I draw specifically your attention to it,—for the Chair, especially when a time limit is put during the Budget discussion and when interruptions take place,—for the Chair to take notice of the length of the interruptions and add it to the time allotted to the speaker for the time being. I hope that you will have the kindness to give this concession to speakers, because, on a controversial motion of this kind, interruptions of a Parliamentary kind will be inevitable, otherwise the debate will be dull as ditchwater, but I do not want that a speaker should lose his time at all.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair has added ten minutes for that.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I am thankful to you, Sir. In fact, I was going to conclude my observations. I will conclude by saying that I am glad to have this disclaimer from my friends, Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar and Mr. Joshi, that they never agreed to any enactment being enacted by Parliament for the creation of this Statutory Railway Authority. What

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

I would submit is this, that this House should not be divested of its responsibility for creating the Authority, call it by the name of the Railway Board or the Statutory Railway Authority, or whatever be its name, which will control this huge property in which the rate payers of India have invested more than 800 crores of rupees and are vitally interested in seeing that this property is efficiently and well managed.

There are one or two things which appear to be at the back of the Government proposal. One is that a part of the investment in Indian railways is held by British investors and that they will not trust Indians. That is one suspicion which seems to be lurking behind the suggestion that the Federal Government or the Federal Legislature should have nothing to do with the creation or the administration of the proposed Railway Authority.

An Honourable Member: What is the proportion of British capital?

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: I do not know what the proportion is, but they have invested their capital and there seems to be a suspicion on the part of the Government lest the Federal Minister will not properly look to the interests of the British investors. Then, Sir, the railways are important from the military and strategic points of view and this might be one of the reasons why the little control, which we are exercising over the affairs of the Railway Administration in this country, is sought to be taken away from us. I do not want to take up any more time of the House, but I should like to enter my strong protest against any proposal which will give to the British Parliament the right of legislating for the creation of the Railway Authority in this country. Sir, I move my motion.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): Cut motion moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Railway Board' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, as one of the members who sat on this Committee, I think it is my duty to enlighten the House and to remove the misunderstanding that has been created by the speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh. If the Honourable Member will read the report, he will find that there is no mention anywhere of any member of the Committee having agreed that this legislation should be taken up by the British Parliament and not by this House. We vehemently opposed the idea that any legislation should be taken up in England and not in India. I should like to give credit to my friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer. He opposed the idea on the very first day. We were all unanimous on that point. There were certain Members of the Legislature who were not members of the Committee, but who were sitting along with us, though they did not take part in the discussion, and they will bear testimony to the fact that none of us agreed even by implication that any legislation should be taken up in England. We, the members of that Committee, will unanimously deplore any action that the Government of India may take in order to accede to the request that this legislation should be taken up in England. The Reserve Bank Bill has already been through this House and we are all waiting to get the other Bill in respect of the Railway Authority before this House, and this must be brought up as soon as possible. If that Bill does not come before this House, we will think that the members of that Committee were

not properly treated by the Government and we do join fully in the sentiments expressed by my Honourable friend and others. We think that there would have been no justification for the Members of this House to go all the way to England to take part in the discussions of this Committee if the legislation was not to be brought up before this House. There would be no sense in sending members there as representatives of this House. We are very jealous of the privileges of this House. We stand on the same footing as other Honourable Members, and I am sure that Honourable Members on the Government Benches will be as jealous of the rights and privileges of this House as we are. Though officially their lips may be sealed, they will be as much jealous of their rights and privileges as any Honourable Member on this side of the House.

There is one thing which my friend will notice. This is the only Committee which reported unanimously, of all the Committees that sat outside India. This is the first instance in which Hindu and Muslim members were unanimous in arriving at a decision, and that Committee gave the lead to many others to follow. There was an accommodating spirit and we all came to an unanimous conclusion.

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): What was the bait given to the Muslim members?

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Bait given by whom? My friend is quite ignorant of that report, as he usually is. There was no bait given.

Sardar Sant Singh: Is it not a fact that two Mussalmans will be appointed on that Statutory Railway Authority? You ought to know it better than myself.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: My Honourable friend is mistaken if he thinks that this bait was given by an Englishman. This was the compromise arrived at between the Hindu and the Muslim members. This is the compromise that was arrived at by Mr. Ranga Iyer, Mr. Mudaliar, Mr. Joshi, myself, Dr. Ziauddin and Sir Muhammad Yakub, and it was a proposal, made in that Committee by Mr. Joshi, to give him the credit, and nobody else. My friend says in his ignorance that this was the bait given by the English members of that Committee. Before making any assertion, my friend will be well advised in getting possession of the facts. The Indian members, the Hindus, the Muslims and the Parsis, were all unanimous, and there was no note of dissent. The only questions which we discussed at great length were what should be the constitution, who should work it in the best interests of India, and whether there should be officials on that Statutory Board or not, and if they are not going to be there, then what shall be the position? All these questions were weighed and weighed properly and we were engaged in long discussions with results neutralising and balancing one another, so that nobody's interest may be in any way jeopardised, no interests may suffer, and so on, Sir, there are many interests involved in the case of the Indian railways. There are not only the Hindus and Mussalmans, there are many other interests like those of the Anglo-Indians and of the Europeans. All these had to be taken into consideration and we weighed all of them properly and we considered that this Committee, if it is appointed, must command the confidence of the whole of India as well as of the people who have got such important interests through having their capital invested in the railway undertakings,

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

and so on. This was not an easy task. Members had to deliberate separately. The Indian members were sitting separately and discussing the questions amongst themselves, then they had to discuss the subject with the British side, and they had to come to a compromise. We had to come to an agreement which might safeguard the interests of all sides, of all peoples. That was not an easy task, to satisfy everybody, but this is fortunately a report which has satisfied everybody excepting the European members on the communal question who said that, although they did not like this to be made a provision in the Statute, they would like a convention started on this basis and worked like this. We Indian members did not see eye to eye with them,—we said, no. We wanted to have the matter settled once for all and we must stand by it. Now, Sir, thousands of questions are put almost every day in the House. Do we not want that they should be shut up for ever? Do we not think that this is spoiling the spirit in this House? We wanted that by this body we should work as smoothly as possible and, in order to get this kind of spirit and in order to achieve this object, the only possible way was that a kind of managing committee may be appointed which may safeguard this House outside and in which everybody may have confidence, so that there might not be occasions for putting any questions in this House, but those questions might be raised there. We wanted to satisfy everybody and we could not satisfy everybody unless we came to some such arrangement: and, instead of receiving any congratulations from some Honourable Members, there comes up a kind of criticism which is based only on mere ignorance, and I suppose my remarks must now have thrown some kind of light on the issues and removed misunderstandings from the minds of Honourable Members. I assure you, Sir, that none of us was or is willing that this legislation should be undertaken in England and not here. We are as much jealous to guard the interests of this House and its privileges as any other Members would be, and we stood fast and strong guarding our interests and our privileges. We did not at all like the rights of this House being given up by any individual Member outside this House. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat.

Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan

Urban): Sir, I must thank you for kindly offering me also an opportunity to intervene in this debate, although I am not one of those who have tabled a cut motion thereon. At the outset, Sir, I must say that it is really unfortunate for all of us here that this subject has been incidentally mentioned in the Honourable Member's Budget speech, when it has yet no direct or indirect bearing on the present Budget. The mischief that has been done is that the mere mention of the thing has tempted many of my Honourable friends to speak on the subject, more or less involving a political issue, superseding for the time being discussion of some matters of greater moment vitally affecting the country in relation to our present-day railway working and administration. I need hardly point out that this subject will come forward for separate treatment by itself hereafter, when all this speaking done today could have been more effectively made. But now that I am on it, I must say my say as briefly as possible.

It was in September, 1930, that a Despatch is said to have been sent from the Government of India to the Home Government containing a proposal for the establishment of a Statutory Railway Board in India.

Among its recommendations there were the following: (1) to render prompt and adequate service to military authorities in times of political crisis; (2) to safeguard the enormous capital sunk in the Indian railways; (3) to guarantee the services of the higher officers in the railways appointed by the Secretary of State for India; (4) to ensure future recruitment of Europeans on a larger scale on military grounds; and (5) to maintain the interests of the Anglo-Indian community in the railway services. But I do not know, Sir, when and how the question of the Statutory Railway Board first cropped up in the discussions at the Round Table Conference. But, so far as my knowledge of the matter goes, it was the White Paper that first came forward with the suggestion to take our railways out of the control of the Central Legislature and place them under a Statutory Authority, which would be the absolute master of the destinies of our railways. The scheme, as has been already adumbrated by one of the speakers, is that our railways are to be managed and controlled by a Statutory Railway Authority, which will be functioning more or less like the administration of one of our existing Port Trusts. In that case the Railway Administration of the future will cease to be accountable for all practical purposes to the Central Legislature. So the major portion of the railway expenditure, which is now subject to the sanction of the peoples' representatives in the Legislative Assembly, will be taken away from their control. But, Sir, we must not forget this important fact that the revenue derived from the railways is in normal times often more than the revenue of all the Provincial Governments put together. Thus, if a comparison be made between Provincial Administration and Railway Administration, it can safely be said that by losing the control of the Railway Administration through the operation of the Statutory Railway Board, we shall be losing a bigger Administration in exchange for smaller ones, which we expect to get by the proposed Constitutional Changes. Again, Sir, it must not be overlooked that the railways are the largest employers of labour in this country. It is, therefore, all the more necessary that the railways should be kept under popular control in the interests of the poor and voiceless labourers. Also, Sir, as it is a fact that the railways are the biggest consumers of stores and minerals, it is essential that there should be a more rigid popular supervision over them in order to protect the interests of indigenous industries, which are, by the way, getting into a position to supply the requirements of our railways. Then, Sir, it cannot be denied that so far as the trade and industries of this country are concerned, the Railway Administration is an important factor. Now-a-days when transport facilities are so essential requisites for the development of the trade and industries of the country, inter-country trade cannot possibly develop, unless indigenous manufacturers receive full support and sincere co-operation from the country's Railway Administration. At present, as we all know, even with the direct supervision of the Legislative Assembly, the Railway Administration continues to be tainted with preferential treatment amongst the different classes of the employees, favouritism in freight rates, jobbery, corruption, pilferage, wilful waste and extravagance, and callous neglect of the country's indigenous trade. Such being the case, it is naturally apprehended that if the Railway Administration is made entirely independent of popular control, the condition of trade and industries, as well as of the finances of the country, will not improve in any way. But, on the other hand, they will be prejudiced by the constitution of the future Statutory Railway Board.

[Mr. Nabakumar Sing Dudhoria.]

Again, Sir, having come to know the true aims and objects of the proposed institution, I am of the opinion that the Statutory Railway Board should meet with unstinted opposition from every quarter of this House.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: Sir, I was glad that this question whether the Statutory Railway Board is going to be constituted by legislation of this House has come up for debate. I find that some misunderstanding has been created on this subject, because of some portion of the sketch proposal that I have in my hands. It was because of this that the Mover of this cut referred to that point, and I am very glad that he got a contradiction from those Members who were actually present in London and were responsible for these proposals. I find in para. 2 of the Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India the following passage:

"I venture to think that the proposals set out in this paper are, broadly speaking, conceived on sound lines, and it is gratifying that so large a measure of agreement has been reached."

Now, while one reads this, he feels that the Members of the Legislature, who took part in the debate of that Committee, agreed that this Statutory Board should be created by the British Parliament.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: What is it that my Honourable friend is reading? Is it the report of the Committee or is it the letter?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I have already said that you have explained yourself very correctly, and we are very glad and gratified to see that our Members who went to England did not play false with us. On the contrary, I am very much thankful to them, because they stuck to their guns to see that the privileges of this House are not abused in the least. I am very conscious of it. But I will go a step further and say that, even up to this moment, that question has not been settled, and I do hope that the Members of this Legislature will put it forcibly and strongly that the legislation for the creation of this Statutory Board should be passed by his House and not by the British Parliament, otherwise the control of this House over the railways will be very negligible. But, Sir, when I read para. 5 again of that Memorandum, I find that the Secretary of State has made the position very clear, as to what questions were before the Committee. It implies that they have not yet arrived at the decision whether this Bill should be enacted here in India or in the British Parliament. The question now is whether the public opinion in this country and the opinion of the Members of this House would be strong enough to induce the Secretary of State to give up the idea of passing this legislation in the British Parliament. In para. 5, I read:

"There remains to consider the important question whether a Statutory Railway Authority should be set up by British or by Indian legislation."

The question is very direct. Then, it goes on:

"As I see the position, there appear to be four courses open :

(1) An Act might be passed in the present Indian Legislature and the necessary adaptation to the new constitution made in the Constitution Act itself.

(2) The Constitution Act itself might contain provisions complete in all details.

(3) The Constitution Act might lay down the general principles on which legislation should be based, it being left to the new Indian Legislature to legislate in detail in conformity with those principles;

(4) The matter might be left entirely to the new Indian Legislature with the reservation that the approval of the Governor General in his discretion should be required to the introduction of the original Bill or any amending Bill."

These were the four proposals and they have not yet arrived at the final decision as to which should be accepted. Then, it is said:

"In any event, it will be necessary to insure that a Statutory railway authority shall be set up on right lines."

Now, Sir, the right lines are that the legislation should be passed by this House. I think it will not be right on the part of the British Parliament to dictate to us and then say that they have given us some reform. Further on, it is said:

"In any case, it would be necessary to preserve in the Constitution Act the existing rights which the Indian Railway Companies possess under contracts entered into with the Secretary of State in Council."

There seems to be some sense in that, for the contracts have already been made, and they cannot be dishonoured. But nothing should be mentioned in the Act that there should be no control by this House over these Company-managed railways in the future. I leave that point, therefore, there, and I hope that this House will be as strong as it has expressed itself on other matters and see that this Bill is passed by this House.

Then, Sir, I was wondering how is it that in every matter of reform we find that something is being cooked up already; something or the other is being prepared by the Parliament or the British people and then they say that they have given us the reforms we want. Sir, you know the result of the Reserve Bank Bill. Now, the currency and the financial questions have gone out of our hands, and here also we are faced with the self-same question. It is said that the object of this legislation is that there should be no political interference with the working of the railways. I for one cannot understand that. The commercial questions or the political questions are all connected *inter se* in this Railway Board, and to say that there should be no political interference is a matter which passes all my imagination. Sir, they are not prepared to give us any hand in the finance, or in the economic position of India or even in the administration of railways, and I do not know what reforms then they are going to give us. What about those pledges that were made to us that self-government will be given to India? I know those pledges were made at a time when the Great War was going on, and they wanted our help. How are those pledges going to be fulfilled? Sir, all these machinations have been made in order to have the control in the hands of the British Parliament and to leave very little for us. This idea has not emanated from the Government of India. I find here that the Secretary of State makes a clean breast of it. He says:

"The paper, entitled 'The Future Administration of the Indian Railways' which I now circulate, is the outcome of the deliberations of the Committee which I recently appointed in order to go through the scheme which I had prepared in consultation with the Government of India to give effect to these principles."

So, the Secretary of State has confessed that the matter was conceived by him and there was only a formal consultation with the Government of India. Have the Government of India been treated fairly in

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

the matter? The Secretary of State puts forward a cut and dry proposal and asks the Government of India to give their consent to it. Then the Secretary of State calls a Committee of 22 members to sit in London, the Committee containing, as it did, seven Members of the Indian Legislature who went to England specially for the purpose. I do not in the least say that the Members who went there from here were not competent, were not representatives of India. They fully understood the interest of India which they had in their heart and they expressed their views there. What is the result? The Secretary of State says, we had a large measure of agreement. How can you call it a large measure of agreement? The whole thing was done beforehand by the Secretary of State and then the Indian Members were simply asked to do a certain remnant business. Under the circumstances, how can they profess to call it giving reforms? If they really wish to give reforms, then they must give substantially. Now, Sir, coming to the Committee, it consisted of 22 members, out of whom seven were Members of the Legislature, and, out of the others, four were eminent railway experts, and so on. All the same, we find that they have not been able to decide whether legislation is to be undertaken here in India or in England. We are of opinion that legislation should be undertaken here, and I do not think that there is any difference of opinion amongst us on that point, and the Secretary of State does say that the question is still open.

With regard to the powers of this authority, what do we find? It is not the Federal Government, it is not the Federal Legislature that will appoint that body. It is the Governor General that will appoint this body and, therefore, their responsibility will not be to the people. What is required is that the power of appointment shall be in the hands of the people. If you read the report, you can sum it up in one word. In some other countries where there is democracy or government by the people, we unfortunately now find dictators. In Germany, Italy, Turkey, and elsewhere, there are dictators. That is the principle that is perhaps being applied here also. Who is going to be made the dictator of the Indian railways? The Statutory Railway Authority. Now, the Federal Government might say that this authority had been so badly constituted that it was acting like a dictator. What then? I say this is very bad in principle.

The next point is the services question that is involved in this Statutory Railway Board proposal. This matter is also committed to the Railway Authority. The Legislature cannot even put any question with regard to their doings. Then my Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion, laid great stress on the point whether the Railway Revenue Estimates will be placed before the Federal Assembly or not. No doubt they will be placed, but all the items will be non-votable. At least in the present Constitution, we have some items which are votable and some others which are non-votable. By this so-called progressive reform, even that much is being taken away. Then comes the question of Indianisation about which we have been very insistent in every direction in the railways. Here a stumbling block is being placed on Indianisation. I put it like this. If it is that the Railway Authority is to create and make appointments in the services—and they are subordinate in that direction to the Whitehall and the Governor General only—then there will be no Indianisation, but only the interests of the Imperial Services will remain supreme.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: Is my Honourable friend aware that under this new Constitution, the Railway Minister will be responsible to the House unlike the present Railway Member who is responsible to Whitehall?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: What I mean to say is this. The Federal Minister may be responsible to this House, but, all the same, when the new Railway Authority is constituted,—not by the Federal Minister, but by the British Government,—then he will say “What can I do, my position is very weak. The Authority has been so constituted, and I cannot do anything”. This provision of the Federal Minister is put in there simply to lull you to sleep. Therefore, all the higher posts will remain in the hands of the Britishers, and there will not be any substantial Indianisation. The British people will have full preference. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, and his Anglo-Indian community, however, will have a greater share, but not the other Indians.

Sirdar Harbans Sing Brar (East Punjab: Sikh): Sir, the question of constituting a Statutory Authority for the railways is a very important one. As it will control the assets of the nation of such a great magnitude as to the tune of eight hundred crores, it is essential that such a body, if it is to be constituted, must be controlled by the Federal Government and the Federal Legislature in its entirety. The legislation to constitute that body must be enacted by the present Indian Legislature or the future one which will take its place and by no outside authority, and, on that point, there is no division in this House, and I hope there will be none outside.

The next question is this. How is this House or its successor to control the appointments to, and the general administration of, the Railways in the future in which concern will be invested more and more money in times to come when we develop our rural communication? Or is the Legislature merely to govern the policy alone? To my way of thinking, the Federal Government must have active control over the administration as well as the policy of the would-be Authority which will control the railways. The appointments to such a body must of necessity and, in the national interests, should be made by the Federal Government and not by the Governor General at his discretion, nor even after consultation with the Federal Government. I say, it must be on the advice of the Federal Government alone and in no other manner. The Chairman of such an Authority should in similar ways be appointed by the Federal Government and not by a person responsible to a body outside this country. In addition, the power of dismissal ought in fairness to rest also with the Federal Government which will be responsible to the Federal Legislature which will in turn be responsible to the people of India, both in British India as well as the Indian States, because the Federal Government, if it is to function, must have a competent say in matters of appointment as well as dismissal of a body which has to have a control over the money of the nation invested in the railways. These assets belong to nobody outside India. They have been subscribed by the nation and the nation has to pay for them when they are borrowed. It is for the representatives of the nation and its Government,—when it is to have federal autonomy and control of its own finances and its own property,—that the Legislature and the Government responsible to that Legislature must have the whole say and the complete say in the matter of appointments as well as of dismissal of that Statutory Body as well

[Sirdar Harbans Sing Brar.]

as its Chairman. No other scheme would either be in the interests of India or would be acceptable. It may be forced on us, but it will not be willingly accepted. If we leave the administration of the railways completely to that Statutory Railway Authority without any control either by the Federal Government or the Federal Legislature, I do not think that things will move too happily. Even at present we have not much control over the ordinary administration of the railways, though we vote all the expenditure, sanction all the money, provide all the funds for capital expenditure. But, as far as the actual administration of the railways is concerned, we have only a nominal or a fictitious say in the matter. The officials directly concerned and the Agents of the different railways are the actual administrative officers, and no interference is made or can be made even at present. And, in future, if the body is to be wholly independent and if the administration of the railways is to be completely divorced from the control either of the Legislature or of the Federal Government, that body may rule, as we have been condemning in this House, like the autocrats in some portions of India today, and it will be very difficult for us to mend matters. Suppose, for instance, that Statutory Body ignores the interests of the minorities. I am not a communalist and would not like to press communal claims. But, as far as the present trouble in India is concerned, it is merely for positions and places for the different interests, call them by communal names or call them on an interests basis. You can say that the Muslims are not sufficiently represented or the Hindus are not sufficiently represented, or, if you do not like any of these communal names, you can still say that the rural interests are not sufficiently represented. In times to come, the rural people have to play a more and more important part in the government of the country, and it will be their desire and their claim, with justification, that they must have an adequate share of representation in the different branches of the administration.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury).]

Unlike other commercial concerns, very large amounts have been invested in the Indian railways. If we leave the administration completely in the hands of the Statutory Body, it may not listen to the rural people and give them adequate representation—the commercial interests being predominant in the urban areas and most likely predominant in the so-called Statutory Authority,—their claims may be completely ignored, as at present, they are being ignored, all the high places are being occupied by urban people, who are looking to the interests of their own people; and it will be only the Federal Legislature in which they (the rural people) will be represented and the Federal Government before whom they will be able to press their claims, who can give them fair consideration. And if the Federal Government and the Federal Legislature are not to have any control in the administration of that Statutory Authority, how will those claims and grievances be remedied? I, therefore, think that the Federal Government and the Federal Legislature ought to have sufficient control as the Legislature at present has over the Railway Board. At present what do we do? We ask for information by way of questions, and from that information we find out whether particular interests are safeguarded or not and whether particular conveniences are provided for the patrons of the railways, namely, the passengers,

and such like things. And in the future it is only fair that such information should be sought in order to see that the railways are managed as the masses want them to be managed and administered. The Authority should be independent in the way as the Agents at present are within their limited spheres of administration. But the Legislature and the Federal Government must be competent, when it is felt necessary in the interests of the country and the nation, even to interfere in the details of the administration of the Statutory Authority. They must be the sole judge of the necessities and the time for it. You should not suppose that the Federal Government, as constituted in the future with the representatives of the States and the different interests of British India, with such administrative experience as the States provide, will be fools to interfere in ordinary details of administration. You can leave to them to act as sensible statesmen as in other parts of the world; but you must not curb their discretion and their power to interfere when they consider that the interests of the country as a whole demand that the Government and the Legislature should interfere to a certain extent with the administration of railways.

Sir, there is nothing more to be said on this subject. We are all agreed that legislation constituting the Authority should be enacted by the present Legislature or its successor, that the appointments should be made by the Governor General on the advice of the Federal Government, and I am of opinion that dismissal should likewise be on the advice of the same Government. The report of the London Committee has placed certain disqualifications regarding appointment and, I think, as the Committee is agreed on it, nothing need be said on that issue. But the Authority, to my mind, should be of people who will give their whole time to this business. I am not in favour of part-time appointments to such an important body which will have to have under its control such big concern as the railways throughout India. Part-time people cannot devote that much attention and that much care as a person whose sole concern will be to devote his time to the business he is appointed to control. I, therefore, consider that, if possible, whole-time persons will be much more advantageous in the better management of the railways.

Mr. Bhuput Singh (Bihar and Orissa: Landholders): Sir, I would like to say a few words on this important discussion. We find in the proposals for the future Statutory Railway Authority the following:

"In paragraph 74 of the White Paper, it was stated that His Majesty's Government considered the aspect that while the Federal Government will necessarily exercise general control over railway policy, the actual control of the administration of State railways in India should be placed by the Constitution Act in the hands of a Statutory Body so composed and with such powers as will ensure that it is in a position to perform its duties upon business principles and without being subject to political interference."

We always find this question of political interference springing up everywhere: whenever any important question comes up in connection with future reforms, the same bogey of political interference is brought to the forefront. Take the case of the Reserve Bank. There also this bogey cropped up. It seems that the British Parliament has got so much suspicion of the future Legislature that they cannot have any faith in it and wants to take away all real powers of control from it and keep them with the British Parliament through the Secretary of State and through the Governor General acting at his discretion. I must say that this

[Mr. Bhuput Sing.]

suspicion is very injurious to the principle of good government. If the British Government is so suspicious of the Indian Legislature, then there is no wonder if we on this side of the House have also the same suspicion against the British Parliament, and the very foundation of this proposal, I believe, remains on very shaky ground.

Then, Sir, there is a proposal that the Statutory Board should consist of seven Members, four of whom will be appointed by the Federal Government and three by the Governor General at his discretion. It is very curious to find why the Federal Government should not be given the power to appoint all the Members. They say in one place:

"The committee recommended that all the members of the authority should be appointed by the Government; the rest of the committee while agreeing that four out of the seven should be appointed by the Federal Government considered that the other three should be appointed by the Governor General in his discretion."

Suspicion, I believe, came in at every step. Why this suspicion? We must see that the future Railway Authority remains solely under the Federal Legislature; if the appointing authority is the Governor General, then the Minister in charge of Railways cannot be responsible to the Legislature. The Legislature must be given power to deal with all the important questions of railways and communications, because Members of the Legislature are the representatives of the people from whom the railway earnings will be derived.

As regards the proposal for statutory recognition for the appointment of two Muslims on the present Board, I have nothing much to say; but I think there should not be Statutory recognition of any claim of any community: it must be composed of men who are experienced in the matter of administration. Why should there be any reservation for any community? Let there be the most efficient men and let them be selected by the Minister who will be guided in such appointments by the advice of the Public Services Commission.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Will the Honourable Member like that all the Members of the Board should be Europeans?

Mr. Bhuput Sing: No.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan: Why not?

Mr. Bhuput Sing: If the Federal Government is given power to appoint the Railway Authority, then proper representation will be enforced by the future Legislature, and there should be no suspicion in the minds of any Member either here or there. (Interruption.)

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): The Honourable Member is not giving way.

Mr. Bhuput Sing: Why Europeans? Why should not the most expert and experienced and efficient people be appointed? Certainly there should be no scarcity of Indian intellect to compose that Board. I am surprised to find that Mr. Yamin Khan thinks that only Europeans will be found efficient and that there will be no competent Indians when the future Federal Government comes into existence. I say that there should be no

discrimination against any community; there should be equal chance given to all communities in India, because the railways are the property of the Indian Government and not of the British Parliament. Let Indians of every caste and creed have an equal chance to be on the Statutory Authority and not one single community: if now we say that the Muslims should get two seats, the Sikhs will come up and ask for one seat, and this communal strife will go on for ever, and there will be constant quarrels over the rights of each community for representation on this Statutory Railway Authority.

I find that though the Budget Estimates will be placed before the Federal Legislature, there will be no voting on those demands. This House at present enjoys this right which was secured to this House by the Government of India Act of 1919 after a prolonged political agitation, and it is very curious that the future Federal Legislature should be sought to be deprived of that right, though we are told that the future Constitution is a further advance than the present one. I say the future Government ought to have the power to appoint and dismiss any one in the Statutory Railway Board.

I am very glad that when this question was being discussed, all the Members from the Indian Legislature had opposed the idea that such an Act should be passed by the British Parliament. Now, Sir, in all the discussion that has taken place in this House today, I find that not one, except Mr. Yamin Khan, from the London Committee spoke on this subject, though the discussion has been going on from quarter past two, and I do not know why these gentlemen are sitting quiet without enlightening us on this subject

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I on a point of order suggest that the Government of India should now speak, instead of leaving the discussion to ourselves?

Mr. Bhuput Singh: But Mr. Yamin Khan rose and explained his position, and I am very thankful to him. As regards the enactment for bringing this body into existence, I think that this Act should be enacted by the future Federal Legislature which will be more representative in character and which will have the right to influence the future Government in drafting the Bill to the best interests of India.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I again, on a point of order, repeat what I said before? If the Government of India are not going to take part in the debate, I can understand; but if they are going to take part in it towards the end, it is not fair to the other Members that they should not speak during the debate at all.

Mr. C. S. Hanga Iyer: If I may rise to a point of order on the same subject, may I suggest that the Government should not take part in this debate, but that they should communicate this debate to the Secretary of State for India?

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Abdul Matin Chaudhury): The Government of India are entitled to choose their own time for their intervention in the debate.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney (Nominated Non-Official): Sir, I had no intention of taking part in this debate until the last speaker had spoken. He, at the conclusion of his remarks, stressed certain aspects of the Statutory Railway Board Committee Report which calls for some criticism. He objected, no doubt as a democrat, to communal introduction into the constitution of the Railway Authority as opposed to the Railway Executive, and my friend, Mr. Yamin Khan, interfered and asked him a very pertinent question to which he could not give a reply. But, Sir, if anyone examines the White Paper, he will find that every page of that White Paper is pregnant with communal weightage and awards. Indeed, I would go further and say that though it is nothing else but a book full of anomalies affording protection to certain communities, a large majority of Indians are prepared to accept such communal awards, etc.

Sardar Sant Singh: Question.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: You may say, question, but if you are prepared to accept the Communal Award, then you accept the award in the White Paper of political weightage to communities which, in itself, gives each one of them a political voice in the Legislatures to enable them to demand economic weightage and economic protection. And so, I can imagine the majority party in this House sweeping the Railway Authority with its own representatives. Sir, I have no desire to stop the progress of democracy in this country. Indeed, I firmly believe that so long as communalism remains in this country, it will impede the progress of nationalisation. I go further and say that communalism is the direct negation of nationalisation

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury (Bengal: Landholders): Who signed the Minority Pact then?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I would say the Majority Pact, and not the Minority Pact.

Sardar Sant Singh: Who fathered it?

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: I did and I am proud of it. Now, let us face facts. We have to face facts. The Muhammadans, who have as important a stake in this country as my Hindu friend over there, demanded at the Statutory Railway Board meeting in London a certain percentage of Muslims on the "Railway Authority",—they in fact went so far as to exclude Anglo-Indians from it,—but they demanded a certain Muslim percentage. This was not accepted by the Secretary of State, and quite rightly too. At the same time, one cannot get away from the fact that for the present you must have communal representation in all such constitutions—indeed I challenge any Member in this House to say that any Cabinet, Provincial or Central, can be formed in India, that has not got a fair number of Muslims in it. I ask, is this not introducing communalism into our Legislatures and Cabinets, and yet you object to it in the composition of the new "Railway Authority"?

Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury: Who is responsible for introducing the communal spirit?

Mr. S. C. Mitra (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Anglo-Indians.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: No doubt you are right, but, Sir, I am not talking to my friend, Mr. Mitra. He will get his turn to speak. As to whether the "Railway Authority" will be elected by, and be subject to the control of, the Federal Legislature or not, matters very little to me. Whatever happens I am anxious that the main spring, which controls the Railway clock, must be in good working order. I want this not only for the benefit of all railways in India, but of all the communities employed on railways.

Sir, there are certain aspects of this Report that should receive the serious consideration of the House. In the few speeches I have heard today, they have not been touched. There is an aspect to be found in the very opening paragraph of this Report, and if the principle underlying that paragraph is rigidly operated by the future Government, I do not see how any Member of this House could object to any form this "Railway Authority" assumes. Let me, for the information of the House, read this para. In paragraph 74 of the Introduction to the White Paper, it is stated that:

"His Majesty's Government consider it essential that the whole of the Federal Government will necessarily exercise a general control over railway policy, the actual control of the administration of State Railways in India, including those worked by Companies, should be placed by the Constitution Act in the hands of the Statutory Body so composed and with such powers as will ensure that it is in a position to perform its duty upon business principles and without being subject to political interference."

Sir, I take my stand on that. As one who has made himself very familiar with the administration of the Indian Railways,—and I think I can claim a closer familiarity than most Members of this House,—it is my considered opinion that the time has come when there must be, as far as is possible, a distinct separation of the two bodies, controlling the general policy of railways and the day-to-day administration of railways. This House,—with all respect to you, Mr. President, and to your predecessors,—I say, this House has been allowed too many privileges. These privileges have been,—I was about to say, "abused",—let me say ill used by certain Honourable Members. And what do you find today? Most of your best railway officials, senior and junior, are sick unto death of our interference with the men at the wheel and they are just waiting to pack up bag and baggage and clear out of this country and leave us to our own devices.

Some Honourable Members: Hear, hear.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: You may say Hear, hear, but let me tell the interruption, if the administration of railways were in his hands, there would be a derailment everyday. Sir, it is my considered opinion that we cannot run our railways by any constitution that permits of interference with the day-to-day affairs of the railways. No business concern will ever succeed, unless it is properly controlled by those who are in direct authority and control of it. Certainly if there is a case of grave injustice, it should be brought to the notice of the House, but, here, again, I would say, if the Railway Board had any political foresight and imagination, it would have long ago appointed a Committee of Inquiry into all complaints. It has not done so. But even so to make the floor of this House the venue of petty complaints in the shape of questions, as to why 21 ticket collectors or 81 firemen were transferred from one place to another,

[Lt.-Col. Sir Henry Gidney.]

is, in my opinion, a great waste of our valuable time,—it occupies our time absolutely uselessly and fruitlessly. I could, if I choose to do so, stand on the floor of this House and ask many questions so far as my community is concerned. I do not do so, because I know it is a waste of time. Moreover, the Railway Board, though interpellated for all these years with questions of this character, take no notice whatever, their ears are deaf and so I would beg of this House not to poke their noses into the "Railway Executive"—the body controlling the day-to-day administration of railways.!

Mr. S. C. Mitra: I suppose questions like those you put about the Chief Medical Officer on the E. I. Railway are all questions that would help the administration to be conducted in a business-like manner! (Applause.)

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: Sir, my friend, Mr. Mitra, has a most wonderful habit of laughing when he speaks and then clapping himself. I do not generally worry myself over such small issues as the Chief Medical Officer of the E. I. Railway—a waste of time,—and Mr. Mitra knows it.

Mr. S. C. Mitra: It was a big issue.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: It may have been a very big issue as far as Mr. Mitra's brain was concerned, but I am glad I have not got Mr. Mitra's insectorial insight or brain. In my humble opinion,—I submit it is not right for us to interfere into the meticolae of the day-to-day administration of railways. Certainly with larger issues of policy, bring them before the House, expose them, and I am with you, but do not any longer waste our time over small matters. Sir, the first para. of the Statutory Railway Board Report clearly states what should form the general policy. However the constitution of the Railway Authority may be secured, whether it be elected by the Federal Legislature or incorporated into the New Constitution Act or elected by the British Parliament. I do beg of my friends on the other side of the House, do not interfere with the man at the wheel for, in doing so, you may replace him by a worse man, or administrator, especially if we appointed such railway expert as my Honourable friend, Mr. Mitra.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: Sir, a Statutory Board is a Board created by an Act of the Legislature, and the Board created by the executive action of the Government is an ordinary Board and not a Statutory Board. Sir, I first heard of this Statutory Board in connection with the special Board created in Germany for guaranteeing the payment of reparations. At that time they created a special *gaschelschaft* with a kind of Board of Directors, called *Verwaltungsrat*, on which they had representatives of the creditor countries, and they had a special commission to see that the reparation payments were regularly made. That was the view which I took in 1927 when I first studied the question. I leave the references in the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report to those Members who were members of it.

The attention of the Assembly was first drawn to the proposed Statutory Board by the memorandum of Major General Hammond, which was discussed on the floor of this House at the instance of Mr. Ranga Iyer. I

had great doubts, which I expressed on the floor of the House, and I thought that the question in India was not the same as in Germany. Here our Railway Department is indebted only to the Indian Government from whom the Department borrows. The Railway Department does not borrow directly from the people here or abroad, but borrows from the Indian Government. Therefore, our railways are not indebted to any other Government except our own. I, therefore, thought that the question of instituting a Railway Authority which was found necessary in Germany did not arise. When I left India, I left with the firm conviction that I would oppose the formation of a Statutory Railway Authority tooth and nail, and I went to Geneva and to Berlin specially for this purpose in order to fortify myself with arguments. I stayed several days in Berlin and went into great detail of the working of the Statutory Railway Board, and discussed the matter with Directors and Managers. I studied at Geneva the administration of other European countries, by examining the working of these boards, and I came to the conclusion that the formation of a Statutory Railway Board was the only means by which the Indian railways could be saved from extravagance and financial ruin.

I have repeatedly said on the floor of this House that we have spent large sums of money on capital expenditure. Though nominally 4 P.M. they were sanctioned by the Assembly, though nominally they have been passed by the Finance Committee, but our powers of supervision are very limited. Even in this year's Budget we have provided a capital expenditure of Rs. 4½ crores which will be guillotined on Saturday without giving any opportunity to discuss the merits of those items of capital expenditure. Our powers, though they exist on paper, are in practice very limited. The only person that we have got to supervise the expenditure of the railways on our behalf is the Financial Commissioner of Railways, but we know that he is more a representative of the railways than of the tax-payers or of the Legislature or even of the Finance Department. With this state of affairs, I thought that it was absolutely essential that we must have better supervision of the expenditure of the railways, better supervision of the railway policy, better supervision of the railway programmes, and the only way in which it could be done is to institute a body between ourselves and the Railway Administration who can scrutinise on behalf of the tax-payers the whole of the railway programme. I was confirmed in my ideas when I studied the action taken by some of the Governments in Europe. I studied very carefully the action taken by the Swiss Government, by the Belgian Government and by others. They had to constitute, after series of losses that they incurred, a special Statutory Body to look after the interests of the tax-payers. In Belgium, they tried all possible methods and in the end they had to fall back upon the establishment of such an Authority. Therefore, we find that in nearly every country they had to establish some kind of Authority which would scrutinise the expenditure and the policy of the Railway Administration on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the tax-payers. This is the inevitable conclusion at which I arrived, and I challenge any one here or outside this House to tell me how this particular supervision could be more effectively exercised than by means of a body whose business will be to do the work of supervising the railway policy, because our supervision by a Finance Committee of the type that we have got or even a *post-mortem* examination by a Public Accounts Committee or by any kind of general discussion in this House, has failed to exercise that amount of control

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

which the tax-payers desired. It is proved by the enormous wastage that we have incurred from the time that the Railway Accounts were separated from the General Budget. Here I came to the conclusion that some kind of Authority was necessary and that Authority must have the benediction of law, that is, it must be created by means of an enactment, or it must be a Statutory Body. The second question, immediately after this thing is decided, is by whom should that body be created.

My Honourable friend Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh, has already quoted the four alternatives which the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for India has mentioned in his memorandum. When we met in London, and I think my Honourable friends will bear me out,—at the end I pleaded with the Secretary of State that this Statutory Body should be created by the Indian Legislature and not by the British Parliament, and I gave the following arguments which I repeat here on the floor of the House. My first argument was—mentioning in the reverse order of importance—that our Indian Legislature, though not so efficient, was certainly much more expeditious than the British Parliament. (Laughter.) My second argument was—that the Railway Act dealt with all kinds of subjects, and the Parliament was too busy a body to deal with them in details and that it could not be done by the British Parliament. The Railway Act is a big volume. My third argument was that the railways were intended for the benefit of the people, and the people of India were more qualified to understand the conveniences and comforts of their own people, and Parliament really would not know the requirements of the people of India and, therefore, they were not competent to legislate on behalf of the Indian people. Then came the last and most important argument—I ask, who is to pay the deficits of the Indian railways? Are they to be voted by the Legislature of India or by the British Parliament? Evidently there is only one reply to this question, and that is that the deficits will have to be paid by the tax-payers of India by the vote of the Legislature of India. I maintain in that case what right the British Parliament has to legislate that the Indian Legislature will pay the deficits? It is *ultra vires* of the British Parliament to legislate that the tax-payers of India should pay the deficit. These are really some of the arguments that we used. I emphasize very strongly that this legislation should be enacted by the Indian Legislature, and this Railway Authority should be responsible to the Indian Government. There had never been any difference of opinion among Indians at any stage of the discussion on the question that the Railway Authority should be created by the Indian Legislature, and not by any other Government than the Government of the people for whose benefit the railways exist.

Now, as to the details of the constitution of the Statutory Body. We have created a body consisting of seven persons and some of us thought it very important that these seven men should be whole time officers, because they are not expected only to meet once or twice a year, but to work all the year round. We have got before us the example of other countries. We find that these persons are whole time men in this sense that this work has got the first claim over their time. The Authority will work in committees. Take the case of Germany. The *Verwaltungsrat* has got several standing committees, the Executive Committee, the Finance Committee, the Tariff Committee and the Technique Committee. These are permanent committees functioning all the year round.

The next question was about the Chairman of this Committee. There were three possible alternatives. One was that the Minister should be the Chairman. The second alternative was that the Chief Commissioner or the Chief Manager of the Indian Railways should be the Chairman. The third alternative was that it should have a Chairman of its own. We thought that we should follow the practice of Germany and it would be better, in the interests of general administration, that we keep the Minister out of it. If the Minister be the Chairman of this Committee, and his opinion is included in the proposals of the Authority, it would be very difficult for the Government to upset the decision. So we decided not to have the Minister as permanent Chairman and leave him free. The second alternative was to have the Financial Commissioner for Railways as the Chairman. There is not a single country in the world except the L. M. S. Railway in which the Chief Manager is the Chairman of the Board of Directors or of the Statutory Board. That is a solitary example. The Manager there is Sir Josiah Stamp. He is the greatest living authority on railways. He is a man in whose hands any Legislature and any Administration could safely entrust the administration of the railways, but Sir Josiah Stamp's are not found in every country. Even in England, the other three Railway Administrations could not appoint the Chief Manager as the President of the Board of Directors, because the second Sir Josiah Stamp is not available. A man of Sir Josiah Stamp's ability will never be available in this country, and so we could not follow that example. We practically ruled out that idea as not being a practical proposition. The next alternative is to have an independent President who may be a wholetime officer and may look after the interests of the Indian railways from the point of view of the Government and from the point of view of the tax-payers. This is really the inevitable conclusion we arrived at. We considered for a very long time whether the Chief Commissioner should even be a Member of the Railway Authority, and, we came to the unanimous conclusion that it was not in the interests of the Railway Administration that he should be a Member of the Railway Authority, because this Railway Authority will not deal with the questions of day-to-day administration. In other countries, the Chief Manager of the Railways is not a Member of the Statutory Authority. Therefore, with the consent of the railway experts, with the consent of all the political groups, and with the unanimous consent of the representatives of the Legislature, we decided that the Chief Commissioner ought not to be a Member of the Railway Authority, and any attempt whatsoever to go back from the unanimous decision will be a reactionary move and it cannot be supported either by arguments or by any example of any other country. We owe to Diwan Bahadur Mudaliar for the next useful decision that the Financial Commissioner should not also be a Member of the Railway Authority. He will be in a very difficult position. In India, unfortunately we have developed wrong traditions. On account of these wrong traditions, the financial supervision has become very shaky and the finances are not scrutinised to the extent they deserve. The Financial Commissioner is not a representative of the Railway Department. The Railway Department will have their own financial expert and that financial expert will be under the Chief Commissioner of Railways. The Financial Commissioner represents really the tax-payers. He represents the Government of the day whatever that Government may be and, on his advice, the Statutory Board will practically act. He is really an expert of the Statutory Board. He is an expert of the Government. He

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

is an expert of the Legislature and not the expert of the Railway Department, because their actions will have to be scrutinised by him. He cannot scrutinise his own proposals. It will be unsound if he first scrutinises on behalf of the Chief Commissioner, and then gives a certificate to himself on behalf of the Railway Authority. But being in this position, we considered that it was desirable that he also should not be a Member of the Statutory Railway Board, but should be invited to come as an expert to express his opinion. Both these should not be regular Members and should not have votes, and this is an essential part of the constitution of the Railway Authority. I may also mention here that when we came to what is now called the Railway Board, here we also discussed the question in greater detail and from the arguments advanced and examples brought forward from the successful operations in other countries, we came to the conclusion that the responsibility of administration should rest on one man. The responsibility should not rest with a Committee or a Board: the responsibility of a Committee or a Board is practically no responsibility. The whole responsibility should rest on one man, the Chief Commissioner of Railways. He should have the services of a number of Heads of Departments whom he might consult, either collectively or individually on any problem. The difference of opinion between himself and the Head of his Department should be brought to the notice of the Railway Authority. The Financial aspects of the proposals must be scrutinised by the Financial Commissioner, who is really the expert of the Railway Authority. He will scrutinise with an unbiased mind the recommendations made by the Chief Commissioner. In these proposals we are really following the example of several Companies in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. The Chief Manager and his colleagues do not constitute a regular Committee or a Board, but the whole power rests on one man, and he consults his colleagues or subordinates whenever he likes in any capacity he pleases.

I do not like to raise the issue on this debate about the personnel of the Authority except to point out one thing, namely, that the Hindus and Muhammadans, who live and who will have to go on living in this country, must settle their mutual differences by some kind of agreement, and we cannot go on fighting for ever, and some kind of compromise should be arrived at. (Hear, hear.) It is immaterial, whether that compromise should form part of the Statute or be enforced by means of a convention. The important point is that there must be some kind of settlement of this particular question, so that we may work together for the good of the country and not fight unnecessarily on smaller issues.

Paragraph 6 of the London Committee's report deals with the Depreciation Fund and other investments and it suggests that a Committee might be convened to advise what those conditions should be. As regards the expenditure from the Depreciation Fund and other Funds, I think it is high time, even independent of the Statutory Board, that we should consider these questions very seriously and solve them for good. We have been demanding year after year that the Railway Board should present a balance sheet along with the profit and loss account, but no balance sheet has ever been presented. Sir, we ought to have some better provision and better manner of spending funds placed at the disposal of the Railway Authorities. I believe even the amount debited to the account of the Depreciation Fund is much more than any other country puts in. Out of an income of Rs. 85 crores, we are putting in 18

crores, that is about fifteen per cent., which is too big an amount. We ought to have clear rules (not confidential) about spending these funds, whether it should be left entirely to the Railway Authorities to do it as they like or whether they should not come before the Legislature; but these are important points of detail which must be settled sooner or later, and, I suggest, whether the Railway Authority is established or not, these important points should be considered, and these cannot for a long time be overlooked.

There is one point more about the power of the Legislature. In the first place, we said that the Members of the Legislature should not be eligible for being Members of the Railway Authority till one year has elapsed after the vacation of their seats. Now, that particular provision, as I said, has been borrowed from the Belgian Constitution, and that is the only Constitution where a provision of this kind exists, but they have taken only a part of it. The other part of that scheme is that the Minister is the Chairman of that particular Board. (Hear, hear.) The real idea was that the Minister might possibly begin to bring in members of his own Party. If you decide that the Minister should not be a Member of the Board, then this special provision which was found expedient in the Belgian Constitution has got no force, and this is also a provision which does not exist in any other country whatsoever. Therefore, if a special provision was introduced in one particular country for special reasons, we need not follow it blindly. We cannot introduce that provision without introducing its counterpart. If you make Members of the Indian Legislature not eligible till one year has elapsed, then, as a necessary consequence, you must make the Minister to be the President of the Railway Authority. Either follow both, or follow none.

The second thing which I should insist upon is that the Estimates and the Budget proposals ought to be laid before the Indian Legislature, and we should have the right to pass Resolutions, and this we do now in practice in the voting of the Demands. We only raise questions of policy by token cuts during the Budget debate. So I do not think we are losing any power.

Mr. S. G. Jog (Berar Representative): Questions on railway administration will be disallowed.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: The Railway Authority will do it.

Now, the next thing which we might consider and which I would certainly strongly support is to follow the method adopted in some of these Constitutions of European countries. They appoint a Committee of six persons: three are nominated by the Lower House and three are nominated by the Upper House. This Committee of six persons scrutinises very minutely the Budget of the year.

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

They are also laid before the two Houses when they consider the Budget and when they consider Resolutions. This is really a power which is parallel to what we have—that these things ought to be scrutinised by somebody on behalf of the Legislature and that their report should be considered by the Legislature. Though I do not advocate that we should have the power to vote for a demand, we should certainly have the power to pass Resolutions on the policy, and so forth. Then,

[Dr. Zaiuddin Ahmad.]

if we possess all these powers and we also have the power given to the Federal Minister or Member in charge of the Railways which is provided for, that if the Federal Government decides a particular question about the policy, then the Railway Authority will give effect to it, we can delegate our powers to this Authority. We know that the Member in charge of Communication will always represent the views of the majority of the Legislature. Therefore, if we have all the powers that I have just enunciated, then I think we are not losing any power which we possess not in name, but *de facto*. I think our supervision with all these provisions will be much more effective than the supervision which we exercise over the expenditure of the Indian railways at present.

As regards the rates and fares, I have a definite suggestion. Though the Railway Administration should have some latitude in fixing the tariffs, the limits should be prescribed by the Government. These limits should not be very wide such as one pie a maund and one rupee a maund. With these wide limits, it is impossible for anybody to leave the exact fixation to the Railway Administration. The variations should be narrow and such as exist between the maximum and minimum points in exchange. The degree of variations cannot be left to the Railway Administration. If you read the Constitution of any country in which the State-owned railways have been handed over to the Railway Authority, you will notice that the final authority for fixing the rates and fares is always the Government itself, because the prosperity of the country and the development of the trade depend upon the fixing of the proper rates and fares. These rates can create or destroy industry. The maximum and the minimum fixed under the present administration are too wide, and such wide limitations cannot be left to the Railway Administration.

Then, Sir, another question mentioned here is the question of a difference of a dispute between any trade and the Railway Authority about the rates of a particular article. We have practically followed the system which exists at present which is this. The matter is first referred to an Advisory Committee; then the report of the Advisory Committee is referred to the Railway Authority and then the Government decide. I think this is too elaborate a procedure. We should follow the practice that prevails in other countries and have a Tribunal instead of the Rates Advisory Committee. That Tribunal consists of a Judge of the High Court who is the President, and there is a representative of one Party and also the representative of the Railway Authority, and their decision is final. That will be a great improvement on the present cumbersome and expensive system.

Then, Sir, there is one other point on which I should like to lay great emphasis in the interest of economy and efficiency. We have followed the example of Germany in introducing the divisional organisations in order to have efficient management, but we should follow it in other respects. We should examine the systems of other countries. My friend, Mr. Mitra, says that we should follow the practice of Japan. But, Sir, whenever I speak, I speak only of those systems which I have actually seen and tested. I have read only the reports about the administration of Japan, and, therefore, I am not an authority on it. My friend says that that is the only country where the railways pay. It may be so. I think we ought to improve our general administration in order to make it work more efficiently and more economically. I suggested it in the

London Committee, but it was considered to be irrelevant to our discussions. We should co-ordinate our railways. We should follow the practice of abolishing some of the unnecessary offices. We followed Germany in organising the divisional system, but we should also follow Germany and abolish agencies. Give full powers to the Superintendents, and the Chief Commissioner should control and co-ordinate their work. The Chief Commissioner should directly be responsible for the administration of Indian railways and appoint as many Divisional Superintendents as may be found necessary. I know that this system cannot be introduced all at once, because we have got a very complicated system. We have got a system in which we have got State railways being managed by the State; then we have State railways being managed by the Companies; then we have private railways being managed by the State. All these combinations are there, and unless these complications are solved, this particular ideal cannot be introduced successfully. We will soon acquire the direct administration of few important lines now worked by Companies, and we should be ready with a better administration of the Indian railways. And I think the ideal is that we do create an Authority responsible to the Indian Government and also responsible to the Indian Legislature who are the representatives of the tax-payers. The day-to-day administration should be left entirely to one individual, namely, the Chief Commissioner, who should have a large staff under him representing different heads of the administration. He should supervise and control direct work of the Divisional Superintendents with out the intervention of Agents. I think the existing administration is expensive and there is a great duplication of work. The system worked exceedingly well when most of the lines were managed by Companies.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Honourable Member should now conclude.

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad: I will finish. I only recapitulate what I said; it is essential for the better administration of the Indian railways that we should have a Railway Authority, but it is equally essential that this Railway Authority should be responsible to the Indian Legislature and to the Indian Government, and should be created by them. After all, it is intended for the benefit of the people of India, and the Indian Government have got an interest in it, because they are entitled to get one per cent. of the capital at charge, that is, about eight crores of rupees. The Indian Government is also responsible for the payment of the interest on the capital advanced to the Railway Department.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: Mr. President, I am anxious that the House should express its opinion on the one important question that has arisen in the course of the debate, and I hope that somehow, in putting the motion to the vote of the House, you will make it clear that that is the question on which the House will divide. I suggest that that question is whether legislation should be by Parliament or whether legislation should be by this House or by its successors. The Right Honourable the Secretary of State, in the Memorandum that he submitted to the Joint Parliamentary Committee, has put forward four alternatives, and I should like to draw the attention of the House to alternative No. 1 and alternative No. 4, under either of which legislation will be by this House. Under alternative No. 1:

“An Act might be passed in the present Indian Legislature and the proper adaptation to the new Constitution made in the Constitution itself.”

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

Under alternative No. 4:

"The matter might be left entirely to the new Indian Legislature with the reservation that the approval of the Governor General in his discretion should be required to the introduction of the original Bill or any amending Bill."

I am agreeable to either of these courses, but I am not agreeable to the courses laid down in alternatives Nos. 2 and 3, whereby Parliamentary legislation is required for establishing the Statutory Railway Board. I should like to make it clear at the outset that the Members of the Central Legislature, who were members of the London Committee, were unanimously of opinion, as my friend, Mr. Yamin Khan, has already pointed out, that legislation of this kind should be undertaken by the Central Legislature of India. In fact, my Honourable friend, Mr. Ranga Iyer, raised this issue in a prominent manner at the very inception of the proceedings of the Committee, and it was only because it was ruled out of discussion by the Secretary of State as the Chairman of the Committee who suggested that this matter was eminently a matter which could be discussed by the Joint Parliamentary Committee in collaboration with the Indian delegates who attended that committee, that the London Committee was not in a position to express any opinion on the subject. Otherwise, I do not have the least hesitation that practically all the Indian members of that Committee, whether they were representatives of the Central Legislature or outsiders would have been in favour of legislation by this House or by the Central Legislature for the creation of a Statutory Railway Board.

Sir, in discussing this question about the Statutory Railway Board, I wish to emphasise not indeed para. 1 of the Secretary of State's memorandum which my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, read out, but para. 1 of the Committee Report itself which, I am afraid, has not received the attention which it deserves from Honourable Members of this House. That paragraph begins:

"Subject to the control of policy by the Federal Government and the Legislature, a Railway Authority will be established and will be entrusted with the administration of railways in India as described in para. 4 and will exercise its powers through an executive constituted as described in para. 3."

It will be seen from this paragraph that the authority and the functions of the Railway Authority are limited to this one supreme consideration. This one supreme control that the policy will be dictated by the Federal Government and by the Federal Legislature. Honourable Members may want to know what is meant by this. I feel, Sir, that it means that on every essential question concerning the railways, this House will have the power of expressing its opinion, and remember, Sir, that the Federal Minister under the new Constitution will be responsible to this House, and, if any motion is carried in this House by a majority, that will be binding on the Federal Minister and through him on the Statutory Railway Authority.

Sir, some of my Honourable friends feel somehow or other that the present powers are much wider than they will be under the new Constitution. But I would ask my Honourable friends to turn their attention to the 190 amendments that have been given with reference to the Budget discussion, now, in the present year when we are supposed to have very wide powers and when we have actually the power of voting on the demands and passing the demands put forward by the Honourable the Commerce

Member. I have before me a list of these amendments, 176 in number in the printed list, and 11 from my Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai. With the exception of two motions, every one of them is a motion for reduction by Rs. 100 to discuss a question of policy. Therefore, 185 out of these 187 motions raise questions or discussion of policy. Let me now advert to the question of substantial cuts, the very first is by my very interesting friend, Kumar Gopika Romon Roy, who, I am sorry, is not here, and it reads as follows:

“That the demand under the head ‘Railway Board’ be reduced to pies 3.”

If that is the substantial cut that this House can be advised to carry, I do not envy its position now and I do not regret if that power is removed from the future Federal Assembly. The only other cut is from my Honourable friend

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: If I may interrupt my Honourable friend, that power is not removed from the future Federal Assembly, because it will have the power of censuring the Minister if it differs from his policy.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudallar: I was referring to substantial cuts reducing the grant, but not to censure motions at all. All these are in the nature of censure motions or questions raising issues of policy, and this power will completely inhere in the Federal Legislature. What I am pointing out is that the present Legislature, by some scheme of its own, by the adaptation of some policy imposed on itself, is carrying out that which the future Federal Legislature is asked to do under the scheme of reforms. It has not taken on itself the task of reducing the grant, by cutting the pay of an Agent here or a Deputy Agent there, or a Chief Engineer of Railways elsewhere or a Publicity Officer in another direction, and, during the last fourteen years, while this Railway Budget has been discussed in the Legislative Assembly, I venture to put forward, from a rather cursory reading of the debates of this House, that this House has never exercised and, may I say, never wanted to exercise, so far as the Railway Budget is concerned, the power of reducing a grant substantially. It has always, I find, tried to exercise the power by raising questions of policy, and, so far as that is concerned, the new proposals keep in tact,—in fact go further than the present powers naturally, because we are visualising a constitution of responsible Government,—keep in tact the present powers of the Legislature and make the exercise of those powers much more potent and much more effective.

Mr. K. P. Thampan (West Coast and Nilgiris: Non-Muhammadan Rural): What about interpellations?

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudallar: If these policies are dictated by the Central Legislature and if the Railway Board is bound to carry out this policy, then it stands to reason that any interpellations with reference to any application of policy laid down by the Legislature and adopted by this House can be interpellated upon in this House and can form a subject of censure motion on the Ministry concerned. I have no doubt at all that that is the actual constitutional position.

Let me now come to the position of the Railway Authority and the Railway Board. I suspect that there was a confusion in the mind of my Honourable friend, Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh,—I may be wrong and I may

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

be doing him an injustice,—but the position is surely this. The Railway Board will be in existence under the new Constitution, which will come into existence, in a different way from the present Railway Board, but in between the Federal Legislature and the Federal Minister and the Railway Board, which will be actually the executive authority for managing the Railways, there will be interposed an authority called the Railway Authority composed of non-officials, composed of Members who, according to the unanimous recommendations of the Members of the Central Legislature, will be Members nominated by the Federal Minister, who, according to the proposals of the majority of this Committee, will be composed partly of Nominated Members by the Federal Legislature and partly by Members nominated by the Governor General at his discretion. In either case, this Railway Authority will be the real representative non-official body which will be in close touch with the working of the railways, it will have control over the Chief Commissioner, it will scrutinise the Railway Budgets and it will, from time to time, lay down instructions for the Chief Commissioner which he is bound to carry out. In fact, Sir, the Chief Commissioner of Railways will carry out only those powers which are delegated to him by the Railway Authority. The question arose in the Committee, whether such a Railway Authority, keeping such a constant and close supervision over the working of the railways, should be composed of men who are full-time men paid for the job or whether they should be half-timers getting a fairly good allowance. Some of the Members felt that they must be full-time Members from the very start. A majority of the Committee, however, felt that it was an experiment which may be tried, but they kept an open mind on the question whether they may be full time men or not. If experience necessitated the appointment of these Members to the Railway Authority on a full-time basis, they did not oppose it, but they did not want to make a proposal from the very start that they should be full time officers paid for the purpose. This Railway Authority is the authority which is going to have the real control over the management of the Railway Administration, subject, of course, to the policy being dictated by the Federal Government and by the Federal Minister. In either alternative, and taking the worst alternative, that is, the alternative, whereby four Members are nominated by the Federal Minister and three Members nominated by the Governor General, I ask this House to give its verdict on this question whether that Authority will not have greater control over the Railway Executive than the present Legislature is having. There is no use of thinking that the Railway Executive, as we know it, will have no check over it at all hereafter. No, Sir, that is not the position. There is a Railway Authority composed of non-official gentlemen, seven in number, and they will have the requisite control over the Railway Executive. If that Authority is going to function satisfactorily, I venture to suggest that the extent of control over the Railway Board, and, through the Railway Board, over the Agents of the various Railway Administrations, will be much more close and much more exacting, and it will be much more concerned with the day-to-day administration than it is possible at the present moment. (Hear, hear.)

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: May I rise to elicit an explanation? Will the Honourable Member enlighten the House for I am also in a little doubt. My Honourable friend has used the words "Railway Board" frequently. I do not know what exactly he means by "Railway

Board". In the new constitution, there will only be a Railway Authority and a Railway Executive, but no Railway Board.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudalliar: At the present moment, we are having a Railway Board, constituted of a Chief Commissioner, a Financial Commissioner and two or three other Members as the occasion may demand, at the present moment, there is only one other Member, and these are in supreme command of the whole affairs of the railways. The only authority above them is the over-worked Member for Commerce and Transport. Is that an Authority which is going to be more under control under the Railway Authority or less under control under the Railway Authority than it is at present.

I shall come now to the next scheme of this report. Under this Railway Authority, there will be a Railway Executive. The Railway Board will be composed of the Chief Commissioner, the Financial Commissioner and such other number of Commissioners as the Chief Commissioner may recommend. This is what I call the new Railway Board composed of a Chief Commissioner, a Financial Commissioner and such other Commissioners as may be desired by the Chief Commissioner. This is the executive which carries out the work of the railways, Company-managed, State-managed, branch lines and all other lines. Now, how is this body going to be appointed? The Chief Commissioner is appointed by the Statutory Railway Authority; that is to say, these seven non-official gentlemen, howsoever they may be composed so far as communal considerations are concerned, will be the persons who will select their future Chief Commissioner. The only restriction is that that selection should be approved by the Governor General in Council. It is not a question of their making a recommendation to the Governor General which may or may not be approved; it is not a question of their being consulted as in the case of the appointment of the Governor of the Reserve Bank. Consultation in that event may mean that the Governor General at his discretion may appoint some one who has never been thought of by the Board of Directors. But, on the other hand, the Chief Commissioner is going to be appointed on the recommendation of the Railway Authority; that is to say, if one gentleman is not accepted by the Governor General, then he can only ask the Railway Authority to send in the name of another gentleman. He cannot choose somebody in whom the Railway Authority has not got confidence. And quite rightly. The Railway Authority, under the scheme of the proposals, you will find, Mr. President, has the supreme responsibility of seeing that the railways are managed and conducted so economically and so efficiently that they are a profitable concern on commercial lines. You cannot throw that responsibility on the Railway Authority and, at the same time, suggest that the Chief Executive Officer shall be put over their heads without consultation with them and in direct negation or opposition to their orders.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer: May I ask my friend where he gets this new Railway Board from? It is not in the report.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudalliar: I would suggest to the Honourable Member to read the report of the Committee once over. You may call it the Railway Board or you may call it the Railway Executive. There is no charm in the words "Railway Board". I consider that as the Railway Board, and it does not matter so long as the idea is not that these people should act in consultation or that the majority

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

of votes will prevail. I distinctly say that that is not the case, but if these two or three people are going to act together and the Chief Commissioner is to be mainly responsible to the Railway Authority, I consider this an incipient Board at any rate.

Now, Sir, the Financial Commissioner is the next chief authority, almost co-equal in extent of authority or in powers or in responsibilities to the Chief Commissioner himself. The Financial Commissioner plays a very important part at present in the affairs of the Railway Board, and the future Financial Commissioner is going to play an even more important part in the new Railway Executive that will be created,—I will avoid the words "Railway Board" if that does not suit any of the Honourable Members of this House. Now, the Financial Commissioner is going to be appointed by the Federal Minister or by the Governor General on the advice of the Federal Minister, to use a constitutional phrase, and that means that the recommendation of the Federal Minister is binding on the Governor General. It is a well known constitutional phrase. The Governor General cannot repudiate the advice of the Minister and is bound to accept the advice.

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney: It does not say so in the report.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: It does say so in the report, and I would beg my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, who takes a very lively interest in all railway matters, to read the report once again:

"The Financial Commissioner will be appointed by the Governor General on the advice of the Federal Government."

I did not know I was quoting the report so accurately, Mr. President. That merely means that the Governor General must appoint the man chosen by the Federal Government. And, naturally, it is right that it should be so. Matters of finance, finance being a transferred subject under the control of the Legislature and in charge of a responsible Finance Minister, must be so arranged that the man in charge of financial scrutiny must be a man in whom the Federal Ministry has complete confidence. And, therefore, even as the Chief Commissioner is the person in whom the Railway Authority has complete confidence, the Financial Commissioner must be a person in whom the Federal Minister has complete confidence. Over and above this, the Chief Commissioner may suggest such other number of Commissioners as he considers necessary and the Railway Authority shall appoint them.

This is the skeleton of the proposals in the main. Now, I come to the question which was raised and which was debated to a certain extent on which, I admit, there was no agreement among representatives of the Legislature, whether the Minister of Transport should be a Member of the Railway Authority or not. Some of my colleagues felt that the Minister of Transport should be a Member of the Railway Authority and should be the Chairman of the Authority. I took the view, along with some other colleagues, that it was far better that the Minister of Transport should be outside the Railway Authority altogether, that he must have only the power, at any time he likes, to attend meetings of the Railway Authority, give directions to the Railway Authority on the lines of the policies approved by himself or by the Legislature and require the

Railway Authority to carry out certain instructions which the Federal Government or the Legislature may lay down on questions of policy. And I felt that it would add to the prestige, it would add to the dignity and it would add to the efficiency of the Minister of Transport if he were kept outside the Railway Authority and were merely in a position to attend any particular meeting of the Railway Authority and carrying on to them in person the wishes of his Government on any particular subject. What would happen in the alternative case? If he were Minister and if he were the President of the Railway Authority and if he were outvoted in the Railway Authority, what is his position with reference to the Legislature? If he is called upon to give an explanation for some act of the Railway Authority, is he going to suggest, as many of us who have served on committees are inclined to suggest in this House, that for his part he did not do so; he voted against the proposal, but his colleagues on the Railway Authority voted him down and, therefore, he should not be censured, but that the censure should be on his colleagues on the Railway Authority? That may be an easy position for a Non-Official Member, but it will be an impossible position for a Minister to take up, that while he is a Member of that Authority and bound by the decisions of the majority, he can have the hardihood to come up to the Legislature and say that personally he should be exonerated from any decisions that that Railway Authority has taken on any particular point. I still hold the view that it is far better for himself that the Minister of Transport should be outside the Railway Authority and should not be either a Member or the President of that Authority.

Now, Sir, the Secretary of State has emphasised this point that on questions of policy the Federal Government and the Legislature will have complete control. In paragraph 4, he says:

"The governing principle laid down in paragraph 1 of the proposals is that railway policy is to be controlled by the Federal Government and the Legislature, and where Defence requirements may be concerned, the authority of the Federal Government will reside in the Governor General by virtue of his special responsibility in respect of any matter affecting the administration of the Reserved Department of Defence."

That is to say, in all matters the Federal Government will be responsible. In those matters of policy which are within the competence of the non-reserved departments, the voice of the Legislature will prevail. In those matters of policy, such as defence matters with reference to strategic railways or with reference to mobilisation and utilisation of the railway energies at times of war or in cases of need, defence being a reserved subject and the Governor General being responsible, under the White Paper scheme, matters of policy in that respect must obviously be dictated by the Governor General. My Honourable friend, Mr. Dudhoria, raised some interesting questions, and asked what the Legislature will do hereafter. He raised the question of labour and said that supposing there is trouble with reference to railway labour,—and the railway is one of the largest employers of labour,—what will be the position of this Legislature? If, as a matter of policy, this Legislature feels that particular hours of work should be prescribed for railway labour or that particular wages as the minima should be prescribed for railway labour, then I hold that, under the scheme of this London Committee's report, this Legislature has complete and omnipotent powers on those questions. Take, again, the question of the promotion of indigenous industries in the purchase of stores. If as a matter of policy, this Legislature decides

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

that the railways should utilise stores and articles produced in this country and promote the indigenous industries, I venture to claim that if that is a question of policy,—and I cannot see how it is not a question of policy,—the opinion of this Legislature expressed by Resolution must be accepted by the Federal Minister and must be translated into practice by the Railway Authority and by every officer connected with the railway system.

Take, again, the question of transport facilities to encourage trade and industry and agricultural produce with reference to which my learned friend, Raja Bahadur Krishnamachariar, is going to have a motion tomorrow: well, that is certainly a question of policy; and, therefore, if agricultural produce is to be conveyed at certain rates as a matter of public policy, then I venture to say again that the Legislature will be completely seized of that question, and its views must undoubtedly prevail.

Take, again, the question of Indianisation. I cannot conceive of any question which is more a question of policy than the question of Indianisation, and whatever is laid down by the Legislature must be binding on the Railway Authority subject to one consideration—yes—because you will find in the White Paper scheme that the Governor General has got some special responsibilities in this matter of services—subject to that consideration, subject to any particular proposal of the Legislature being overruled by the Governor General in the discharge of his special responsibilities, I say once more that this Legislature dealing with it as a matter of policy will have complete power. I venture to go further, and, may I say, I am making a personal confession, that if only this Legislature, not even the Federal Legislature, knows how to exercise its powers and tries to bring up questions of policy—not detailed questions of a Ticket Examiner here and an Assistant Station Master there,—it could exercise much more influence even under the present Act than it is doing by the hundreds and thousands of questions that it unfortunately asks on the floor of this House. We have to educate ourselves—and here I say from my friend, Sir Henry Gidney, down to my humble self, as to how we have to educate ourselves as to the manner in which we can bring contentious questions for discussion on the floor of the House without disgusting some of our own colleagues and without having any effect on the Honourable Members of the Treasury Bench.

Now, somebody suggested that the interests of the minorities were ignored under the scheme. That was a very difficult question. We faced it fairly and squarely, and I think we have evolved a solution which I commend to the attention and acceptance of this House. That solution is to be found in para. 8 of this Committee's report:

"The railway Authority will be empowered, subject to the powers of the Governor General, in the exercise of his special responsibilities, and subject to the safeguarding of the rights of all officers in the service, at the time of the establishment of the Railway Authority, to regulate by rules or by general or special order the classification of posts in the railway services on state-worked lines in British India, and the methods of recruitment qualifications for appointment to the service, conditions of service, pay and allowances, Provident Fund benefits, gratuities, discipline and conduct of those services; to make such delegations as it thinks fit, in regard to appointments and promotions, to authorities subordinate to it; and to create such new appointments in the State Railway Services in British India as it may deem necessary or"

It comes to this that the new Railway Authority is the supreme authority with reference to all these matters, and others can only exercise it by way of delegation. Then comes the important sentence:

"In its recruitment to the railway services the Railway Authority shall be required to give effect to any instructions that may be laid down to secure the representation of the various communities in India."

Those instructions will be laid down by the Federal Government and by the Federal Ministry

Mr. S. C. Sen (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce: Indian Commerce): Where do you find it?

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: That is the obvious meaning

Mr. S. C. Sen: The obvious meaning is that the instructions will be laid down by the Secretary of State or the Governor General.

Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar: My Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, is a very good lawyer, and I bow to him on all questions of interpretation of Statutes and laws, but I prefer to interpret a report, to which I was a direct party, in my own way. The Secretary of State does not enter into this question at all: he is wiped out of the picture, so far as this matter is concerned, the moment the Railway Authority is constituted. Then my friend referred to the Governor General. The next sentence says:

"In regard to the framing of rules to regulate the recruitment of the Superior Railway Services the Public Service Commission shall be consulted. Any powers in regard to matters dealt with in this paragraph at present exercised by the Government of India over Company-managed railways shall in future be exercised by the Railway Authority."

Therefore, as regards the Governor General, the very opening sentence of the para. I have quoted says that the Railway Authority will be empowered, subject to the powers of the Governor General in the exercise of his special responsibility. The special responsibility for maintaining a contented service, for giving effect to what is termed communal representation, or, for looking after the grievances, etc., inheres in the Governor General. In making those appointments, so far as principles are concerned, the Railway Authority will be bound by the regulations or instructions which the Government of the day, that is, the Federal Government may lay down; and, with reference to the qualifications, etc., as regards the superior services, it will be guided by the recommendations of the Public Services Commission. Some members of the Committee went further and suggested that, both for superior and subordinate appointments, the Public Services Commission may be consulted and their rules adopted by the Railway Authority. Unfortunately we were not able to carry the majority of our colleagues on the London Committee with us, but it is quite clear that at every stage and in every manner possible we have tried to see that the representation of various communities is adequately safeguarded. How else could we do it when no less a champion of the rights of minority communities than my friend, Sir Henry Gidney, appeared before the London Committee with a special memorandum on the subject of the appointment of Anglo-Indians, and pleaded so eloquently, so charmingly and so effectively that the London Committee was left gasping at the moment when he finished his eloquent appeal?

One or two minor points only remain. Take the question of maxima and minima rates and freights. One of the questions that is so often

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

debated in this House is the reduction of third class passenger fares and of traffic rates. In fact, this morning we had a debate on that question: you will find that in para. 11, it is said:

"In regard to the railways referred to in paragraph 4, maxima and minima rates and fares shall be fixed by the Railway Authority subject to the control of the Federal Government."

That is to say, if the Federal Government so choose, it can, with the approval of the Legislature, direct the Railway Authority to take a particular maximum fare and a particular minimum fare. I venture to think that, on the whole, in this report, we have tried to safeguard, as far as possible, the real effective control of policy on behalf of the public. It is true that we are not going to have a replica of the discussion that we now have on the Railway Budget; it is true that my Honourable friend, the Commerce Member, or his successor, the Federal Minister of Transport, will not put forward 12 items before us which we now scrutinise with the idea of reducing them substantially; it is true, at any rate I hope it will be true, that we shall not have 976 out of 3,000 questions relating to railway employees, which we had during the last year, on the floor of the House. But there is the control of the Federal Legislature through the responsible Federal Minister over the Railway Authority. I venture to submit that under this scheme of reforms, if it goes through, we shall have greater power than we have today. But that is not saying much: we shall have more effective power in controlling the Railway Administration than we are having today.

One last question. Somebody suggested to the Commerce Member that he need not partake in this debate. I do not know whether he will be in a position to do so with reference to these proposals; but I would like to ask the question, which I asked Sir George Schuster with reference to the Reserve Bank Report: is he in a position to tell us how far the recommendations of the London Committee with reference to the Statutory Railway Board have been accepted by the Secretary of State and by the British Government? I know that so far as the Joint Parliamentary Committee is concerned, the question is still an open question—it is *res judicata*, if I may say so; but I wish to know how far the British Government and the Secretary of State are willing to back up the report of the London Committee, and in what particulars, if any, he is prepared to reject the recommendation of the majority of the London Committee. I venture once more to suggest to this House that it will be utilising its opportunity to the best purpose if it concentrates on this one issue, whether legislation shall be by Parliamentary Statute or by this House, and, on that question, I have no hesitation that the overwhelming opinion of this House will be in favour of legislation by this House or by its successor. (Applause.)

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The Chair has no objection to adjourn the House now.

Some Honourable Members: Yes.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty): The House now stands adjourned till 11 O'Clock tomorrow.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 22nd February, 1934.