

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THURSDAY, 9th AUGUST, 1934

Vol. VII—No. 4

## OFFICIAL REPORT



### CONTENTS.

Questions and Answers.

Unstarred Questions and Answers.

Statements laid on the Table.

Resolution *re* Representation of Indian Christians in the Services and Committees—Adopted.

Resolution *re* Appointment of a Committee on the Indian Coal Industry—Withdrawn.

Statement of Business.

SIMLA : PRINTED BY THE MANAGER  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS : 1934

•Price Five Annas.

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 9th August, 1934.

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

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### EUROPEANS AND INDIANS SERVING IN THE OFFICES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA.

497. \*Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar : Will Government please state the number of Europeans and Indians serving in the offices of the Secretary of State for India and the High Commissioner for India, who are in receipt of over Rs. 300 per mensem ?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré : The information required, in respect of the office of the Secretary of State for India, is not available. As regards the office of the High Commissioner for India, information is being collected and will be furnished to the House in due course.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai : Is not the information already known to the Government of India ?

The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré : No, Sir.

### STAFF IN THE IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

498. \*Khan Bahadur Haji Wajihuddin : (a) Will Government be pleased to state the total strength of the staff employed by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, which is paid from the annual grant given by Government, or from the grant of the funds at the disposal of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state how many of them are Mussalmans ?

(c) Will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the names and salaries of all the persons employed by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research ?

(d) Do Government propose to give effect to the recent Resolution of the Home Department regarding the 25 per cent. proportion of Muslims in Government service ?

Mr. G. S. Bajpai : (a) The strength of the staff on the Administration side which is paid for from Central Revenues is 51, and on the Research side which is paid from the funds of the Council is 111.

(b) Sixteen on the Administrative side and forty-one on the Research side.

(c) Statements are laid on the table.

( 1247 )

(d) In the ministerial and inferior ranks, this percentage has been exceeded. In the gazetted ranks, both on the technical and administrative side, there is a deficiency. Every endeavour will be made to rectify this.

Statement showing the names and salaries of officers and establishments employed under the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department as on the 4th August, 1934.

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.	Remarks.
<b>GAZETTED OFFICERS.</b>			
		Rs.    A.    P.	
1	D. B. Sir T. Vijayaraghavacharya, K.B.E., Vice-Chairman.	Pay .. 3,208 5 4 Pension.. 791 10 8 <hr/> 4,000 0 0	
2	Mr. B. C. Burt, C.I.E., M.B.E., I.A.S., Agricultural Expert.	Pay .. 2,750 0 0 O. P. .. £13 6 8	
3	Colonel A. Olver, C.B., C.M.G., F.R.C.V.S., Animal Husbandry Expert.	Pay .. 2,750 0 0 O. P. .. £13 6 8	
4	R.S. Malik Charan Das, I.S.S., Secretary.	Pay .. 1,100 0 0	
5	R. S. Tej Bhan Bahl, B.A., Superintendent.	640 0 0	On leave till 16th November, 1934.
<i>Ministerial Staff.</i>			
1	Mr. Bazlul Karim .. ..	400 0 0	Officiating as Superintendent vice R. S. Tej Bhan Bahl, on leave (acting pay Ra. 680).
2	Mr. P. M. Sundaram .. ..	260 0 0	
3	Mr. Mohammed Shafi, Librarian	365 0 0	
4	Mr. P. S. Sundaram .. ..	245 0 0	
5	Mr. T. S. Krishnamurti .. ..	230 0 0	
6	Mr. Arnar Nath, Cashier .. ..	300 0 0	Plus S. P. Ra. 50.
7	Mr. Shams-ud-Din .. ..	180 0 0	
8	Mr. V. Padmanabhan .. ..	196 0 0	Plus P. P. Ra. 8.
9	Mr. M. H. Sultan .. ..	124 0 0	
10	Mr. H. C. Thapar .. ..	132 0 0	

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.	Remarks.
		Rs. A. P.	
11	Mr. M. Y. Burney .. ..	108 0 0	
12	Mr. N. R. Srinivasan .. ..	106 0 0	
13	Mr. Kasturi Lal .. ..	106 0 0	
14	Mr. Nazir Ahmad .. ..	106 0 0	
15	Mr. B. Chatterji .. ..	106 0 0	Plus P. P. Rs. 8.
16	Mr. Mohammed Sanullah .. ..	106 0 0	
17	Mr. Sardar Mohammed .. ..	122 0 0	
18	Mr. Ajudhia Prashad .. ..	102 0 0	
19	Mr. Ramji Das Mohindra .. ..	106 0 0	
20	Mr. Shanti Lal Dung .. ..	125 0 0	Employed in a temporary post created for a period of 4 months.
21	Mr. M. L. Chatrath, Stenographer.	237 8 0	
22	Mr. Abdul Gani .. ..	225 0 0	
23	Mr. Harnam Singh .. ..	312 8 0	
24	Mr. E. Parthasarathi .. ..	225 0 0	Plus D. A. Rs. 50.
	<i>Inferior Staff.</i>		
1	Bija Ram, Record Sorter .. ..	37 0 0	
2	Ahmad Din, Duftry .. ..	22 0 0	
3	Mohammed Din, Duftry .. ..	19 0 0	
4	Amar Singh Duftry .. ..	19 0 0	
5	Gya Pershad, Jemadar .. ..	30 0 0	
6	Purbi Din, Jemadar .. ..	27 0 0	
7	Debi Ram, Jemadar .. ..	26 0 0	
8	Kesru .. ..	22 0 0	Officiating 2nd class Jemadar vice Sadhu Ram on foreign service.
9	Debi Din .. ..	16 0 0	Officiating Dafadar vice Kesru.
10	Chandu .. ..	16 0 0	
11	Paras Ram .. ..	15 0 0	
12	Mohammed Ismail .. ..	15 0 0	

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.		Remarks.
		Rs.	A. P.	
13	Mohammed Ali .. ..	15	0 0	
14	Durga Ram .. ..	15	0 0	
15	Chingoo .. ..	14	0 0	
16	Mohammed Nazir .. ..	14	0 0	
17	Musaddi .. ..	14	0 0	
18	Gulam Mohammed .. ..	14	0 0	
19	Ganga Pershad .. ..	14	0 0	
20	Durga Ram II .. ..	14	0 0	
21	Abdul Wahid .. ..	14	0 0	
22	Madan Singh .. ..	14	0 0	

Statement showing the names and salaries of officers and establishments employed under the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research as on the 4th August, 1934.

*I. Staff employed at the Headquarters of the Council.*

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.		Remarks.
		Rs.	A. P.	
<b>GAZETTED OFFICERS.</b>				
<i>Technical.</i>				
1	Mr. A. M. Livingstone, Marketing Expert.	2,500	0 0	Plus O.P. £ 13 6 W
2	Mr. R. D. Kapur, Chief Economist	600	0 0	
3	Mr. M. Vaidyanathan, Statistician	600	0 0	
<b>NON-GAZETTED OFFICERS.</b>				
<i>Technical Staff.</i>				
1	Mr. K. P. R. Kartha .. ..	230	0 0	
2	Mr. Subramanyan Iyer .. ..	190	0 0	

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934	Remarks.
		Rs. A. P.	
	<i>Ministerial Staff.</i>		
1	Mr. <del>Shyam</del> Swaroop, Accountant	420 0 0	Appointed by the Accountant General, Central Revenues, as his representative as a primary auditor of the research accounts of the I. C. A. R. (The Council pays only average cost of the post, viz., Rs. 379-10-0.)
2	Mr. B. B. Saksena, Assistant ..	200 0 0	
3	Mr. Baksh Illahi, Assistant Accountant.	167 8 0	
4	Mr. A. A. Shakir, Assistant ..	140 0 0	
5	Mr. N. S. Lakshmanan (on leave). (Mr. Nadir Shah, offg. on Rs. 60 per mensem).	125 0 0	
6	Mr. V. N. Kohli, Clerk .. ..	120 0 0	
7	Mr. T. R. Rajagopalan .. ..	120 0 0	
8	Mr. Mahfooz Hussain .. ..	100 0 0	
9	Mr. Abdul Rahim .. ..	80 0 0	
10	Mr. Man Mohan Singh Manchanda	75 0 0	
11	Mr. V. Rangaacharia .. ..	75 0 0	
12	Mr. Amar Nath .. ..	75 0 0	
13	Mr. Mohd. Din .. ..	75 0 0	
14	Mr. Hans Raj Bahl .. ..	75 0 0	
15	Mr. Pran Nath .. ..	75 0 0	
16	Mr. C. S. A. Subramanyan .. ..	75 0 0	
17	Mr. Nihal Chaud .. ..	75 0 0	
18	Mr. Nasrat Ullah .. ..	60 0 0	
19	Mr. Chaman Lal .. ..	60 0 0	
20	Mr. K. V. Nanjundiah .. ..	60 0 0	
21	Mr. Hamid Ali .. ..	60 0 0	

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.	Remarks.
		Rs. A. P.	
	<i>Inferior Staff.</i>		
1	Sadhu Ram, Jamadar ..	26 0 0	<i>Plus compensatory allowance Rs. 4-8-0 and H. R. allowance Re. 1.</i>
2	Dip Ram .. .. .	16 0 0	
3	Tara Singh .. .. .	16 0 0	
4	Gulam Ahmad .. .. .	16 0 0	
5	Sant Ram .. .. .	15 0 0	
6	Sadar Din .. .. .	15 0 0	
7	Khuda Bux .. .. .	15 0 0	
8	Jamna Dhar .. .. .	15 0 0	
9	Chandu .. .. .	15 0 0	
10	Man Singh .. .. .	15 0 0	
11	Paras Ram .. .. .	15 0 0	
12	Paras Ram .. .. .	14 0 0	
13	Allah Diya .. .. .	14 0 0	

*II. Staff employed under the Sugar Technologist, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research.*

	GAZETTED OFFICER.		
	(Technical),		
1	Mr. R. C. Srivastava, Sugar Technologist.	1,900 0 0	
	NON-GAZETTED OFFICERS.		
	<i>Technical Staff.</i>		
1	Mr. J. P. Mukerjee (Engineer) ..	150 0 0	
2	Mr. K. M. Sadhu (Draftsman) ..	144 0 0	
	<i>Clerical Staff.</i>		
1	Mr. M. N. Mehta, First Assistant	170 0 0	
2	Mr. R. N. Prasad, Head Clerk ..	127 8 0	

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.	Remarks.
		Rs. A. P.	
3	Mr. L. P. Sinha, Stenographer ..	127 8 0	
4	Mr. S. N. Gupta, Second Assistant	95 0 0	
5	Mr. Subha Singh. .. ..	88 0 0	
6	Mr. J. N. Prasad .. ..	88 0 0	
7	Mr. Amir-ul-Hasan .. ..	80 0 0	
8	Mr. Sukhdev Thakur .. ..	70 0 0	
9	Mr. J. P. Sinha .. ..	70 0 0	
10	Mr. M. P. Misra .. ..	70 0 0	
11	Mr. Asghar Ali .. ..	50 0 0	
12	Mr. Ganga Prasada .. ..	50 0 0	
	<i>Inferior Staff.</i>		
1	Kaliocharan .. ..	16 0 0	
2	Imam Khan .. ..	12 0 0	
3	Abdul Hafiz .. ..	12 0 0	
4	Din Dial .. ..	12 0 0	
5	Umeshankar .. ..	12 0 0	
6	Ram Prasad Bajpai .. ..	12 0 0	
7	Chandu Lal .. ..	10 0 0	
8	Chandri Khan .. ..	10 0 0	

III. Staff employed under the Locust Research Entomologist, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, Karachi.

GAZETTED OFFICERS (TECHNICAL).

1	Rao Sahib Y. Ramachandra Rao, Locust Research Entomologist.	Pay .. 1,000 0 0 L. A. .. 60 0 0
---	---	-------------------------------------

NON-GAZETTED OFFICERS.

*Technical Staff.*

1	Dr. K. R. Karandhikar, Assistant Locust Research Entomologist.	370 0 0
2	Mr. K. D. Baweja, Locust Research Assistant.	.. .. 350 0 0

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.	Remarks.
		Rs. A. P.	
3	Mirza Ahmad Ali Khan, Locust Research Assistant.	Pay .. 160 0 0 L. A. .. 15 0 0	
4	Mr. D. R. Bhatia, Research Assistant.	Pay .. 160 0 0	
5	Mr. A. C. Sen, Research Assistant.	Pay .. 160 0 0 L. A. .. 75 0 0	
6	Mr. M. Taqi, Research Assistant. <i>Clerical Staff.</i>	125 0 0	
1	Mr. Abdul Ghani .. ..	Pay .. 124 13 0 L. A. .. 12 8 0	
2	Mr. Chandar Prakash .. ..	Pay .. 67 0 0 L. A. .. 10 0 0	
3	Mr. Shanti Lal .. ..	Pay .. 67 0 0 L. A. .. 10 0 0	
4	Mr. Mohd. Ramzan .. ..	Pay .. 52 0 0 L. A. .. 7 8 0	
5	Mr. Abdul Halim .. ..	52 0 0	
6	Mr. H. G. Sheikh .. ..	Pay .. 35 0 0 L. A. .. 5 0 0	
	<i>Inferior Staff.</i>		
1	Mohd. Sharif, Fieldman .. ..	41 0 0	
2	Mohd. Aslam, Fieldman .. ..	41 0 0	
3	Nasurullah, Fieldman .. ..	41 0 0	
4	Abdul Hamid, Fieldman .. ..	41 0 0	
5	Khushi Mohd., Fieldman .. ..	41 0 0	
6	Norata Singh, Fieldman .. ..	40 0 0	
7	Abdul Qadir, Fieldman .. ..	Pay .. 31 0 0 L. A. .. 10 0 0	
8	Mohd. Rashid, Fieldman .. ..	30 0 0	
9	Deeki Nanadan, Fieldman .. ..	30 0 0	

Serial No.	Name.	Salary per mensem on 4th August, 1934.	Remarks.
10	Narayan Behari, Fieldman ..	Rs. A. P. 31 0 0	
11	Shanti Swarup, Fieldman ..	30 0 0	
12	Peshawari Singh, Fieldman ..	30 0 0	
13	Didar Singh, Fieldman ..	31 0 0	
14	Girdhari Lal Amar Chand, Fieldman.	30 0 0	
15	Abdul Latif, Fieldman .. ..	31 0 0	
16	Mohd. Shafi, Fieldman ..	30 0 0	
17	Swali, Fieldman ..	21 0 0	
18	Malik Mohd., Fieldman ..	21 0 0	
19	Borak Ram, Peon ..	18 0 0	
20	Sita Ram, Peon .. ..	18 0 0	
21	Ata Mohd., Peon ..	18 0 0	
22	Mohd. Ismail, Peon ..	17 0 0	
23	Khadim Hussain, Peon ..	17 0 0	
24	Bhag Singh, Peon ..	15 0 0	
25	Hans Raj, Peon ..	15 0 0	
26	Faiz Baksh, Messenger ..	12 0 0	
27	Ganesh, Messenger .. ..	12 0 0	
28	Brij Mohan, Messenger ..	12 0 0	
29	Maleo, Messenger .. ..	12 0 0	
30	Dhogar, Messenger ..	12 0 0	
31	Gopal Singh, Messenger ..	12 0 0	
32	Rahmat Ali, Messenger ..	12 0 0	
33	Sukhidel, Messenger .. ..	10 0 0	
34	Rahmat, Messenger .. ..	10 0 0	
35	Mohd. Ismail, Messenger ..	10 0 0	
36	Murad Ali, Messenger .. ..	10 0 0	

INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

499. \*Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad : (a) Is it a fact that 57 States are members of the League of Nations ?

(b) Is it not a fact that India contributes 56 units out of 1,013 units to the funds of the League of Nations, which is equivalent to 5.5 per cent. ?

(c) Is it not a fact that there are only five countries which contribute more than India ? What are the names of those countries and what are their contributions ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** (a) and (b). The answer is in the affirmative.

(c) The names of the five countries and the number of units contributed by them are as follows :

	Units.
(i) Germany ..	79
(ii) United Kingdom ..	105
(iii) France ..	79
(iv) Italy ..	60
(v) Japan ..	60

#### EMPLOYMENT OF INDIANS IN THE SECRETARIAT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

500. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** (a) Is it not a fact that the League of Nations employs over 700 clerks and secretaries whose names and nationalities are published on pages 1262—1293 of the official Gazette of the League of Nations ?

(b) Is it not a fact that out of this number only five are Indians, of whom four are temporary ?

(c) Have the Government of India taken any action to press on the authorities that the number of Indians in the Secretariat of the League of Nations and allied offices should be in proportion to their contribution, i.e., 5.5 per cent. ? If not, why not ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** (a) Government have no information additional to what is contained on the pages of the Official Journal. We have no further information beyond that.

(b) Six Indians are permanently employed and three are believed to be temporarily employed.

(c) Appointments in the League Secretariat being normally for terms of seven, 21 or 28 years, and appointments under the International Labour Office being normally for terms of 21 or 28 years with an age limit of 60, the Honourable Member will kindly understand that the possibility for effective action in this matter is extremely limited ; Government are at pains to take such action as is possible by causing India's delegates to the Assembly to ventilate the matter as often and as strenuously as is consistent with tactical considerations, and that has been done. I would like to disassociate myself from the suggestion that it would be practicable to introduce a precise correspondence between percentage of contribution and percentage of representation in the Secretariat.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** As regards part (b), is it not a fact that the Indians are poorly paid as compared to their qualifications and as

compared to the salaries of the nationals of other countries who are employed in the League Secretariat ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** As regards their actual pay, the Honourable Member will find them in the pages referred to by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad, namely, pages 1262—1293. We are not in a position to tell this House the exact educational and other qualifications of each. We have no materials in our custody.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Is it not within the power of the Government of India to find out the qualifications of their own nationals and to see that they are paid adequate salaries in proportion to their qualifications ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** It is quite within the power of the Government of India to get that information, and, if that information is required, that will be laid as soon as possible. But I think it is not within the power of the Government of India to compel any particular person to be paid any particular salary.

**Mr. F. E. James :** Is it not a fact that the Indian Members of the Secretariat do in fact receive the pay which is normally listed for the posts which they occupy and that there is no differentiation in the pay of those posts as between the nationals of different countries ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** That is so.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Have not the Government of India found out the qualifications of the nationals of other countries and the qualifications of their own nationals ? If they had not found out the qualifications of the individual members, then how did the Government answer the question in the affirmative ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The same post carries the same pay whoever might be the national. This point has been mentioned already.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** My point was that a man holding a higher qualification should be appointed to the higher post.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** May I ask whether the Government of India ever represented to the Secretary of the League of Nations that the Indian Legislature and the people of India are very much dissatisfied with the small proportion of Indians in the Secretariat ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** That was done, not by direct correspondence between the Government of India and the Secretariat of the League of Nations, but repeatedly through the members of the Delegation there.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Will the Honourable Member please convey to the Secretary of the League of Nations the feelings of the Indian Legislature that we would seriously consider the question of our contribution to the League of Nations if India was not properly represented on the staff of the League of Nations ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** I will not only do that, but I shall indeed be very pleased if anything comes out of that representation.

**INDIA'S MEMBERSHIP OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.**

501. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : (a) Is it not a fact that there are 13 members in the Council of the League of Nations (*vide* page 619 of the official Gazette of the League) ?

(b) How many of them are permanent members ?

(c) Is it not a fact that Japan and Germany, who were permanent members, have now withdrawn ?

(d) Did the Government of India apply for the inclusion of India among the permanent members on the ground that our contribution is sixth in the list and next to Italy and Japan ? If not, why not ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : (a) It is not 13, but 15. But I should explain what the actual number is. Japan having withdrawn, and nothing having been done by Japan within the two years for which notice has been given, the number 15 was put in by the League so that the exact number should be either 14 or 15, as the Honourable Member likes to have it.

(b) Five.

(c) Japan and Germany have given two years notice of their intention to withdraw from the League. They remain permanent members of the Council, pending expiration of the period of notice, though they are understood not to be actually attending the Council.

(d) The Honourable Member is referred to Sir Brojendra Mitter's reply to his own question, No. 1164, asked on the 27th November, 1933.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : The reply to the last part "if not, why not" was not given.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : I have got the reply. I think my Honourable friend is mistaken. The reply to "why not" may not be satisfactory to the House, but the reply to "why not" was given, and the Honourable Sir Brojendra Mitter explained that it was not possible to carry out the suggestions which were indicated, and I cannot add anything to the answers which were given on the last occasion.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : May I ask whether the Indian Delegation or the Government of India ever made any representation that India ought to be a permanent member of the League of Nations in view of the fact that there are two vacancies ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : Is not that covered by the next question ?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Then I will discuss it later on.

**INDIA'S MEMBERSHIP OF THE COUNCIL OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.**

502. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Did India ever offer herself as a candidate for election as an ordinary member of the Council of the League of Nations ? If not, why not ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : No. The Honourable Member is referred to the reply by Sir Brojendra Mitter to the Resolution

moved by the Honourable Sir Phiroze Sethna in the Council of State, on the 14th July, 1930.

INTEREST OF THE INDIAN LEGISLATURE IN THE WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

503. \*Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad : (a) Was the attention of the Government of India drawn to the proposal No. (1) of the Indian delegation to the League presided over by Sir Muhammad Habibullah ?

(b) What action have Government taken to increase the interest of the Indian Legislature in the work of the League ?

(c) Did Government ever give an opportunity to this House to discuss the reports of the Indian delegation ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** (a) The recommendations in question were addressed to, and could not fail to attract the attention of, the Government of India.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply by Sir Brojendra Mitter to the Resolution mentioned in my reply to the last question. Government are of opinion that Non-Official Members of the Legislature, desiring to interest themselves in matters pertaining to the League of Nations, might suitably establish and support an organization on the lines of the League of Nations Union Committee of the British Parliament.

(c) If the Honourable Member means to enquire whether Government have ever set apart an official day for discussion of the Report, the answer is in the negative. I would point out, that it has at all times been open to any Honourable Member, to give notice of a Resolution regarding anything contained in the Report which he desires to be discussed, but that to the best of my belief and information no notice of any such Resolution has ever been given.

**Mr. F. E. James :** With regard to the answer to (c), will Government consider the advisability, on their own initiative, of giving this House an opportunity of discussing the Report or Reports of the Indian Delegation or Delegations rather than leaving it to the chances of a ballot for Resolutions ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** Government are quite prepared to do that and will not take up an obstructive attitude.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The point of Mr. James was whether Government will set apart an official day for discussing the Report of the League of Nations Delegation.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** My Honourable friend's question was whether Government will consider the advisability of doing that. I said we are prepared to do so.

**Captain Sher Muhammad Khan Gakhar :** Have the Government of India ever attempted to send a Member of this House to represent them on the League of Nations ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** I am not aware if any attempt was made, but if any were made, it was not successful. (Laughter.)

**Mr. B. Das :** Is it not a fact that super-loyalists must be found before they can receive the recommendation of the Government of India to go to the League of Nations ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** Does the Honourable Member want a reply to that question ?

**Mr. B. Das :** Government can reply if they like.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** Then it is optional. (Laughter.)

**Mr. S. C. Mitra :** Is it a fact that the discussion in the Council of State to which reference has been made took place in 1930 ? And will the Honourable Member tell this House what interest they are taking since that date, four years ago ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** If my Honourable friend wants to know exactly what has been done between 1930 and 1934, I would ask him to give notice of this question, and I will accept short notice.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** As Germany and Japan have gone out of the League of Nations since 1930, has not the time now come when we should make every effort for India to be accepted as a permanent member of the Council of the League ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** It is a matter of opinion whether the time has or has not come.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Do the Government of India contemplate to approach the authorities of the League of Nations so that India may be included in the Council of the League ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** At the present moment that is not in contemplation.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar :** Have the Government of India any option in these matters at all ? Is it not entirely dictated by the Secretary of State, and is not the Secretary of State the only person to consider these questions ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** If that is the Honourable Member's view, he could have relieved me from the task of answering all these questions.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar :** That is a fact and I am telling that to the Honourable Member in order to relieve him from answering these questions.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** I may accept that fact or reject it, but no question has been put to me.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** In view of the fact that it is a League of Nations and not a league of Governments, will the Government of India consider the opinion of the people of India as represented in the Legislature, and convey to them that it is the strong feeling of the Indian people and the Indian Legislature that India should be a permanent member of the Council ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar :** I think I have already answered that question recently.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : On the question of the choice of delegates, is it a fact that the ultimate choice lies with the Secretary of State ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence** : Questions have very frequently been answered on that point before. The position is that the delegates are appointed by the Secretary of State acting in consultation with the Government of India.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : That is certainly the formal position, certainly they must be ultimately appointed in the name of the Secretary of State, but have the Government of India a free hand in making the selection ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : I thought the answer given by Mr. Spence was that the men are selected in consultation with the Secretary of State, which involves the idea that sometimes the Secretary of State yields to the Government of India and sometimes *vice versa*.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : Then, may I expect my Honourable friend to give us an idea about the considerations that govern the choice of the members of the Delegation so far as the Government of India are concerned ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence** : I would suggest, Sir, that this question may wait. There is a substantive question now on the paper which will be answered in a few days' time which raises this very point.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : May I know if Government are now prepared to make an attempt to send a Member of this House to the League of Nations ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : Government will be prepared to consider that if we know the number of members who are willing to go and their qualifications.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar** : Is that the basis on which they have so far selected Honourable Members for the different Delegations ? Did they receive applications and did the applications contain the qualifications, and did the Government of India Members sit on those qualifications and decide them ? Is that the complimentary way in which the League delegates have so far been treated ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : A man cannot be sent there against his wishes, and, therefore, "application" does not mean something written on a piece of paper and signed and attested and witnessed. But an intimation may be conveyed in various manners, and Honourable Members of this Assembly do manage to convey their wishes in various matters as to what they are willing to do and what they are not willing to do. No deprecation of anybody was intended in that answer.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : May I know in what way the Honourable Member's predecessor conveyed that wish to the Government of India ? Was it on stamped paper ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : I have got to wait until I get a reply from my Honourable predecessor who is at Calcutta.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : May I know from the Honourable Member whether he thinks that the Legislators on this side of the Assembly are less competent than the Members on that side, so that they cannot be sent ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : That is a matter of opinion.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : May I ask whether these applications were invited by public notification ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : If there had been a public notification, it could not have escaped the eagle eyes of Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.

**PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF INDIA AT THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.**

504. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : What action, if any, did Government take to have a permanent representative at the headquarters of the League of Nations, as recommended by the delegations of 1933 and 1929 ? If none, why not ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : The attitude adopted towards the recommendation of the Delegation of 1929 was stated in Sir Brojendra Mitter's reply to the Resolution mentioned in my reply to question No. 502. The renewed recommendation by the Delegation of 1933 is at present under consideration.

**CIRCULATION OF REPORTS, ETC., OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.**

505. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Do Government circulate among the Members of the Central Legislature and the interested persons, the literature and printed reports they receive from the office of the League of Nations ? If not, why not ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given in the Legislative Assembly on the 18th August, 1927, to question No. 21, asked by Mr. Gangand Sinha.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Since circumstances have changed after the reply given in 1927, during the last seven years, may I ask whether they will consider again that the literature supplied to the Government of India may not be circulated among the Members of the Legislature ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : If the question is whether they are prepared to consider, the answer is in the affirmative.

**OFFICIAL OR CLERK TO DEAL EXCLUSIVELY WITH THE WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.**

506. \***Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Have the Government of India got any official or clerk to deal exclusively with the work of the League of Nations ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : The answer is in the negative.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : May I ask whether it is not a waste of time, and a waste of energy and waste of money to send our Delegation and be a member of the League of Nations when we have not got any staff here to deal with this particular question and to reply to our questions ?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** : That is a matter of opinion.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know why the reply is in the negative ? Is the staff needed or not needed ? It means that the Government of India have got no office dealing exclusively with the work of the League of Nations : I ask, why ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** The answer is that the work done by the Government of India in connection with the League of Nations is more conveniently done by being done by a large number of people in addition to other duties than being done by one or more persons exclusively.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** Then the Government of India are not over-worked ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** I do not think there is any implication in the answer I gave that the Government of India are not over-worked : I cannot subscribe to the suggestion that they are not over-worked.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Is it a fact that the way in which they treat this literature from the League of Nations is that they throw it into the waste paper basket ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** It is not a fact.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** If it is not a fact, did they ever circulate this literature among the Members of the Assembly ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** If the Honourable Member would be good enough to refer to the earlier reply to which he was referred by the Honourable the Law Member in answer to a previous question, he will find that the position is that the Government receive from the League of Nations only sufficient number of copies for official use. The cost of printing and circulating this literature to Members of the Indian Legislature would be exceedingly heavy : the matter would be extraordinarily voluminous. On the date the answer was previously given, the Government were not satisfied that there was so lively a demand from the Members of the Indian Legislature to have access to the literature that they would be justified in incurring the considerable expense involved.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad :** Did the Government of India ever demand of the League of Nations that sufficient number of copies should be sent, so that they may be circulated among the Members of the Legislature ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** I am afraid that if any such demand were made, it would inevitably be refused.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** I understand my Honourable friend to say that the papers they receive are only for official use. May I know who are the officials among whom these papers are circulated ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** We get only two or three copies and we send them to such administrative Departments as may be concerned with the subject matter of the paper.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** Who decides as to whether a particular Department is interested in a particular matter ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence :** In the last resort that decision is probably by myself.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** My Honourable friend is the censor in this particular matter ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence** : Not a censor, Sir ; a post office.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : The Honourable Member suggests that if the request is made to the League of Nations for more copies, it would be certainly refused : is it not a question of his opinion only, and is he justified in giving that opinion ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence** : It may in the last resort be a question of opinion, but I am tolerably confident that my opinion is correct.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Is it not a fact that this House sanctions money for the League of Nations, and are not the Members entitled to get a copy as asked by Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad ?

**Mr. G. H. Spence** : I have already stated that, when this matter was raised before, the position of Government was that they were not satisfied that the demand was so lively as to justify them in incurring the not inconsiderable amount of expenditure involved : I may say that a great bulk of League literature will be found in the Library.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai** : May I know if the Honourable Member's opinion is subject to correction by anybody ?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : May I ask whether you will recommend on behalf of the Legislature to the Government of India that the future grant to the League of Nations should be stopped, because they are not even prepared to give us copies of their literature ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : That question does not arise out of this.

#### GIVING OF CONTRACT FOR RUNNING MUSLIM REFRESHMENT ROOMS.

507. **Khan Bahadur H. M. Wilayatullah** : (a) Is it a fact that the contract for the running Hindu and Muslim Refreshment Rooms at the railway stations of Allahabad, Gaya and some other places, has been given to one man who is a Hindu ?

(b) Are Government aware that in the Hindu Refreshment Rooms *jhatka* meat is used ?

(c) Are Government also aware that Muslims have very strong objections to eating *jhatka* meat ?

(d) Do Government propose to consider the desirability of giving a separate contract for running Muslim Refreshment Rooms to Muslim contractors only ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau** : (a) The contract for the Hindu and Muhammadan Refreshment Rooms at Allahabad is held by a firm in which, Government are informed, the principal religions are equally represented. The Agent, East Indian Railway, understands, the firm consists of three partners, one a Hindu, the other a Muhammadan and the third an Indian Christian. At Gaya and all other stations, there is a separate Hindu and Muhammadan contractor for the Indian Refreshment Rooms.

(b) The Agent, East Indian Railway, reports that *jhatka* meat is not used in the Hindu Refreshment Rooms.

(c) Yes.

(d) This is generally done.

**HARASSMENT TO THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY FOR THE ANTECEDENTS OF THEIR FRIENDS.**

108. **\*Seth Liladhar Chaudhury** : (a) Are Government aware that the Criminal Investigation Department staff pester Honourable Members of this House for the antecedents of their friends ?

(b) Are Government aware that when a Member signs the applications for admission cards, he is responsible for the conduct and antecedents of the persons for whom applications are made ?

(c) Do Government propose to issue instructions to these men to stop harassment of Honourable Members in the future ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** : (a) No.

(b) Yes, in the case of special applications.

(c) Government see no necessity for such instructions.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : Will it surprise the Honourable Member if I were to tell him that I received a visit only yesterday from a police officer who came to inquire as to whether I was prepared to vouch for the conduct of a particular person for whom I had asked for a card—not that I knew him personally, but because he was introduced to me by another person whom I knew personally ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** : The Honourable Member asks me whether it would surprise me ?

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : Nothing will perhaps surprise him !

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** : If the Honourable Member has any complaint to make regarding the conduct of the police, I should be very glad to look into it if he will speak to me outside the House.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : I do not want to make a complaint : that was furthest from my intention. But, under the rules, when we are permitted to ask for cards for persons whom we do not know personally, are we necessarily expected to vouch for the conduct of those persons ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** : No ; I do not think so ; but the police have a responsibility which they must discharge in some way or other ; and, in the discharge of their responsibility, I take it that they asked my Honourable friend to help them.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : I will speak to the Honourable Member outside the House.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** : I shall be glad if the Honourable Member will do so.

**Mr. Vidya Sagar Pandya** : Even when the addresses are given and they are Government servants, the Members are asked to give further details about them ! I had an inquiry from the Department even when the full address was given, and it was a responsible Government servant for whom the card was given.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** : There, again, if the Honourable Member will give all details of the case, I shall be very glad to look into it outside. It is rather difficult for me to answer these questions about specific cases without notice.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Are Government aware that sometime back a C. I. D. official came to my place to inquire about a certain individual for whom I had asked for a card and for whom I had written that I personally knew him ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik :** I was not aware of that.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai :** May I know whether there are any specific orders to the police given by Government to go to Honourable Members to make such inquiries or whether the police do it at their own instance ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik :** I must have notice of that. If the Honourable Member wishes me to look into the question of what instructions are issued, I am afraid I must ask for notice.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** May I inform my Honourable friend that with reference to the visit from the police I had yesterday, he read out from an official typed letter in which he was asked to make inquiries of me ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik :** As I said, I shall be very glad to discuss the case with the Honourable Member.

**Mr. B. Das :** Will it surprise the Honourable Member that once when I arrived in Simla, the Punjab C. I. D. visited me and asked me to sign my name in a book and I referred the matter to the Honourable Member's predecessor, and the Punjab Government apologised through their Chief Secretary to me ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik :** Perhaps it would surprise my Honourable friend to know that when I arrived in Simla a week ago, I had to sign that book. (Laughter.)

**Mr. B. Das :** Do I take it that a C. I. D. official of the Punjab Government visited the Honourable Member at Ava Lodge and asked him to sign his name in his note-book ? In my case, an official of the C. I. D. came to my residence and asked me to sign my name in his book.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** They showed more courtesy to you than to the Honourable the Home Member. (Laughter.)

**Mr. B. Das :** Perhaps the Home Member is referring to the Tara Devi medical examination, but I was referring to the visit of a C. I. D. official at my own residence and asking me to sign in his note-book according to an order from the Home Department.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** Or he wanted your autograph.

**Mr. B. Das :** The Punjab Government had to apologise through their Chief Secretary on behalf of their police.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY HEADQUARTERS.

509. **\*Seth Liladhar Chaudhury :** Will Government please state whether it is necessary to pass the Public Service Commission Examination for promotion from the third to the second division and from the second to the first division in the different Branches of the Army Headquarters ? If so, will Government please state why clerks who are only qualified as typists, or who are in the third division, have been confirmed in the second division, and even in the first, in the offices of the A. D. O. S. (P.), M. G. O.,

Q. M. G., E.-in-C. and R. A. F., without their qualifying for the divisions for which they are drawing their present salary ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** Permanent third and second division clerks in Army Headquarters may, if they wish, sit for the Public Service Commission examination for the second or the first division, provided they satisfy the ordinary rules for the examination. They are not required, however, to qualify by examination for the second division or the first division before being promoted into one of the vacancies set apart for departmental promotion. The rest of the question does not arise.

**VICEROY'S COMMISSIONED OFFICERS SERVING IN THE INDIAN ARMY.**

510. \***Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar :** (a) Will Government please state the total number of the Viceroy's commissioned officers now serving in the Indian Army ?

(b) How many years will it take according to Government's present plans for the total extinction of these officers from the Army in India ?

**Mr. H. A. F. Metcalfe :** (a) The number of officers on the 1st April, 1934, was 3,652.

(b) I would refer the Honourable Member to the latter portion of the reply given on the 7th August, 1934, to his starred question No. 492.

**CELEBRATION OF THE JUBILEE OF HIS MAJESTY THE KING EMPEROR'S REIGN.**

511. \***Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar :** Do Government propose to make a detailed statement as to the arrangements which are to be made for the celebration of the Jubilee of His Majesty the King Emperor's reign ?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik :** As the announcement regarding His Majesty the King Emperor's "Silver Jubilee" has only recently been made, the Government of India are not yet in a position to make any detailed statement, but they will make an announcement in due course. As was stated in the announcement, in the House of Commons, the question of the representation of India has been discussed by His Majesty's Government with His Excellency Lord Willingdon.

**CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE DELIMITATION OF CONSTITUENCIES.**

512. \***Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar :** Will Government please state if they are in a position to make a statement as to when the committee for the delimitation of constituencies of Provincial and Central Legislatures is to be constituted ?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore :** The reply is in the negative.

**Mr. B. Das :** Sir, I have an authority from Lala Hari Raj Swarup to put his questions. He wrote to the Department long ago.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) :** He has not.

**COMPLAINT ABOUT THE INCIVILITY OF A MEMBER OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY STAFF AT MEERUT.**

513. \***Lala Hari Raj Swarup :** (a) Is it a fact that a complaint about the incivility of a member of the East Indian Railway staff at Meerut

station on the 3rd January, 1934, was made to the Chief Operating Superintendent on the 10th January, 1934 ?

(b) Is it a fact that no action was taken by the East Indian Railway authorities, though the incident concerned them only ?

(c) Is it a fact that no information as to the fact of that complaint was given to the passenger concerned ?

(d) Has any action been taken on the said complaint ?

**Mr. P. B. Rau :** Government have no information regarding the incident, but a copy of the question has been sent to the Agent, East Indian Railway, to consider what action is necessary.

#### TRAVELLING FROM STATIONS TO THE WEST OF ALLAHABAD TO BENARES *viâ* MOGHAL SARAI.

514. **\*Lala Hari Raj Swarup :** (a) Is it a fact that passengers travelling from Allahabad can travel to Benares either *viâ* Janghai or *viâ* Moghal Sarai ?

(b) Is it also a fact that a passenger from Delhi, Cawnpore, or any other station to the west of Allahabad is not permitted to go to Benares *viâ* Moghal Sarai, though there is a clear proviso that passengers can travel by the quickest route ?

(c) Is it also a fact that ticket checkers have been charging from such passengers penalties and the fare from Allahabad to Janghai ?

(d) Is it also a fact that a similar case brought against a passenger in the Benares Courts by the East Indian Railway was dismissed against the East Indian Railway and even after that case the ticket checkers are charging the penalties from such passengers who go to Benares *viâ* Moghal Sarai ?

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

(b) A passenger from any station West of Allahabad can travel to Benares, *viâ* Moghal Sarai if he purchases a ticket by that route. I am not aware of the proviso referred to by my Honourable friend.

(c) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that he is not aware of any such case having occurred.

(d) The Agent, East Indian Railway, states that in a case relating to a passenger holding a return journey ticket, the trying Magistrate dismissed the case brought by the Railway, holding that the rule was defective. The rule has since been amended. As regards the latter part of the question, the Agent states that he is not aware that ticket checkers are penalising passengers in the manner suggested.

#### UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

##### ASSISTANTS AND CLERKS IN THE RAILWAY BOARD'S OFFICE.

42. **Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah :** (a) Will Government please state :  
(i) the number of assistants

(ii) the number of second division clerks, and

(iii) the number of third division clerks.

in the Railway Board's Office ?

(b) Is there any proposal now before the Railway Board to increase the strength of the office ? If so, why and for which branches ?

(c) If the reply to part (b) above be in the affirmative, how many additional assistants will be recruited, and will they be recruited by promotion from among the second and third division clerks ? If not, why not ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** (a) (i) Twenty-seven.

(ii) Forty-three.

(iii) Twenty-six.

(b) Yes, temporarily in Establishment, Finance, and Stores Branches, owing to the existing strength of the office having been considered inadequate.

(c) The number proposed is five. The method of filling the posts is still under consideration but it is probable that they will not all be filled from clerks in the Board's office, owing to the number of suitably qualified men being at present insufficient.

#### RECRUITMENT OF ASSISTANTS IN THE RAILWAY BOARD'S OFFICE.

**43. Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah :** (a) Is it a fact that some additional assistants in the Railway Board's Office will be recruited from the Railways ? If so, why ?

(b) Are Government aware that there is a wide-spread discontent amongst the staff of the Railway Board on account of the proposed recruitment of the additional assistants from the Railways ?

(c) Is it a fact that a certain number of the staff represented to the Chief Commissioner of Railways against the proposed recruitment from outside and that their representations were returned by the Secretary without any remark or observation whatsoever, and that they never reached the officer to whom they were addressed ?

(d) Is it also a fact that in view of the Secretary's attitude, about a dozen representations were not forwarded to him by the Superintendents and the Branch Officers ?

(e) Are Government aware that the recruitment from outside will be a great injustice to the existing staff ?

(f) Is it a fact that there was a previous decision at a meeting of the Directors that recruitment from outside should be stopped and that this decision was endorsed by the Railway Board ? If so, why is it now proposed to act against that decision ?

(g) Is it a fact that recruitment of outsiders direct into the first division is in contravention of the policy and practice followed in the other Departments of the Government of India ? If so, why is this practice not followed in the Railway Board's Office ?

(h) Is it a fact that there are in the Railway Board's Office many clerks with suitable educational qualifications in the second and third divisions who have been receiving uniformly good reports and have been recommended by their Branch Officers as fit for promotion to the first division? If so, what is the reason for this attempt on the part of the Secretary to the Railway Board to import outsiders?

(i) Is it a fact that recruitment of Railway people is being made on the plea of getting experts for specialised work?

(j) Are Government aware that there is no specialised work in the ministerial establishment of the Railway Board's Office which a man with good general education, intelligence and experience cannot do? Are Government also aware that men are transferred from one branch to another and the work has been going on smoothly all these years?

(k) Do Government propose to stop recruiting men from Railways, and to give chances to the best men of the existing staff who have all along been reported to be fit for promotion to the first division and thus alleviate a real grievance?

**Mr. P. B. Rao :** (a) My Honourable friend is referred to the answers to part (c) of his previous question.

(b) No.

(c) Four representations from members of the staff were addressed to the Secretary, Railway Board, and one to the Chief Commissioner, asking that the applicants might be considered for the vacancies. These were placed by the Secretary before a Member of the Board.

(d) and (f). No.

(e) All men with suitable qualifications will be considered for promotion to these posts.

(g) The regulations for recruitment to the Railway Board's office are not identical with those for recruitment to the offices of the other Departments of the Government of India. Special regulations for the Railway Board's office were authorised by the Government of India as it is considered that it may be desirable in some cases that the Assistants' grade in the Board's office should be filled partly by direct recruitment of qualified persons from Railways.

(h) and (i). The Railway Board do not consider that there are at present a sufficient number of qualified clerks in their office to fill the additional posts of Assistants proposed, and the recruitment of persons from Railways is under contemplation for that reason.

(j) Certain work in the Board's office requires more specialised experience of railway working than is ordinarily possessed by persons who have had no experience outside the Board's office. In many cases men are transferred from one branch to another, but it has not been the practice to fill all vacancies in this way, as has been shown in the reply to part (a) of this question.

(k) Government do not propose to change the existing practice, but due consideration will always be given to the claims of the existing staff.

## STATEMENTS LAID ON THE TABLE.

*Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 251 asked by Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury on the 28th March, 1934.*

### STAFF ENGAGED FOR PAYMENT OF PENSIONS TO ARMY RESERVISTS.

The information regarding clerks and other staff engaged for payment of military pensions and their cost for 1933-34 is given below :

	Rs.
(i) Estimated number of clerks and other staff employed for payment of pensions .. .. .	203
(ii) Estimated amount of pay, pensionary charges, cost of leave, cost of stationery, etc. .. .. .	2,93,682

*Information promised in reply to unstarred question No. 309 asked by Maulvi Muhammad Shafee Daoodi on the 4th April, 1934.*

### REPAIRS OF MOSQUES AND MAUSOLEUMS IN NEW DELHI.

(a), (b) and (c). A statement giving the facts with regard to the different items of the memorandum referred to by the Honourable Member is laid on the table. Mosques and mausoleums in New Delhi are subject to the bye-laws framed by the New Delhi Municipal Committee to regulate the erection and re-erection of buildings in the locality, within the meaning of section 3 (5) of the Punjab Municipal Act, and such erection or re-erection is in the interests of the safety and convenience of the public, required to conform to the requirements of those bye-laws before it can be approved. Applications must be judged on their merits, and the Chief Commissioner, Delhi, will be prepared to enquire into any complaint as to the manner in which individual cases are dealt with, but the Honourable Member will appreciate that unless the required prior sanction is duly applied for in all cases where it is required difficulties are bound to arise. No sanction is, however, required for repairs which do not involve the operations defined in section 3 (5) of the Punjab Municipal Act already referred to.

The sum referred to in the concluding paragraph of the memorandum has been earmarked by Government for a Muslim educational institution in Delhi.

*Statement showing the results of Enquiries into Allegations made by the Secretary of the Managing Committee of the Juma Masjid, Delhi, in connection with the Repairs or Alterations of certain Mosques and Mausoleums in New Delhi.*

Items of complaints.	Complaints and the names of the mosques.	Correct position.
1, 2, 4, 5, 23 and 24.	<i>Masjid Barakhamba, New Delhi</i> Requests for permission to effect repairs and make additions and alterations have been turned down.	Certain unauthorised work was carried out for which the offender was prosecuted and fined by the court.
3, 7 and 17 ..	<i>Masjid Takia Abdulla Shah ..</i> No shed upon praying platform permitted. Plans unapproved and sanction refused.	An application for the construction of a shed was received and rejected in accordance with the procedure laid down.

Items of complaints.	Complaints and the names of the mosques.	Correct position.
6, 22 and 31	<i>Masjid D Circus, New Delhi</i> .. Additions or alterations disallowed.	The reference here appears to relate to the praying platform situated within one of the Connaught Place shops. Government have taken steps to preserve it by leasing the site rent-free to a Muslim who has accepted the conditions that while repairs can be carried out no additions or alterations will be permitted.
8	<i>Masjid Zabtaganj, New Delhi</i> .. Maulvi of the mosque was prosecuted and had to demolish a wall. Sanction for repairs not granted.	The Maulvi was served with a notice for unauthorised construction and himself demolished the wall.
9, 11 and 18	<i>Masjid near Isa Khan Tomb at Nizamuddin.</i> A 'Hamam' constructed within the mosque was ordered to be removed. Additions and alterations not allowed.	No orders for the removal of the unauthorised 'Hamam' were issued, but the Juma Masjid Committee were asked to regularise the matter, and were informed that the plan received was returned unapproved as it contravened the Municipal bye-laws.
10, 21 and 27	<i>Masjid platform at point Y at Gol Market graveyard, New Delhi.</i> Removal of a Chaukidar's hut shed (other complaints are un-intelligible).	Certain unauthorised structures were constructed and occupied by a Muhammadan Fakir. Civil suits were filed by Government and subsequently a settlement was made with the Juma Masjid Committee who had the trespasser removed, and Government sanctioned the retention of the unauthorised platform.
12 and 15	<i>Mosque at cattle byre point I, New Delhi.</i> Alterations and additions not allowed and plans for repairs not approved.	This appears to relate to the mosque near the cattle byre on the lower Ridge Road. Certain unauthorised works were carried out to the mosque which was also occupied without permission. A suit in this connection is proceeding in the Civil Courts.
13	<i>Masjid at Stone Yard, Rakabganj, New Delhi.</i> Additions and alterations are not allowed.	Proposals relating to the extension of the mosque are under consideration and the members who put up the proposals have been informed accordingly.
14 and 19	<i>Mosque at Race Course, New Delhi</i> Flower pots kept inside the mosque ordered to be removed. Additions or alterations not allowed. Repairs to a shed disallowed.	The Honorary Secretary, Juma Masjid Committee, was informed that sanction was necessary before any additional work could be carried out. No mention regarding removal of flower pots has been made in any reply given to the Committee.
16 and 28	<i>Masjid Curzon Road, New Delhi</i> Notice to remove surrounding walls of courtyard served by the New Delhi Municipal Committee.	An unauthorised construction was built in this mosque and a notice was served under the Municipal bye-laws. Sanction to carry out repairs has been given.
20	<i>Masjid Bacho Shah Wali near Railway Siding.</i> Mosque stairs repaired without permission should be demolished.	Permission was granted for repairs and no demands were made for the demolition of the staircase.

Items of complaints.	Complaints and the names of the mosques.	Correct position.
25 ..	<i>All mosques in New Delhi</i> .. If walls of mosques made without permission are not removed legal proceedings will be instituted.	No additions or alterations to mosques in New Delhi can be allowed without competent sanction. Some of these mosques are central protected monuments under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act. They are open to Muslim public for saying prayers therein, but cannot be relinquished or made over to any private body. The Director General of Archæology will however be pleased to consider any proposals for providing facilities to the <i>namazis</i> .
26 ..	<i>Mosque at Asoka Road, New Delhi</i> Plastering of walls without sanction was questioned.	Repairs carried out were not disallowed, but the Juma Masjid Committee was asked to see that no additional work beyond that which was sanctioned should be given effect to.
29 ..	<i>Mosque Sonehri Bagh</i> .. Verandah of mosque may be demolished.	An unauthorised verandah was erected and a notice was served under the Municipal bye-laws on the offender. The verandah was subsequently demolished by the offender, and a light-lean-to was thereafter sanctioned under the bye-laws.
30 ..	<i>Mosque of Bibi Fatima, Siam</i> .. Imam prohibited to sleep in mosque.	An unauthorised structure was erected and offender was prosecuted and-fined by court. Permanent residence within this mosque is undesirable, as owing to its locality which is void of services, it tends to create a nuisance.

*Information promised in reply to starred question No. 116, asked by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 19th July, 1934.*

**ABSENCE OF AN ENCLOSED BATHROOM FOR THIRD CLASS WOMEN PASSENGERS AT PHULERA RAILWAY STATION.**

Enquiries have been made from the Agent, Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, and the facts are as follows :

Certain technical matters in connection with the design for the proposed bathroom for women passengers at Phulera Junction Station have been under investigation and a revised design is under consideration. It is hoped that the work will be taken in hand shortly.

*Information promised in reply to starred questions Nos. 318 and 319 asked by Mr. Sitakanta Mahapatra on the 31st July, 1934.*

**AVOIDANCE OF ASSESSMENT OF INCOME-TAX BY THE TRANSFER OF PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS FROM BIHAR AND ORISSA.**

Question No. 318.

The allegation in the first part of the question appears to be unfounded, and the second part does not, therefore, arise.

**AVOIDANCE OF ASSESSMENT OF INCOME TAX BY THE TRANSFER OF  
PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS FROM BIHAR AND ORISSA.**

**Question No. 319.**

(a) The required information for the past three years is laid on the table. Figures for years prior to 1931 are not available.

(b) I should be glad if the Honourable Member would furnish me with the evidence on which his allegations are founded. I do not consider that it would be justifiable to go to the labour and expense of collecting information to verify or disprove a charge for which no evidence has been produced. In any case the Government of India have no power under the Income-tax Act of interfering with inter-Provincial transfers.

*Statement showing the Total Number of Applications filed for Transfer of Principal Place of Business out of Bihar and Orissa, District by District, during 1931, 1932 and 1933 and the Number of Successful Applications.*

District.	1931.		1932.		1933.	
	No. of applications filed for transfer of principal place of business.	No. successful.	No of applications filed for transfer of principal place of business.	No. successful.	No. of applications filed for transfer of principal place of business.	No. successful.
Purnea .. ..	1	1	2	2	2	2
Bhagalpur ..	3	1			1	1
Darbhanga ..			2	2		
Muzaffarpur ..			1	1	1	1
Ranchi .. ..	1					
Dhanbad .. ..	2	1	1	..	2	2
Cuttack .. ..	2	2	..	..	..	..
Balasore .. ..	2		..	..	..	..
Gaya .. .. .			1	1	1	1
Patna .. .. .	2	2	1	1	..	
Monghyr .. ..	1	1	2	2	..	
Chemparan ..			2	2	..	
Sontal Parganas ..	1	1	1	1	..	..
Shahabad .. ..	1		1	..		..
Manbhum .. ..				..	1	1
Palamu .. ..	..	..	..	..	3	1

Statement showing the Total Number of Cases Transferred from other Provinces into Bihar and Orissa, during 1931, 1932 and 1933 excluding Cases of Salary Holders and House Property and Government Security Owners.

Year.	No. of cases transferred from other provinces into Bihar and Orissa (excluding cases of salary holders and house property and Government Security holders).	Remarks.
1931 .. ..	3	
1932 .. ..	6	
1933 .. ..	2	

Information promised in reply to starred question No. 340 asked by Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar on the 1st August, 1934.

#### RULES REGARDING THE GRANT OF HONORARY RANKS IN THE ARMY IN INDIA.

The rules are contained in the regulations mentioned below :

Royal Warrant for the Pay, Appointment, Promotion, and Non-Effective Pay of the Army, 1931—Article 186.

Regulations for the Army in India—Paragraphs 182, 726, 732, 733 and Appendix XXX, paragraph 27-A.

Regulations for the Medical Services note to paragraph 59-B (f) and paragraph 60.

Regulations for the Auxiliary Force, India, paragraphs 46, 47 and 48.

Regulations for the Indian Territorial Force, paragraph 23.

I shall be glad to show them to the Honourable Member if he will come to my office one day when the House is not sitting.

#### RESOLUTION *RE* REPRESENTATION OF INDIAN CHRISTIANS IN THE SERVICES AND COMMITTEES.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The House will now resume consideration of the following Resolution moved by Dr. DeSouza on the 26th July, 1934.

“ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the claims of the Indian Christian community for adequate representation in the services and for representation on any Committee to be constituted by the Government of India, by the decision of which the political future of the community may be affected, should be recognised.”

The Chair would like to hear from the Honourable Member, Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar, how his amendment is in order.

**Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar** (East Punjab : Sikh) : I have to submit, Sir, that the Government Resolution, regarding the quota of representation in the services of minorities, is prejudicial to the interests of minorities generally including the Indian Christian community and the Sikh community, and, therefore, the claims of minorities which are affected by the so-called “ Chhota Award ” come within the scope of this Resolution.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The original Resolution deals only with the claims of the Indian Christian community for representation in public services, etc. That Resolution does not throw open for discussion the whole question of the representation of the various communities in India. The amendment of the Honourable Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar widens the scope of the Resolution in this respect, and is, therefore, out of order.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : Sir, before I deal with the Resolution before the House, I must offer my congratulations to Dr. DeSouza for the very forceful and very reasonable manner in which he presented his Resolution. Sir, Dr. DeSouza in his speech declared that he was not a communalist. I, on the other hand, approach his Resolution as a whole-hogger and a communalist of the first water, I do so because I am forced to this position. I think the speaker would have secured more had he worn the robes of a communalist instead of the threadbare garments of a camouflaged nationalist, and had his community done so, when their representatives gave evidence before the Simon Commission, I believe the economic position of his community would, today, have been much stronger.

**An Honourable Member** : Question ?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : The " Question " is answered by a repetition of my statement.

Sir, approaching this Resolution as a whole-hogger communalist, I would tell the Honourable Member who moved this Resolution that, if he had been truly democratic in his outlook and demand, in that efficiency was the only *sine qua non* for recruitment into public services, his educated and progressive community, would today be filling about 15 per cent. of all Government appointments as I shall show later on, instead of being in the position of mendicants asking for the crumbs that fall from the tables of others. Now, Sir, let me come to the Resolution.

I propose to take in the reverse order of demand. In it the Honourable Member has made two claims. His first claim is that : " the demand for representation on any Committee to be constituted by the Government of India, by the decision of which the political future of the community may be affected, should be recognised ". I presume this demand refers mainly to the absence of his community on the Third Round Table Conference and the Joint Parliamentary Committee, and, incidentally, on that very important Committee that visited India, the Lothian or Franchise Committee. Sir, I have great respect for the Honourable Member and I have great respect also for his community, among whom I have many of my best friends, but I feel that I should be doing a dis-service to his community if I failed to take advantage of this opportunity and frankly express my views on the present unfortunate position of his community as regards this. His complaint, I submit, is well placed, but I do not think he is entirely right in ascribing the absence of his community on these committees as being due to neglect of duty on the part of the Government. I think the reason for the absence of his community on these Committees, lies largely at his own door, and it is with much regret that I have to implement my views by further observations on this matter. With all respect to his feelings, I think, the Honourable Member will agree with me, when I say that, the present religious cleavage,

that exists in the ranks of his community, is largely responsible for the absence of his community on the various Committees and its present economic apprehension. In my humble opinion, this is why his community was not represented at the Third Round Table Conference and the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Sir, I was a witness to the wide and apparently unbridgeable cleavage that was unfortunately exhibited by the two Indian Christian representatives, one a Roman Catholic and the other a Church of England, in their politico-cum-economic demands at the Second Round Table Conference. This, in my opinion, was why his community was not represented at the Third Round Table Conference and the Joint Parliamentary Committee. Whenever Mr. Pannirselvan, the Roman Catholic delegate, who very ably represented the cause of my friend's community and who has been rightly honoured by being appointed Home Member of the Madras Government, expressed his views and demands, Dr. Dutta, the Church of England representative, who entertained almost pro-Congress views, would diametrically oppose him, and so the voice of the Indian Christian community was divided and, consequently, went by default.

**Mr. B. Das :** Don't speak about Mr. Datta. He was an Honourable Member of this House.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney :** I have said nothing derogatory against Dr. Dutta whom I hold in great esteem, but I should like to say something about Mr. B. Das :

“ Mr. B. Das,  
Is at times an Ass ;  
When with politics he tries to play.  
But, when he talks,  
On communal awards,  
Who listens to what he'd say ? ”

**Mr. B. Das :** I am not a communalist. I am not at all in favour of the Communal Award.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney :** India is fortunate in your confession and belief. I believe, I am right in saying, that the reason why the Indian Christian community were not represented on these important Committees was on account of these economic-political differences of opinion, based on an unfortunate religious cleavage that, even today, exists in this community, and I would impress upon my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, the urgent necessity of bridging this gulf and of bringing about a political and economic rapprochement in the ranks of the Indian Christian community, which is one of the most progressive communities in India.

It is only when they realise that politics and religion must be separated, that the community will unite and secure adequate economic protection and will be able to forge ahead as one of the most important communities in India. I repeat, Sir, it is this utter absence of unity which accounts why the community was not represented on these Committees and, again, I say that their absence was due to the impossibility of Government, faced as it was with a smaller conference, being able to choose two members to represent the two religious view-points of the Community, or to secure one member who was willing to voice the needs of the entire Community. As regards the absence of an Indian Christian

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

representative from the Lothian Commission, I agree with the Honourable Member in his grievance. His Community and mine had a common sufferance on that occasion. But to exclude a community of 6½ millions, the third largest in India, on such an important Committee, a Committee which had to be familiar with the Indian Christians' needs, was, in my opinion, wholly improper, especially when we saw much smaller communities represented. I am happy to say, that I am in close correspondence with the organiser and Secretary of the United Christian Nationalist Party, Mr. Ernest Deva Lal, and I do hope that the time is not far distant when these two religious sects will join hands together and form a political and economic unity, separated from their respective religious differences, but which beliefs will be respected by each other, as we do in the Anglo-Indian Association and community. I would, however, tell my Honourable friend, that though there was no Indian Christian representative present at the Third Round Table Conference, the Community had many friends to help them there and who did help them; for instance, my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, was there, there was Sir Hubert Carr and there was myself. We all represented their needs. I referred to the absence of Indian Christians in the Central Provinces Council, where they are an important community and which serious omission I pointed out to the Joint Parliamentary Committee and pressed for redress. I would advise the community to get together on a common economic platform, and then, they will, by their power and force, be represented in all Conferences and Committees. I hope my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, will take no umbrage at anything I have said on this unfortunate and undeniable religious cleavage in his ranks, because, as I have said, I have the greatest respect and admiration not only for him, but for his community also, whom I have never lost an opportunity to help. I refer particularly to my defence of equal treatment and more to Roman Catholic Schools in the operation of the Irwin Education Committee Report and which I say without fear of contradiction has hitherto been denied them.

Let me now take the second part of the Resolution, the "demand for adequate representation in the Services". The Honourable Member asks that adequate representation be given to Indian Christians in the Services. I stress the words used "the Services", because I find a belief is current in this House that the Honourable Member's demand is only for the All-India services with special reference to the omission of his community in the Home Department's Resolution of the 6th July, 1934. On reading his Resolution, I find, he does not confine himself to the All-India services; he refers to all services, both in the Central and Provincial Governments. Am I right? (Dr. F. X. DeSouza: "Yes".) Thank you. I shall proceed on that basis. Now, Sir, what has the Honourable Member stated in his speech? He said: We Indian Christians are a community of 6½ millions strong, a community whose population is increasing every decade by about 30 per cent., and, might I add, on a rough calculation, a community that by 1940 will have a total population of about ten millions. Continuing, he said that it is more literate, both in vernacular and in English, than any other Indian Community. As regards the general literacy, the Community is five times as literate as any other Indian community, and ten times more educated in English, per 20,000 of population, than any other

Indian community. It is a law-abiding, well disciplined and loyal community. And, yet, to use the Honourable Member's words, "We are being, on the one hand, elbowed out from our position in the public service by the more powerful communities, and on the other hand, the Government of India and the Home Government act as if we are not entitled to claim a share in the public life of the country".

Let me for a moment put aside the genuine alarm that was created and still remains in the minds of this and other Christian communities in India and the resulting fear and indignation felt and expressed by the clergy of all Christian faiths, both in England and in India, when Mr. Gandhi, in March, 1931, uttered his extraordinary warning against the freedom to proselytize the Christian faith and against which an united Christian protest was made in the Press, both in England and India, as also in Parliament. But all that is past history and we might today forget it. I would ask my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, not to worry about Mr. Gandhi. I am sure that Mr. Gandhi, with his characteristic vacuous memory, must have, in his quest for new ideals, completely forgotten his anti-Christian warning.

Let us come down to something real, something concrete, and ask ourselves this question: "Has the Indian Christian community any real cause for complaint, and, is it entitled to the Honourable Member's economic demand?" To answer this question, I would ask the Honourable Member on the Treasury Benches who will reply for Government, to bear with me and together let us make a brief survey of the economic position of this community, with whom I would add the European and Anglo-Indian community or any other Christian community in the various Provincial Services, where Local Self-Government is being practised. Sir, it is well known that the total annual expenditure of all Local Boards and Municipalities in the whole of India is Rs. 50 crores, equalling the total expenditure of the Government of India, after deducting Army expenditure, and, yet, you will find the Indian Christian, the European and the Anglo-Indian communities conspicuous by their absence in such Services and Departments. The Indian Christian community, if you look at it from the point of view of general literacy, i.e., in the vernacular, which is demanded for many Provincial Services, is neglected in these Provincial Services, though the percentage of their literacy is very high in the vernacular, and, if you look at it from the point of view of the knowledge of the English language possessed by this and other Christian communities, what do you find? Do you call this Democracy? I call it Hypocrisy. Do you call this Local Self-Government? I call it Public Selfish-Government.

**Bhai Parma Nand:** Were the Indian Christians a party to the Minorities' Pact, and if so, may I know why they were ignored in the Government Resolution?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** I am glad the Honourable Member has asked me that question. The Roman Catholic Indian Christian community was certainly a party to the Minority Pact, because, Mr. Panairaculam was a member and signed the Pact.

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty):** The Honourable Member has got three minutes more.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney :** Sir, how time flies ! The Indian Christian community is also not employed in any appreciable numbers in the Indian States Services nor are Anglo-Indians today. The Indian Christian is tabooed there, due, in my opinion, to religious prejudices, i.e., because he is a Christian. Nor is he, nor the Anglo-Indian, employed in any big Indian industrial or commercial concerns. And why ? Despite the advanced and superior educational state of Indian Christians, their present unenviable position, amounting almost to ostracism, is due to religious prejudices which, as the Honourable Member so bitterly and truly said was due to the outcome of the impact of Europeans with the Indians, or the West with the East, and which, in terms of materialism, has always resulted in the Englishman of being ashamed in the case of the Anglo-Indian and disowning his own progeny—his identity,—and, in the case of the Indian Christian, of those who embrace his own religion.

Let me now take the All-India services. The Honourable the Mover admits that in the past the Indian Christian Community has been comfortably placed in the All-India services, but with the publication of the recent Government Communiqué, he fears that his community will suffer. If efficiency is the *sine qua non* for such employment, and, if by "efficiency" is meant a good knowledge (secondary standard) of English as it must perforce do, let me tell this House that, *vide* the 1931 Census of India, a knowledge of English is possessed by about three million people over the age of 15 in the whole of India, and of these three millions, about 1½ millions are educated up to and beyond the Secondary Standard and of this total nearly 300,000 are Indian Christians. Now, let us see in what proportion Indian Christians are employed in the All-India Services ? Mr. Raju stated that they have two per cent. of such appointments. In the whole of India, there are about one and half million people sufficiently qualified in English who can compete for these All-India appointments under dispute and, of which, there are approximately 400,000 in both Central and Provincial Services. I ask the Government, if a knowledge of English connotes the efficiency they and the Nationalists demand for Government Services, what percentage should the Indian Christian community, who claim 270,000 of these 1½ million English educated, get of these appointments, if this efficiency test of English were rigidly applied, as it should be, if a truly National India is the future ideal as claimed by the Opposition, including the Congress, and, then, see what the Indian Christians are really allotted in the recent Government Communiqué ? They get a share of 6½ in the locally recruited services and a share of 8½ per cent. in the All-India services. Considered from all aspects, especially the efficiency test demanded from all sides of the House, the Indian Christians have certainly a claim to demand a specific proportion of such appointments. At the Round Table Conference every community asked for recognition of its past services to Government and this was the *raison de être* of their claims for employment in Government services. The Muslims demanded their claims on the ground of their well-known past loyalty to Government, their non-participation in the Civil Disobedience Movement and the terrorist movement, etc. The Sikhs demanded their share on account of their past military services, especially during the Great War. The Europeans demanded their commercial and trade protection on account of the millions of pounds they had, in the past, sunk in India.

The Anglo-Indians demanded protection on the ground of their devoted and loyal past and present services to the country. I, therefore, say Indian Christians have an equal claim. Dr. DeSouza was quite in order when he stressed their great past services, a record to which very few communities can lay claim. Let us see what this community has done, with foreign missionary leadership and capital; they have today got 20,000 Church of England Schools and a much larger number of Roman Catholic Schools and Colleges, giving education to over a million and a half of people, including thousands of non-Christian Indians. Take St. Xavier's College, Calcutta, as a worthy and leading example, an institution in which most of the notable Bengali families have received their education.

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

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : They maintain over 1,000 hospitals treating over four million people. They are an enlightened and educated community who, by their teaching and training, have been largely responsible for making better citizens of other communities in India. The Indian Christians having no sect and no caste, and have, as neutrals in all other inter-communal clashes, rendered great service to the Government and this is a fact which has been frequently admitted by Government and, yet, this is the community that is today begging at the door of the Government for a specific proportion in all future employment. There are several occasions on which I have espoused the cause of the Indian Christians and, so, speaking with some experience on the floor of this House, I say that the Indian Christians deserve much better from a Government they have served so loyally and so efficiently. Till the impact of the West on the East, the entrance of Christians into the East has been the means of introducing the Christian faith into India, the faith of Jesus Christ which has appealed to millions of Indians,—are these converts to the Christian religion to be penalised by the very nation—the British—the very Government,—the British Government—who, by its great army of missionaries, the pioneers of various European religious denominations, introduced the Christian religion into India and who, for centuries, maintained and encouraged it? Surely a better fate, a more equitable treatment is due to the Indian Christian Community? I would appeal to Government, in their desire to placate their friends, not to ignore the economic claims of this community. In the name of Christianity, for which you are responsible in India, in the name of humanity, and in return for the yeoman service rendered to Government by the Indian Christian Community, I, a descendant of the Britisher, and a son of India, appeal to the Government not to turn a deaf ear to this Resolution which I whole-heartedly support.

**Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar** : Mr. President, I wish to support the Resolution moved by Dr. DeSouza. The whole trend of Government action and of Government policy, since the starting of the Simon Commission, has been moving in one particular direction. Government desire that the loaves and fishes of office should be divided between their special friends, irrespective of the justice of the claim of the teeming millions of India whose trustees and guardians they profess to be. How is it that from the beginning it has been moving in that particular direction since the time of the Simon Commission, following closely on the

[Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar.]

Minorities Pact arrived at in London as the result of intrigue on the part of certain communities? The Government of India dealt with the question of service in the railways a little earlier, and precisely the same line of action was suggested in the so-called Hasan Report. The Anglo-Indians have been specially protected and safeguarded on the ground that they have got vested interests, while others like Sikhs, with greater vested interests, are ignored.

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi (Dacca *cum* Mymensingh : Muhammadan Rural) : Hasan's Report was published before the Minorities Pact.

Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar : I said, the trend of Government action since the Simon Commission has been moving in that one direction.

(Interruption by Captain Sher Muhammad Khan.)

I do not propose to give way. What I say is that in that report also definite and particular mention was made about these two communities only and there is no mention of Indian Christians or Sikhs or other minority communities. Their claims are much inferior to the claims of the Anglo-Indians. Mr. Hasan said that no mention need be made regarding Sikh representation in the services. The Anglo-Indians, who are only one-thirtieth of the Sikhs, have got much more than they can ever hope to get on a population basis. Now, comes the Chhota Communal Award, the Resolution of the Government of India reserving appointments for the minority communities. Here, again, the same two communities are petted. In addition to their 25 per cent., every vacancy, out of this 8½ per cent. reserved for the minorities, is to go to the Muslims and five per cent. is to be reserved for the community of my friend, Colonel Gidney, the Anglo-Indians, in particular departments; and a definite proportion is reserved for them in other cases; but as regards the Indian Christians, Sikhs and other minority communities, they are ignored. Now, my friend, Colonel Gidney, expressed great solicitude for the Indian Christians. He referred to local boards and municipalities. He shifts their claim to these bodies, so that his percentage, in the Government of India service, may not be touched by the Indian Christians. He shifts them on to the Local Governments. What do the Indian Christians get there? They get quite a lot. They are treated as equal citizens, along with other communities. In my own District Board, we had a Secretary for 28 years who is a highly paid official, who was an Indian Christian and in my municipality at Moga there is an Indian Christian who is the Secretary. So, we do not treat them in any way inferior to other citizens of the Empire. It is only in the heights of Simla and in Delhi that discriminations are made.

Mr. President, I wish even at this late stage the Government of India took away this vicious principle of communalism altogether and based it on merit or made a distinction between rural and urban, in the interests of the teeming millions whose trustees the Government profess to be. If services are to be pure and impartial, communalism must be got out of consideration.

Lieut. Colonel Sir Henry Gidney : Why don't you introduce it in the Punjab ?

**Sirdar Harbans Singh Brar** : Sir, Colonel Gidney asked me a question. But I am not responsible for the administration of the Punjab Government. I have, however, been doing quite a lot in my own place on the District Board, and if my Honourable friend will go there and try to find out the facts, there is a large community of Anglo-Indians at Ferozepore—and he will find out how they run the Board. Muhammadans, Hindus, Sikhs, they all work on the basis of economic interest, as rural *versus* urban and agriculturists *versus* non-agriculturists, and not on communal lines, and they thus give their due share to all who contribute to the revenues of the District Board, and not on a communalistic basis. Religion they all keep in their own homes and they do not bring it to the administration. Sir, I wish the Government also should observe non-communalistic principles for recruitment to their services, so that the members of my own humble community and those of the other minority communities might, on the score of their own merits, receive the fair consideration due to them. If, on the other hand, they are unable to do so, then I must urge that such power and patronage should not be distributed solely amongst the friends and favourites of the Government : that must be distributed on a fair and equitable basis between all the communities who compose this Indian Empire. I do hope and trust, Sir, that my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Craik,—who, I may say, was so very popular in the Punjab for having always administered the several Departments on a non-communalistic basis (Hear, hear),—will, now that he has come to the Government of India, consider how best to bring that spirit of non-communalism into the services, and to give a fair share to all the communities who are entitled to their equitable share in the administration of this great country. With these few remarks, Sir, I support the motion.

**Mr. F. E. James** (Madras : European) : Sir, I rise to extend the general support of our Group to this Resolution. I have no doubt that my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, and the community which he represents so ably in this House will be extremely grateful to the championship of my Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney (Hear, hear), and I am also quite sure that the Leaders of the two great religious divisions in his community will weigh with great consideration the remarks that my Honourable and gallant friend made in regard to unity in the Indian Christian community, to the extent to which those remarks deserve consideration. I should like to bring the House back to the terms and spirit of the Resolution which was moved by my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, in his speech, which, if he will allow me to say so, was not only eloquent, but restrained in its appeal to Government. Sir, the Resolution is of a general character : it recommends to the Governor General in Council that the claims of the Indian Christian community should be recognized in regard to two particular avenues of service. The first is the wider avenue of public service to the State, and the second is the avenue of what I might call service in connection with public affairs in the Committees which are set up to determine the future constitution of this country. Now, I am particularly concerned with the former ; with the latter, I have very little concern, and though I do endorse what my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, said in his speech, *viz.*, that the Indian Christian community did feel very deeply their exclusion from the Third Round Table Conference, from the Joint Select Committee and from the Franchise Committee, I am not prepared for one moment to endorse

[Mr. F. E. James.]

the suggestion which my Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, has made as to the reasons for those exclusions. It is better not to dig into the past and raise anew old controversies that are now better dead. But as far as the public service, so far as State employment is concerned, I think the community has a very distinct claim upon the sympathetic consideration of the Government : and I am quite sure that, in stating that claim with moderation, not on stark communalistic grounds, but on the ground of fair play and justice, my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, will have every Member of this House with him. I do sincerely trust, Sir, that in the ensuing discussion, the communal argument, the stark communal consideration, will not be unduly pressed, because these considerations always arouse undesirable repercussions in different parts of the House ; and it would be much better if this House were to consider the Resolution in its limited terms and in the spirit of the speech of my Honourable friend, the Mover of the Resolution. I would particularly commend to the House the spirit in which my friend, Dr. DeSouza, moved this Resolution. He said :

“ We ask for no special concessions and special privileges. All that we ask for is that the Government of India, before surrendering the reins of power to the Swaraj Government, shall give adequate recognition of our status as numerically the third largest community in India, in literacy superior to all other communities, and in education and culture second to none in the political and public life of the country.”

Sir, I think there is no one in this House who would not support that claim. We felt, during the time when merit operated as the sole basis upon which the services were recruited, that the Indian Christian community, by reason of their high standard of education and culture, had very little to complain about : and, as my Honourable friend from the Punjab has just said, where it is purely a matter of merit and no other consideration operates, there would be absolutely no fear as to the position which the Indian Christian community will be able to attain in the public life of this country. But, Sir, in the present transitory stage, considerations of merit have, it seems, to be modified by communal considerations, and that makes the position different ; and that is the reason, as explained in my Honourable friend's speech, why the Indian Christian community, which has done so well in the past on the basis of merit, are a little apprehensive as to its position in the future. The claim, as I have already said, is a very moderate one ; it does not say that there should be this or that percentage ; it merely says that the Government should recognize their special position. The Resolution recently published by the Home Department makes the situation clearer. Thirty-three and one-third per cent. of the services, under the control of the Government of India, are to be allotted to the minorities, of which twenty-five per cent. will be allocated to the Muhammadan community. That leaves a matter of eight and one-third per cent. to be distributed amongst the other communities which are not specified ; and, it is presumed, that as the Indian Christian community is the third largest of the communities in India, and the second largest of the minority communities in India, Government will recognize that position in the distribution of the remaining eight and one-third per cent. My Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, threw into the discussion a question which I consider is entirely extraneous. He referred to the question of the Provinces, of the District Boards, the Municipalities

and the High Courts. As far as I understand the Resolution, all that is really under consideration now are the services which are controlled by the Government of India themselves, and for whom this House is ultimately responsible for providing funds. Therefore, I consider that the Resolution should be limited, as far as discussions in this House are concerned, to this particular aspect. I would emphasize what my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, has said that in the past this community has not been a communalistic community. Both wings of the community have so far endeavoured to place the nation first and the community second. That is why I find, amongst the representatives of the other great communities, a feeling of great friendship towards the members of the Indian Christian Community. We feel, therefore, that as in this transitory stage we have to make statutory provision for the proper representation of various communities in the public services (and I trust personally that this stage will ultimately in years to come pass out of existence and that once again merit will be the supreme test of the public servant), for the time being, in this transitory stage, when other considerations have to be borne in mind, as far as this Group is concerned, we would support my Honourable friend's contention and would urge very strongly that the Government of India should give a sympathetic reply to the representations he has made. I do hope that, without much further discussion, this House will be prepared to endorse the claim of my Honourable friend and ask the Government of India to consider it.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Mr. President, I rise to support the Resolution which has been so ably moved by my friend, Dr. DeSouza. I am only sorry that in a somewhat minatory speech my Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, took the community to task for having divided opinion on the question of India's political progress. It seems to me that he made a somewhat extraordinary statement when he suggested that the Award, as we call it, and the Government order relating to the representation of various communities in the services have been passed, having mainly the consideration of the loyalty and the loyal services of various communities. I do not know who is going to reply on behalf of Government, but I should be very much surprised if the spokesman of the Government were for a movement to suggest that the loyalty of any particular community weighed with it in the consideration of the question as to how far particular communities should be represented in the Government services and in what proportion. My Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, talked of friends of the Government and enemies of the Government. Is my Honourable friend in a position to state that the friends of the Government are always friends and the enemies of the Government are always enemies ?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : I rise on a personal explanation. I never used such word as the word 'enemy' and I strongly protest against the Honourable Member putting words which I never used into my mouth.

**Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar** : My Honourable friend's speech was delivered only a few minutes ago and it is within the recollection of the House. He might not have used the word 'enemy', but he certainly used the word 'friend', and he wanted to suggest that the

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

Government, in passing its order on the communal representation on various services, mainly took into consideration the loyalty of the Muslim community and its freedom from participation in terrorist activities. Whatever the Government may have in their mind and whatever the Government spokesman may say on the subject, I am certain that the claims of my Muslim friends have not been based on any question of the friendship to Government and also not on any question of loyalty to Government, but on other considerations such as historical and other considerations of importance to that community. I was going to ask my Honourable friend before he gave his personal explanation, whether he is certain that the friends of today will continue to be the friends of tomorrow? Does he not know that friends and enemies do change with the changing circumstances? May I recall to my Honourable friend the conditions that prevailed in this country when the Khilafat agitation was at its zenith and when the Muslim community to a very large extent found itself unable to see eye to eye with the Government? Is it the contention of my Honourable friend that because there were two opinions expressed at the Round Table Conferences on behalf of the Indian Christian community and because Dr. Dutta took a particular view and Mr. Pannirselvam took a different view, therefore it was that the community had to suffer by this Government order? Certainly not. Is he not aware that the same sort of remark can be made with reference to other communities? Is there any single community in India which is united, homogenous and unanimous in its desire regarding the political advance of the country? Are there not two sections among the Muslim community itself? It may be that one is a microscopic section and the other is an overwhelming section. But these are extraneous considerations which ought not to influence Government. I do not think that the Government of India, with their sense of responsibility, could for a moment consider that because Dr. Dutta did not agree with my friend, Mr. Pannirselvam, therefore, they should penalise the Indian Christian community. It is an indictment against the Government of India which I certainly did not expect from an Honourable Member who, though he sits on neither side of the House, occupies a very central position and therefore neutral.

Now, Sir, as I said, what is the case of Dr. DeSouza with reference to this matter? He does not come forward and say that he has not been fairly treated. He does not come forward and say that the Government of India have not done justice to his community. It may be so, it may not be so. But he, along with the other minority communities in this country, is concerned about the future. They do not know what that future is going to be. They do not know how the services will be organised. They do not know what forces will come to play in regard to the question of the appointment of various communities. They do not know whether pure efficiency and merit will be taken into consideration or whether considerations relating to the likes and dislikes of the powers that be or of the majority for the time being with reference to religious predilections and other predilections of various minority communities will have a certain weight in the appointment of these services. That is an apprehension that has been voiced forth by every minority community in this country. It is for us, who are in the majority, to see that that apprehension is removed. It is for us to so

shape our conduct and to so formulate our policy that these apprehensions are proved to be illegitimate, unfounded and absolutely without any justification whatever. But till that date comes and till we are in a position to establish that fact, claims like this are bound to arise, and if one minority community is taken into consideration and its apprehensions are removed, then it seems to me that it is only reasonable that other minority communities should also come forward and press their claims and ask for a place under the sun so far as their future is concerned. Now, Sir, there is one other consideration that I should like to place before the House with reference to the claim that has been put forward by my friend, who is the champion of the Indian Christian community. They have pointed out that it is the third largest community in this country. Its population so far as British India is concerned, and we are to confine ourselves to British India only for this purpose, is a little over four millions. They form the third community in this country. When a Government order is issued relating to the representation of various communities, when specific mention is made of the Muslim community and specific mention is made of the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community who form a very small number, and when their interests are safeguarded, it seems to me that it is but reasonable that my friend, who is a spokesman and champion of his community in this Assembly, should come forward with a position that the Government have not done sufficient justice to the third largest minority community in this country and that more specific provision is needed. It is possible, at any rate, that the Government spokesman may refer to the fact that about  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. is allotted to various minority communities and that the Indian Christian community can satisfy itself if out of that proportion a decent percentage goes to that community. It seems to me that the Government order has been very cleverly framed. The Parsees will get up and say what is our proportion? My Honourable friend, the Home Member, or his very able Secretary, will say:  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. is reserved for other minority communities. The Sikhs, the Buddhists and the Jains may also come forward and say the same thing, and yet, my Honourable friend, the Home Member, will refer them to this  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Now, Sir, this seems to me to be a very unsatisfactory position so far as the actual facts are concerned. There is no meaning in referring to this  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and trying to satisfy by this, a hundred and one minority communities which will spring up. Is it possible to satisfy all of them with this  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent.? Further, this Government order suggests that if from the minor minorities, candidates are not forthcoming, for vacancies up to  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., the residue will go to the Muslims. I see that my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, who spoke about the literate qualifications of the Indian Christian community, did not refer to that aspect of the case. If the Government are serious about giving to these minor minorities, if I may say so, their due share, does it for a moment contemplate or dream that the Indian Christian community, leaving alone all other minority communities for the moment, the Sikhs and others, will not at any time find  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. that is reserved for all these minor minorities? Do the Government contemplate that the time will ever come when out of this  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. a residue will be left which has to be carried over to the Muslim community? Has the Honourable Member who sat down to

[Diwan Bahadur A. Ramaswami Mudaliar.]

draft this Resolution of the Government of India ever cared to consider seriously this Resolution and appraise the real facts of the situation? It seems to me knowing the circumstances in which the Indian Christian community is placed today with reference to education, efficiency and general qualification, it is impossible that the position can ever arise when out of 8½ per cent. a residue will be left which is to be carried over to the Muslim community. (Hear, hear.) That shows that the Government did not have seriously in mind the consideration regarding the Indian Christian community when they framed this Government order. If the Government had for a moment adverted to the Indian Christian community, to the position that it occupies at present in the Government service, to the position it fills with reference to educational qualifications, then the Government could never have put, what I may call, very respectfully with reference to the Government order, and yet I have to call it, an absurd proposal of that kind. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, Sir, all these facts taken cumulatively do render the Indian Christian community apprehensive as regards its position. My Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, is not a day too soon in coming forward with the suggestion that the position of the Indian Christian community must be positively prescribed and ascertained and not left in this vague and inchoate and undefined manner in which the Government order leaves that community.

Sir, I should like only to refer to one other aspect of the question, and I trust that no community will misunderstand me when I refer to the Indian Christian community and the most dignified place which it occupies in this country. I do not think it requires any elaboration from me if I state that it is very often difficult to discriminate the Indian Christian community from the Hindu community and find out the difference either from facial or from other resemblances, and the feeling of oneness between the Hindu and the Indian Christian communities is something not comparable with reference to any other community like the Muslims, the Sikhs or the Parsis. (Laughter.) Most of us have got the closest relation with our brethren of the Indian Christian community. In my part of the country, Southern India, I should like to state, that they are predominant in that part of the country, and there, their customs and manners almost very often are identical with those of the Hindu community. Socially, between the Hindus and the Christians, there is very little of distinction and to the extent it can be done, intercourse between the Hindus and the Indian Christians is so cordial that very little of the feeling of aloofness arises between them. Turning to political considerations, may I add a significant fact that the Indian Christian community is one of the few minority communities in this country which has its eyes cast neither to the East nor to the West, neither to Mecca nor to Japan, and it concentrates its full attention on the country in which its fortunes are laid. (Hear, hear.) The Indian Christian community cannot be charged with any sense of extra-territorial patriotism under any condition whatsoever. Its fortunes are our fortunes, its future is our future and its prosperity is the prosperity of the whole of India, of the Hindu and the Muslim communities. A community like that which has thrown its fortunes with the people with reference to many of its activities and which has completely identified itself with the people, it seems to me that a community like that should be better treated than any other community in the country. (Applause.) When this Government order ignores that community, I

think it is only proper, that not a member of the Indian Christian community, but a Hindu like myself should come forward and say : " I protest against the Government ignoring that community ". It is from that point of view that I wish to place this case. My Honourable friend, Mr. James, very correctly pointed out what I have been trying to say within the last few minutes, that the Indian Christian community has thrown itself heart and soul into every phase of progressive activity in this country, and it has deserved well by every other community in the country. Sir, I heartily support this Resolution. (Applause.)

**Sir Hari Singh Gour** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions : Non-Muhammadian) : Sir, if there is any community which deserves well of this House, it is the Indian Christian community. The Mover of the Resolution has made no secret of the fact that he is against communalism, and he has made no secret of the fact that he is not enamoured of the so-called minority pact or the partition of services brought about by the Resolution of the Home Department of the Government of India. In saying so, my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, follows the line chalked out for him by the two great representatives of the Indian Christian community who appeared before the Simon Commission in 1928 and declared as their unanimous view that they were against communalism of all and any kind whether in the representation in the Indian Legislature or in the services. They further said that though this view would greatly prejudice their community in the near future yet they placed the ultimate good of the nation before the good of their own community (Hear, hear), and they, therefore, unanimously gave their view to the Royal Commission that they were against the introduction of communalism in any shape or form in the future constitution of this country. That is the view, Sir, which this great Christian community took on a momentous occasion and their protagonist in this House, Dr. DeSouza, has stated in emphatic terms that he stands by the views of the accredited representatives of his community. That is the first point that Honourable Members on both sides of the House must bear in mind. He has further pointed out that he is not claiming any share in the services beyond  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. reserved for the minority communities. Out of that, 25 per cent. has been earmarked for the Muslim community. The remainder of  $8\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. is reserved for the other minorities, but while pointed reference is made in the Resolution to the Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European community, no reference was made to the third largest community in India and the reversion to undisposed of posts has been given to the Muslim community. My Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, points out that, in point of education and culture and homogeneity, the Indian Christian community is second to no other community in this country, and there is no reason why the Government of India, while allocating seats to the minority communities, should have forgotten to make any mention of this great community which rightly claims to be the third largest community in this country. My Honourable friend, Mr. Mudaliar, pointed out that this community is essentially Indian and is indistinguishable from the other communities of this country, particularly the Hindus. Not only in outward appearance is this community indistinguishable from the majority community in this country but in broad outlook on life and in their nationalistic views, this community has fought shoulder to shoulder with the majority community. As Dr. DeSouza has pointed out, he is not standing here for a share of the leaves and fishes of office justifying them on the ground justified by the Govern-

[Sir Hari Singh Gour.]

ment of India Resolution, but what he does say is this that if you are to have a partition of services where do the Indian Christians come in? They must have their proper share, and, I submit, put in that light, there would be hardly anyone on this side of the House who would dissent from the contention of the Honourable the Mover. He has also pointed out that his community ranks first in point of education. Sir, Dr. DeSouza pointed out that his community ranks first in point of education. It has got more schools and colleges and has turned out a larger number of highly educated Indians than any other community in this country. Sir Henry Gidney, who prizes himself upon being a whole-hogger and a rank communalist, charged Dr. DeSouza with having been guilty of not joining the Minorities Pact. Sir, if Dr. DeSouza and his community had joined the Minorities Pact. . . .

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : They certainly did. The section of the Indian Christian community, under the leadership of Mr. Pannirselvam, was a signatory to it, and he was one of their two delegates.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour** : I am reminded by Sir Henry Gidney that the Christian community did join the Minorities Pact. But I may remind this House that they have been proclaiming from the house tops that they are against all communalism and it is only when intrigues began to operate behind the scenes, and my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Gidney, and members of the European Group wanted to dish the majority community in the Second Round Table Conference that the Christian community had no option but to join the Minorities Pact. But they were not willing signatories to it; and Dr. DeSouza has here pointed out that he is not in favour of any communal pacts and he is not in favour of any communalism in the services of this country.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : Where does he say that?

**Sir Hari Singh Gour** : He has said in the opening sentences of his speech that he is against communalism in this country.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : Sir, Dr. DeSouza said in his speech. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable Member cannot speak for Dr. DeSouza. (Laughter.)

**Sir Hari Singh Gour** : My friend, Sir Henry Gidney, has shifted his centre of gravity from the centre to the side (Laughter), with a view to encouraging and inspiring Dr. DeSouza, but I am sure, in spite of that, Dr. DeSouza will keep an open mind and will not fall an easy victim to Sir Henry Gidney's machinations. Sir, Dr. DeSouza has a perfectly plain and straightforward case. His case is that if you are to divide up the services in this country upon communal lines, his own community, the third largest in India, must have a percentage of those services; and he justifies his claim upon the ground that his community is second to none in point of education and culture and social advancement, and there is no reason, therefore, why that community should be ignored while the claims of other and lesser communities are considered. Take for example the community of Sir Henry Gidney which is a microscopic minority amongst the communities in this country, numbering not more than 1,00,000 people,

and yet, Sir Henry Gidney, by his persistency and able advocacy both in the Joint Committee and outside it, has secured to that community the lion's share in the public services of this country. Now, I submit that Dr. DeSouza's community is sixty times more numerous than Sir Henry Gidney's community; and if the Government of India were to give Sir Henry Gidney's community a percentage of the loaves and fishes and public offices in this country, Dr. DeSouza has got a claim sixty times stronger than the claim of Sir Henry Gidney's community. There is absolutely nothing to choose between the two communities. In point of loyalty to which my friend, Sir Henry Gidney, alluded, the Christian community ranks equal to the Anglo-Indian community; in point of education and culture they are not second to the Anglo-Indian community. Then what difference is there between the patronage accorded to one community and denied to the other?

**Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal** (Jullundur Division : Non-Muhamadan) : They are more vocal.

**Sir Hari Singh Gour** : My friend says the Anglo-Indian community is more vocal. I am quite sure that the small grasshopper that chirps in the field attracts more attention of the passers-by than the grand buffalo that lies there browsing quietly in the sun and whose very presence is ignored by him. This little grasshopper of the Anglo-Indian community has attracted the attention of Government and ensured its patronage, but this great community that reposes in the sunshine and the shadow of India, serving the people and asking the passers-by to give to it what are its deserts, has been ignored because it has not been vocal. I hope, Sir, that this House will join with the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution in voicing the sentiments of that community that it is entitled to a fair and,—may I add,—a substantial share out of the percentage allotted to the minorities.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** (United Provinces Southern Divisions : Muhamadan Rural) : Sir, before I develop my argument, I should just like to put one question to Sir Henry Gidney and I will wait for a reply. Is he or is he not an Indian?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : I must ask for notice of that question. (Loud Laughter.)

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : Sir, silence is the only reply that I can give to that. If I say anything, probably he will move a motion for adjournment on myself.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** : My time is more profitably occupied.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions : Muhammadan Rural) : No, he will go and consult at home.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : He said repeatedly on the floor of the House, though he may not admit it today, that he was an Indian and he was proud of being an Indian. I am a strong believer in one principle : others may or may not agree with me in it, but I think that if India is ever to be united, if India is ever to acquire real nationalism, the one thing to be done is to satisfy the minorities. If you look into the history of any other country, you will find that troubles always arose from this fact that the minorities were not satisfied. The majorities are always

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

satisfied, as they are the Government, and it is only the minorities that have to be satisfied. If we are to be united, if we are to develop Indian nationalism, if we are to have independence one day, the one essential thing is to satisfy the minorities which inhabit this country, so that all may unite, and form one nation.....

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran : Non-Muhammadian) : The reasonable claims of minorities.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : My friend says "Reasonable claims". When we say "Satisfy the claims of minorities", we mean "satisfy the reasonable claims"—that is evident. This was done by the Egyptians before they became one nation : they had to satisfy the Christian minority there, and then they practically united together, and we never hear in Egypt of anything communal, as we hear in India today. So I am strongly of opinion that we should satisfy Dr. DeSouza. We should also satisfy Sir Henry Gidney. But my difficulty in his case is of an entirely different type. Colonel Gidney has said that he is an Indian and I presume nobody can doubt that he is a Christian. Sir Henry Gidney is an Indian Christian and Dr. DeSouza is also an Indian Christian ; and, therefore, I ask what the difference is between them and why they want separate shares. The only answer which I can find is colour.

**An Honourable Member** : Not always :

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad** : If that is not the case, if colour is not the consideration, what is the consideration ? I refuse to divide the Christians on the ground of colour or on the ground of their fatness or tallness, and say that persons who are short should get so much percentage and persons who are tall should get so much. My difficulty is to find out in what way they differ. From the point of view of religion it is the same. There may be some difference in culture. If that is so, I should like to know what is the culture of an Indian Christian. This point has been developed by my friend, Diwan Bahadur Ramaswami Mudaliar, already, that from the cultural point of view, the Indian Christians do not differ from Hindus. Here, I would like to relate something which happened when I was on the Continent : I met an American millionaire, a man who had endowed large sums of money for the American missionary societies, and he was referring to the report, and told me that two most important communities in India had become Christians in very large numbers ; and I asked him : "What are those communities ?" and he said, "Bhangiyos and Chamiers". I said, these are two important communities from the point of view of the Americans who do not know Indian conditions, but, certainly, we in India do not consider these two communities to be the most important communities inhabiting this particular land. Though I have very great sympathy for my friend, Dr. DeSouza, and I started with the assumption that we should satisfy the Indian Christian community in every possible manner, yet, at the same time, I should like to mention two facts. One was mentioned by my friend, Mr. Sitaramaraju, when he said : "Do not say, for goodness sake, that you have not got your proper percentage". I have figures here of the Christian community in various services under the Government of India, and I think they have no reason to complain. As far as the higher appointments are concerned, they have no reasons to complain.

So as far as I am concerned, in order to be true to my principle, I am prepared to meet him as much as possible, but I want to know what is the difference between him and Sir Henry Gidney? You are both Indians and you are both Christians. In what way, therefore, do you differentiate yourselves? One of you, perhaps, has got European blood in him, and the other has no European blood in him. If that be the case, then there are Miniammadans who are of Arab stock, some who have ancient European blood in them, some with Persian blood, and so on; and if we begin to divide ourselves, according to the blood of the original country, then, I think, there will be indefinite number of cross divisions; it will be impossible to classify them under any category. Therefore, I think, you will have to make out the difference between the two classes of Indian Christians: as far as we are concerned, we are quite content and willing to satisfy every one so that all of us may work together for the common good of the country. With these words, I support the motion.

**Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal:** Sir, I have much pleasure in supporting this Resolution, and for a variety of reasons. One of these reasons is that I am a signatory to the Resolution, and, fortunately or unfortunately, I drew it in the ballot. Another is, my association with the Indian Christian community since they are a part of my constituency. They are neither Muslims nor Sikhs: they are the "others"; and they are in the same category as the Hindus, and, therefore, it is just as well that I say a few words on the subject. There is, however, another reason, if I may say so, for saying something at this stage, and that is the remarks that fell from my gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney. Sir Henry Gidney, safe in the position secured to him by the Minorities Pact, that unholy alliance at the Second Round Table Conference, came out in a somewhat patronising way to pat the Indian Christians: he said, "Yes; it is just as well that you have your share: I have mine safe enough: you have yours". Now, what is that? It is really generosity at other peoples' cost. Colonel Gidney has his share secured by the Pact at the Round Table Conference: in common with the Muslims, Europeans and others, they had their shares fixed; and now he comes and pats,—in fact he travels to a side of the House and sits by the side of Dr. DeSouza, telling him to stand fast in his demand for his share. What does it mean? It is almost threatening. It means: "We had our share; you have yours". But from whom? From the unfortunate Hindus, sitting here and there scattered about,—the so-called majority on paper.

Let me pass from that, and make a few observations. The first thing that occurs to me, out of the remarks of Colonel Gidney, is that it was the advice of Dr. S. K. Dutta at the Round Table Conference which perhaps had landed the Indian Christian community in their present position. Now, I wish to say only one thing. There are people here who know Dr. Dutta more intimately than I do; but every one has genuine regard for his services to this country, and it came with somewhat of a bad grace from Colonel Gidney to say that it was Dr. Dutta who let them down. If Dr. Dutta was not much of an intriguer and did not succeed like Colonel Gidney with the politicians there is no discredit to him. Dr. Dutta took a nationalistic view, and if he took up a view which did not find favour with Colonel Gidney then all the credit goes to Dr. Dutta. Therefore, if Dr. Dutta has allowed the Christian community to remain with the Hindus and the "others", it is all to the good, and it is from that point

[Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal.]

of view, that I make bold to say that if percentages have to be reserved for minorities, if this unfortunate state of affairs is to continue for any length of time, then it is just as well that Dr. DeSouza has his share. In this connection I would like to say one thing: that when you are reserving these percentages, and the Indian Christian community has come last into the field to claim its percentage, I think it is just as well to look into the question from the historic point of view. The Indian Christian community, we have been told, had done well when merit was the ruling guide. All credit to them. The Indian Christian community stands by it, and so long as the Government of India and the Provincial Governments of this country are going to be run on the principle of merit and merit alone, they are content to remain where they are. They were fairly safe when merit was the real test laid down for public appointments, and they are quite content to remain where they are, if merit is going to be the sole or the predominant consideration in the making of appointments. Dr. Dutta, and many others like him, have mentioned that if merit is not going to be the sole consideration, and if in the future constitution of this country, you are going to have other principles to go by, then it is just as well that this community which yields to none, which is inferior to none in point of importance, in point of historical associations, in point of culture and in point of intellect, should have its share of loaves and fishes of office and its percentage in the Legislature fixed, just as in the case of other communities. Sir, I am one of those who hate these percentages by religions and communities, and that I do so on broad general grounds,—and not because of any partiality for any particular community. Citizenship of a country knows of no divided loyalty, and it can owe allegiance to no one except to the Government of the country. But, when you bring in the poison of divided loyalty, loyalty to religions and communities, then it is just as well to take stock of the situation. I am reminded of what Mr. Balfour said, in speaking on Lord Morley's Bill, in the House of Commons. The Reforms Bill of 1909 introduced the principle of communal representation in a democratic country, in a democratic constitution. It was not much of a democratic constitution, it was only an attempt at a reformed constitution in Lord Morley's Bill. He said he would have opposed this Bill thoroughly and without hesitation, because he hated any kind of communal representation in a democratic constitution, but, he added, this was India,—and he knew next to nothing of this country, and also because the Government of India say it is just as well to have it hence he would agree. But starting from that time, during the last 25 years, we have had communal representation with a vengeance. We have it in the Legislatures, local bodies, services, we will have it in the army, and we will have it in the marriage registers, birth figures, and God knows where it will end. But if that is so, if the minorities insist on having these percentages fixed,—let us hope only for a short time,—then it is just as well to recognise the fact that the Indian Christian community has its claims, and their claims should be recognised on all the grounds that have been put forward by them. I do not think for a moment that the Government is actuated by the chain of loyalty or abatement from terrorism and other things, which my friend made much of,—they are all passing phases,—but the claims to this reservation are based on far sounder foundations than those mentioned by my friend over there.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney :** Sir, I rise to make a personal explanation. The Honourable Member and several others have made reference to what I said about Dr. Datta. My object in referring to him was this, and I hope Honourable Members will understand it quite clearly. My opinion is that the reason for the cleavage between the two religious sections of the community, as represented by Mr. Pannerselvam and Dr. Datta, was because of their religious differences,—one was not prepared to agree with the other, and so the voice of the community was completely divided. It was because of disunity and impossibility of getting one member to represent the views of the community that Government could not send an Indian Christian to the Third Round Table Conference and the Joint Parliamentary Committee whose numbers were more limited. Therefore, if Honourable Members think that in my opinion Dr. Datta's political views had anything to do with this position, I wish emphatically to state that such was not my reason, the reason was entirely a religious difference between the two representatives, they could not agree together, and, as they demanded two seats for the Third Round Table Conference and the Joint Parliamentary Committee, Government could not acquiesce, and so they went by default.

**Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal :** Sir, I am glad of this belated personal explanation. All that I was saying was, that the claims of the minorities rest on a far better foundation, and in this connection I may say that Dr. Ziauddin's point that the claims of minorities in this country have to be satisfied is true to a certain extent, but not wholly true. One might say that the minorities might claim so much that the majority communities claims will vanish into thin air. If we look to the proposals of the future Federal Constitution, we see that the so-called Hindu majority of 77 per cent. in this country is reduced in British India to a very ineffective minority of 42 per cent., and 42 per cent. is a very ineffective minority....

**Sir Hari Singh Gour :** That is not all....

**Mr. Jagan Nath Aggarwal :** Grant that the claims of the minorities have to be satisfied, but that only means that their reasonable claims have to be satisfied in a reasonable way, subject always to the over-riding consideration, that the minorities should not be used to deprive the majority of their statutory right, or to reduce the majority to an absolutely ineffective minority. I, therefore, say, although I support this Resolution, and I support it heartily, that the Government of India, when dealing with these percentages, should bear this in mind and make enough provision for merit, and if unfortunately the majority community is lumped up with many others in this country, and if things come to that pass, there should be a certain percentage reserved for the majority also. If things are coming to that sorry pass, in which the majority will disappear into thin air, then reserve for us any percentage 30, 40 or 25 per cent. whichever you like, because we will then know where we stand. Sir, I heartily support the Resolution moved by my friend, Dr. DeSouza.

**Mr. Sitakanta Mahapatra (Orissa Division : Non-Muhammadan) :** Sir, I have racked my brains to find out what the word 'community' means. Nobody could tell me if it has been defined anywhere by the Government. At last I took the help of a dictionary and found the meaning as "a body of men having religion, profession, etc., in common". On the strength of this, the Government have divided us in the matter

[Mr. Sitakanta Mahapatra.]

of representation in various spheres, such as, services, Legislatures, etc., as the Hindu community, the Muslim community, the Sikh community, the Christian community, etc., etc. Up to this, it is all right. But when the Christian community is sub-divided into Indian Christian community, the Anglo-Indian Christian community, the European Christian community and so on, and given separate representation, and the Jains, Parsis, Buddhists, etc., are taken into the Hindu community, I am again puzzled. My trouble comes here again. I have been appealing to the Government for some consideration, in different spheres, for the Oriyas, whom I would describe as the Oriya Hindu community, although I wish I could include in Oriyas every one inhabiting Orissa without any distinction of caste or creed.....

{ \* \* \* \* \*

The Honourable the Home Member said, during the last Delhi session; "Oriyas are not recognised as a community for recruitment". Then, again, at page 1919 of the proceedings of the same Session, the Honourable the Finance Member says: "We have no rules for securing proper representation of inhabitants of particular areas". Then again, in reply to a question of mine a few days back, here in Simla, the Honourable the Home Member said:

"As has been explained on several occasions in this House, the Government of India have not undertaken to secure representation for Provinces, either generally or in terms of particular communities. I have no information whether there are any Oriyas in the Government of India offices at the headquarters, and I do not think any useful purpose would be served by collecting the information in view of what I have just stated."

But, on the first of this month, the Honourable the Home Member, in reply to a question regarding Bengal Muslims, said:

"I will ascertain how many Bengali Muslims are actually employed in the Government of India Secretariat."

Sir, where is the logic or consistency in these two statements? What useful purpose will be served by ascertaining how many Bengali Muslims are there in the Secretariat of the Government of India? If the Christian community can be divided into the Indian Christian community, the Anglo-Indian Christian community and the European Christian community, and in some cases Muslims can be divided in terms of Provinces, why not the Hindus in terms of Oriya Hindus? Is it, because, in the whole of the Government of India Departments, not only the Secretariats but the Railways, Customs, Archaeology, Medical, etc., there is not a single Oriya anywhere? Sir, I think, in view of the fact that there is a tendency of dividing India into Provinces on linguistic basis, and Provinces are soon going to be autonomous, a time has come for the Government of India to consider the cases of different communities in terms of Provinces at least where the disparagement is extremely great.

I wish to make myself clearly understood that I for one stand for Indian nationalism, but as the Government has thought it fit to put every obstacle against the growth of Indian nationalism since the days of Minto-Morley Reforms, by dividing the Indian community into sub-divisions according to religious persuasions and then following up the vicious principle by still further sub-dividing

~~This portion was arranged by the direction of the House—this page 146 of these debates, dated the 14th August, 1904.~~

men of one religious faith into groups, may I not demand of the Government to be a little more logical and provide for representation of various provincial communities in the services and the Legislatures? Division of a people on racial, linguistic, ethnological and geographical basis, has the tendency of giving solidarity to the people and may not retard the progress of nationalism, but to select only religion, and then members of a particular religious persuasion, to look to their Provinces and denying the same for members of a particular community and Province, is a principle, which I must condemn and the Government lay themselves open to the charge of following the principle of "divide and rule".

I am speaking of my much neglected community and Province, not because I am in favour of sub-dividing the Indian nation, but, because I believe that my Province and community have not received their proper share of the services and representation in the Legislature through neglect of the Government, and because they have not asserted themselves with the same insistence as other communities. I do warn the Government against such neglect of a community which, only till recently, was independent fifty years after Bengal, and is the inheritor of a great civilisation, which every student of ancient history and culture knows. I demand, on behalf of the Oriyas, that the Government should take into consideration the claims of the Oriyas if they do not want to drive a peaceful community to raise the standard of revolt against the misdeeds of their rulers.

† [ \* \* \* \* \* ]

**Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur** (West Coast and Nilgiris : Muhammadan) : Sir, I have no hesitation in supporting this Resolution. I have no quarrel with the Indian Christians. They are a minority community in my Province, though they are well off there. But the Government ought not to have helped the Indian Christians at the expense of the Mussalmans. In the Madras Presidency, where the Muslims form about seven per cent. and the Indian Christians form about 3½ per cent., recently the way of the Government, either of this Government or of the Government of Madras, was to help the Indian Christians at the expense of the Mussalmans. Sir, you know that for the last 14 years after the Montford Reforms came into being, the Mussalmans had a seat in the Madras Cabinet. For what reason, I do not know, that representation of Muslims in the Madras Cabinet has been taken away and given to the Indian Christians. I have no quarrel with the Indian Christians; my quarrel is with the Government. As you know, Sir, in the Madras Government, either in one way or another, the Indian Christians have been represented all the time. You know that one of the Presidents of the Madras Legislative Council was an Indian Christian, the Secretary of the Madras Legislative Council was an Indian Christian, and one of the Ministers was an Indian Christian. The Indian Christians were not without representation in the Madras Government, but the only Muslim representation we had in the Cabinet has been removed. It is an insult to the whole Mussalman population of the Madras Presidency, to say that there is no qualified Mussalman. The Government has been insulting the Mussalmans of Madras for the last 14 or 15 years. In 1919 or 1920 the only Muslim High Court Judge we had on the Madras High Court retired, and Government could not find another Mussalman till now to represent the Mussalmans on the High Court

† This portion was expunged by the direction of the House—vide page 1468 of these debates, dated the 14th August, 1924.

[Mr. Uppi Saheb Bahadur.]

Bench ! Another insult is that the Government could not find one Mussalman in the 35 lakhs of Mussalmans in Madras to represent them in the Cabinet. I am not making any comparison, comparison is always odious, but could they not find one Mussalman with equal qualification to the one whom they selected last time ! There are any number, if they only care to know. Nobody is more blind than those who will not see. To say that there is no Mussalman in the Madras Presidency to represent us on the High Court Bench is,—I would have used the proper word if you will not object me using it,—to say the least, a lame excuse. In order to suit their purpose, they were saying something or other and hoodwinking us for the last 15 years and even now they have insulted us. I want to clear my position with regard to my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza. I have no quarrel with the Indian Christians. My quarrel is that Government have deprived us of our right to be represented on the Cabinet. Government have been insulting us for the last 14 or 15 years and now it has come to the culminating point. I only protest against the Government action for the last 15 years.

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

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

**Raj Bahadur Lala Brij Kishore** (Lucknow Division : Non-Muhannadan Rural) : Sir, with regard to the demand put forward by the Honourable the Mover of the Resolution for safeguarding the interests of the Indian Christian community in respect of representation in the services and on committees, I have got to submit that as long as the Government decision on the Communal Award was not announced, the Christian community as a whole had steadfastly stood for a truly national outlook in the matter. But now that the Government have recognized the principle of communal representation in the services, and conceded valuable privileges to other minority communities, it is but natural that the Christian community should feel aggrieved and press for its claims.

Sir, I myself do feel, that at the time of taking its decision on the subject of communal representation in the services, Government should not have failed to consider the claims of the third important community of India. When representation to the Anglo-Indian community was granted, quite out of proportion to its numerical strength, there was absolutely no justification for ignoring the Indian Christian community. But in this matter of communal representation, Government have not adhered to any fixed principle. The Muslim community has been given protection because it was not sufficiently represented in the services and the reservation of appointments for them on this ground may seem just, but the Anglo-Indian community has been given protection, *because* in the past they were given the lion's share in some services ! So between these two contradictory attitudes, it was but natural that injustice be done to other communities. It was impossible to avoid it !

In conclusion, Sir, I have got to say that when the principle of distribution of posts on communal lines has been accepted by the Government, then, as a matter of justice, I shall feel glad, if the Honourable the

Mover can succeed in inducing the Government to fix a reasonable percentage for the Christian community as well. It is highly desirable that we should try and find out, as much as possible, a common agreement between ourselves, otherwise, if this spirit, which looks only towards differences, is perpetuated through the legislative enactment of this highest Legislature of the land, then we shall be giving a wrong lead, the consequences of which will be serious in future. (Hear, hear.)

The problem of Indian politics will not be solved by apportioning seats in the elected bodies and services on a communal basis, but through the spirit of service and co-operation among the communities it may be possible. Sir, the Honourable the Mover has stated that he demands these safeguards for his community, so that this avenue of service to the motherland may not be closed to them. I submit that there are so many fields of service open to each community, in this poor and much-afflicted land, that really one cannot complain of lack of opportunities ! The Christian community is highly educated and advanced, and so far, has not stood in need of any protection in the matter of securing appointments in Government service and, I think, the Christian community would have been well-advised not to change its truly national outlook ; but, as they do demand it as a matter of justice, their rights may be protected, when similar protection has been accorded to the rights of others. With these few words, Sir, I resume my seat.

**Mr. C. M. Trivedi** (Government of India : Nominated Official) : Sir, the Resolution, which has been moved with such eloquence and with such earnestness by my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, and, on which, other Honourable Members have spoken with equal eloquence, is divided into two parts. I shall deal first with that part of the Resolution which relates to the recognition of the claims of the Indian Christian community for adequate representation in the services. In the term "services", I must make it clear that I include only the All-India Services and the Central Services under the control of the Government of India. The Central Government is not concerned with the services recruited by the Provincial Governments under their own powers. There can be no question of the Government of India interfering with the statutory powers which the Local Governments have to regulate recruitment to the provincial and subordinate services. The Government of India are much less concerned with the services under local bodies such as municipalities or district Boards, to which my Honourable and gallant friend, Sir Henry Gidney, referred. Now, I need hardly remind the House that the policy of the Government of India in the matter of the representation of the different communities in the public services is to prevent a preponderance of any one class or community in the services. As the House is well aware, that policy was adopted in 1923 at the instance of the Legislative Assembly. On the 10th April, 1923, this Assembly unanimously adopted a Resolution, recommending *inter alia*, that steps should be taken to secure that the services are not unduly over-weighted with the representatives of any one class or community, and that, as far as possible, the claims of all communities are considered. This disposes of the allegation made by my Honourable friend, Bhai Parma Nand, that Government is largely responsible for introducing communalism in the services. As the House is well aware, the method adopted, since 1925 for the application of that policy, is the reservation of one-third of all permanent vacancies for direct recruitment for the redress of communal inequalities. The recent Home Department Resolution, to which I shall have occasion to refer in some detail in the

[Mr. C. M. Trivedi.]

latter part of my speech, makes some modification in that method, but the policy I have just mentioned, viz., the policy of preventing a preponderance of any one class or community in the services, remains unchanged, and the first point I should like to make is that for the purposes of that policy the Indian Christian community will continue to be regarded, as at present, a minority community. I hope this will satisfy the European Group, on whose behalf my Honourable friend, Mr. James, gave a general support to this Resolution. The second point I would like to make is that the Indian Christian community forms only 1.4 per cent. of the total population of British India, and that that community is at present represented in the public services well in excess of its population ratio to the total population of British India. My Honourable friend, Mr. Sitaramaraju, quoted some statistics in this connection, but may I, Sir, with your permission and the permission of the House, give a general picture of the existing position regarding the representation of the Indian Christian community in the All-India Services and the Central Services under the control of the Government of India. I realize, Sir, that statistics are very dull, but statistics are an essential part of my case and I should like to take this House through some of them. Take, for instance, the I. C. S. In that service, out of 395 Indians, 23, or about 5.8 per cent. are Indian Christians. That community has done well in the I. C. S. examination in recent years, thanks no doubt to the high level of education in that community to which my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, referred in his speech with great pride, and justifiable pride I may say. Out of a total of 206 Indians selected for appointment to the I. C. S. on the results of the competitive examination, from 1925-26—and that is the year in which the policy, I have just now referred to was introduced—, ten, i.e., about five per cent. were Indian Christians.

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza** (Nominated Non-Official): Which appointments?

**Mr. C. M. Trivedi**: The I. C. S.

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza**: At the Delhi examinations?

**Mr. C. M. Trivedi**: Delhi and London combined.

Again, out of 32 Indians nominated to the I. C. S. since 1925—that is, the year in which the policy to which I have already referred was adopted—three were Indian Christians. The nominations were the direct result of the policy which I have just mentioned. The number of Indian Christians in the I. C. S. has increased from 11 in 1925 to 23 at the end of 1933. Take, again, the Indian Police, in which out of 155 Indians, five, that is to say, a little over three per cent., are Indian Christians. Of the total Indian intake by direct recruitment since 1925, two, or about three per cent. have been Indian Christians. Of these one was obtained by competition and one by nomination. The number of Indian Christians in the Indian Police has increased from two in 1925 to five in 1933. I have got here detailed statistics, showing the position of the Indian Christian community in some of the more important Central Services, but I do not like to weary the House with these figures. I should like, however, to mention certain other figures. In the clerical establishments of the Central Government, the percentages of Indian Christians in 1932 were a little over two per cent. in the Departments of the Government of India, 1.8 per cent. in the Attached and Subordinate Offices, Delhi and Simla, and a little over three per cent. in Subordinate Offices elsewhere.

than at Simla and Delhi. Further, of the permanent appointments made in 1932 by direct recruitment, Indian Christians secured two out of 73 in Departments of the Government of India, or a little over 2½ per cent. ; six, out of 152, in the Attached and Subordinate offices at Simla and Delhi, or nearly four per cent. ; and 70 out of 1,242 in offices elsewhere than at Simla and Delhi, that is, a little over 5½ per cent.

On the Railways, out of the total subordinate staff of a lakh and a quarter on Class I railways, on the 31st December, 1932, a little over three per cent., or, to be exact, 3.3 per cent., were Indian Christians. On State Railways, Indian Christians formed in 1931, 2.82 per cent. of the total subordinate staff, and 4.3 per cent. of that staff on Rs. 150 and over. In the Posts and Telegraphs Department, Indian Christians form two per cent. of the total Indian staff. In non-clerical and non-gazetted superior staff of that Department, they form a little over 6½ per cent. of the total Indian staff.

I hope, Sir, these figures will convince the House that the Indian Christian community is generally represented in the all-India and Central Services well in excess of their population ratio.

I will now turn to the question of the position of the community under the recent Home Department Resolution. In the speech which my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, made on the 26th of last month, while moving his Resolution, I think, he stated that the Resolution virtually ignored the claims of the Indian Christian community for a share in the public services. He went further and added that it had rung the death-knell of the hopes of the community for the future. I quite appreciate the anxiety—a legitimate anxiety—of my Honourable friend regarding the position of the Indian Christians, but I cannot agree with the words which he used. In fact, if I may say so, without any offence, he used the language of picturesque exaggeration and I would make it clear that I emphatically disagree with him. Before issuing that Resolution, the Government of India considered carefully the position of minority communities other than Muslims and Anglo-Indians, and they satisfied themselves that the new rules would continue to provide for those other minorities,—and I may repeat, that the Indian Christian community is one of those minorities—as at present, a reasonable degree of representation in the services. This conclusion has been stated in paragraph 4 of the Resolution and is based on the following facts : firstly, the Indian Christian community is, speaking generally, a highly educated community and should be able to hold its own in direct recruitment to unreserved vacancies, namely, two-thirds of the total vacancies, whether recruitment is made by competitive examination or by selection ; secondly, the Indian Christian community will, as I have stated already more than once, continue to be regarded as a minority community. For services recruited on an all-India basis, it will be entitled, along with minority communities other than Muslims, to a share of 8-1/3 per cent. of vacancies. The communities other than Muslims, hitherto regarded as minority communities, are Anglo-Indians and Domiciled Europeans, Sikhs, Indian Christians and Parsis and the population of these minorities in British India is about 2.64. There are other minority communities which account for about seven per cent. of the total population of British India, but these communities rarely compete or apply for the public services, and I anticipate that, in actual practice, practically the whole of the 8-1/3 per cent. of vacancies would go to Anglo-Indians, Indian Christians, Sikhs and Parsis, who constitute, I might repeat, only 2.64 per cent. of the population in British India. In services

[Mr. C. M. Trivedi.]

recruited locally, the position will also practically be the same. The reservation of 8-13 per cent. will, however, be obtained by fixing a percentage for each railway or local area or circle having regard to the population ratio of minority communities, other than Muslims in that area, and the rules for recruitment adopted by the Local Government of that area concerned. This will ensure that in those areas in which the Indian Christian community preponderates, their representation in the Central Services recruited on a local basis in those areas will be commensurate with their preponderance. It is true that in subordinate posts on Railways only six per cent. of vacancies is reserved for minorities, other than Muslims and Anglo-Indians. This percentage is, however, approximately the percentage of posts held by members of these communities at present, and the Indian Christian community need not, I think, fear that their present position in the matter of subordinate posts on railways, which I have already said is favourable, will be undermined. Neither is there any reason to fear that their position in the Posts and Telegraphs Department will be undermined, as in the Departments or branches of the Posts and Telegraphs Department, in which a special reservation is made for Anglo-Indians, the reservation of vacancies for other minorities, that is, minorities other than Muslims and Anglo-Indians, will be fixed so as to be equal approximately to the percentage of subordinate posts at present held by them. In the light of these facts, I maintain, Sir, that the Government of India are perfectly justified in the claim they have made in paragraph 4 of that Resolution. That claim is that the Government of India are satisfied that the new rules will continue to provide for them, as at present, a reasonable degree of representation in the services.

My Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, asked that a specific percentage of vacancies should be reserved for Indian Christians as in the case of Muslims and Anglo-Indians. I am afraid it is not possible to accept this. The reasons which have led the Government of India to reserve 25 per cent. of vacancies for Muslims, 8 per cent. for Anglo-Indians in subordinate posts on railways and 5 per cent. of vacancies in certain branches of the Posts and Telegraphs Department for Anglo-Indians do not hold good in the case of Indian Christians. Muslims form about 25 per cent. of the total population of British India, but a review of the existing system, which has been in operation for over seven or eight years, showed that in practice they obtained only 18 or 20 per cent. of vacancies, and in some cases even less than that percentage. This is not the case with Indian Christians who have obtained in the past a percentage of vacancies much in excess of their population ratio. Reservation of a certain percentage of vacancies in certain Departments has been made for Anglo-Indians, because they are employed in large numbers only in certain departments. Indian Christians, on the other hand, are employed in all branches or grades of the public service. The Indian Christian community, like any other community in India, is to a certain extent dependent on Government employment, but the Anglo-Indians are very largely dependent on employment in certain branches of the public service, namely, Railways, Posts and Telegraphs and Customs, and it was, therefore, necessary to take steps to prevent in the new conditions anything in the nature of a rapid displacement of Anglo-Indians from their existing position which might occasion a violent dislocation of the economic structure of the community. Moreover, personally I feel that a reservation of a specific percentage of vacancies for Indian Christians is not in their own real interests, even

if some weightage is given. My reason for this view is that that community is already well represented in the services and will, so far as I can see, continue to be represented very much to the same extent in those services. But even if a weighted percentage is fixed, it might be even less than the percentage of posts the Indian Christian community holds at present.

My Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, made another suggestion, namely, that in the annual returns of recruitment a column should be added for Indian Christians. That, if I may say so, is a very valuable suggestion and I have great pleasure in accepting it. (Applause.) The Government of India attach much importance to these annual returns as providing a valuable means of enabling them to watch the observance of the rules laid down in the Home Department Resolution. The opening of a separate column for the Indian Christian community will enable the Government of India to review from time to time the effect of the new policy on the position of Indian Christians, and I have no doubt that if any remedial action was necessary, Government would carefully consider the desirability of taking such action. May I also add that under the new constitution it will be one of the special responsibilities of the Governor General to safeguard the legitimate interests of minorities ?

I might sum up in one sentence what I have said on the first part of the Resolution. The Indian Christian community is well represented in the public services at present and it need not have any apprehension that the new orders will not provide a reasonable degree of representation for them in the services and Government will watch the position of the Indian Christian community in the services through annual returns.

I now turn to the second part of the Resolution, namely, the recognition of the claims of the Indian Christian community for representation on any Committee to be constituted by the Government of India, by the decision of which the political future of the community may be affected. I do not propose to follow my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, into the details of the personnel of the various conferences and committees mentioned by him, or my Honourable and gallant friend, Colonel Gidney, into the reasons why the Indian Christian community was not represented on some of these conferences and committees. I should like, however, to deal with the matter on broad general lines. Committees do not decide matters affecting the political future either of the Indian Christian community, or for the matter of that any other community. The functions of Committees are to investigate and recommend, but decisions on their recommendations rest with Government. Committees are formed primarily to carry out work, not to represent interests, though in the selection of the personnel consideration is had to the existence of interests affected, of which the Indian Christians are merely one. The question of the representation of various communities on Committees stand on a different footing from that of their representation in the public services. Committees are not constituted primarily on a communal basis, but I can give one assurance, that the claims and wishes of the Indian Christian community for inclusion in such future Committees would be taken into account (Hear, hear) together with other considerations relevant to the composition of the particular Committee.

Sir, before I sit down may I suggest to my Honourable friend, Dr. DeSouza, that in view of the position explained by me he might perhaps wish to withdraw his Resolution.

[Mr. C. M. Trivedi.]

One word more, and I have done. This is the first occasion on which I have had the privilege of addressing this Honourable House, and I thank the Honourable Members of this Honourable House for listening patiently to a speech, a good deal of which, dealing as it did with dry statistics, must have been unusually dull. (Applause.)

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza :** Mr. President, I gratefully accept the kind and enthusiastic reception which was given to the Resolution which I, as a humble representative of the Indian Christian community, had the honour to move in this House,—a reception extremely favourable from all quarters of the House except from the Government of India. (Hear, hear and Applause.) I have had the unique advantage in this House that I have been able to create a sharp cleavage of opinion between the elected representatives of the people of India and the Government of India. (Hear, hear.)

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab : Sikh) : Then come over to this side.

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza :** But, Sir, I am really not anxious to widen that cleavage by transforming into action the feelings voiced by the elected representatives of the people of India and asking them to vote in my favour and thereby show that they condemn the policy of the Government of India. I do not want to accentuate the cleavage.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** We do not mind that. We will vote with you. (Applause.)

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza :** I only want to draw the attention of the House to the unanimity with which the Indian Christian Associations throughout the length and breadth of India have given me their support and encouragement and have forwarded to me copy after copy of the resolutions which they have passed condemning what I would call the iniquitous appointment award which my Honourable friend, Mr. Trivedi, tried to defend. I will read only one sample and in this case from a very important Indian Christian Association, Lahore, and another from Allahabad. The Association says :

“ We have seen the new rules published by the Government of India regarding appointments to Public Services. The rules are intended to safeguard the interests of the minority communities, but it is clear that provision has been made in the interest of two communities only, the Muslims and the Anglo-Indians. The claims of the Indian Christians have been totally ignored, in spite of its being second minority community in point of numbers. Sub-rule 7 (III) gives further advantage to Muslims over other minority communities by providing that if in open competition and for nomination, there are not enough qualified candidates, the percentage provided for other minority communities will be available for Muslims. Therefore, it is resolved that this Indian Christian Association strongly protest against this unfair omission of reasonable provision for Indian Christians and calls upon the Government of India to remedy this defect so that the claims of our community may not be sacrificed for the sake of a stronger minority community. It is hoped and urged that the rules be revised.”

If the Resolution, which I have moved in this House, has not done anything else it has done one thing. For the first time in history, Catholic and Protestant Associations have joined—and this will please my Honourable and illustrious friend, Sir Henry Gidney—in publicly condemning the policy of the Government of India towards our community, I do not wish to detain the House longer, but I wish to mention

that the manner in which the Indian Christian community has been systematically ignored, neglected and humiliated in the constitution of different committees to which I referred the other day is such that we feel that some action on the part of the Government of India is necessary to restore our self-respect and to restore our prestige before the other communities of India (Hear, hear). It is for that reason that I am pressing this Resolution (Hear, hear). All the other communities of India look down upon us and whenever I meet members of other communities they put me the question, what are you ? and when I say that I am an Indian Christian, they taunt me by saying, we know what the Government thinks of you. I want to disabuse the public mind, I want to disabuse the Government of India of the impression that the Indian Christian community do not count for anything in this country. We want to show that we too count for something in this country.

**Mr. D. K. Lahiri Chaudhury** (Bengal : Landholders) : We want a clear verdict from this House on the point.

**Dr. F. X. DeSouza** : The only recognition we get from the Government of India is when high officials of Government, 3 P.M. like Governors, Members of Council, etc., visit our schools and our charitable institutions, they praise our loyalty and they say that our schools are the nurseries of future loyal servants of the Government of India. They say : we set an example of Christian conduct which other communities should follow. But when we ask for a concrete recognition of that loyalty, what do we get ? Absolutely nothing. We discover that our loyalty like virtue is its own reward.

Sir, what I have liked more than anything else in today's debate is the manner in which all the other communities, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh, have recognized that we, though Christian in faith, have our hearts beating in unison with the other communities of India. Sir, the nationalism of the future is not going to be a Hindu nationalism or a Muslim nationalism, nor is it going to be a Christian or Anglo-Indian nationalism. It is going to be a composite nationalism in which Hindus, Muslims, Christians and Anglo-Indians will all take part. And in the nationalism so constituted, it will be the right and the duty of the Christians to contribute to the richness and the purity of that nationalism in an ever increasing measure in accordance with the demands of freedom and toleration.

Sir, it is possible, that we have been ignored by the Government of India in their iniquitous Resolution, because hitherto we have never participated in sectarian and separatist movements. Our Christian leaders from the very beginning, like the late Mr. Madhu Sudan Das and Rev. Kali Charan Banerji, were Indians first and Christians afterwards ; and so shall we remain till the very end, till nationalism arises in this country to which we shall continue to give our share according to our lights and according to our advancement in education and standards of conduct.

Sir, I say again that I thank all the sections of the House for the favourable reception they have given to my Resolution. I also thank, though in a somewhat Pickwickian sense, the Government of India for the way in which they have accepted one or two of my suggestions and for an expression of their feeling of sympathy. It is true that the

[Dr. F. X. DeSouza.]

words butter no parsnips nor will the sympathy of the Government of India fill our empty stomachs. But all the same the debate on my Resolution has served the purpose for which it was brought, and for that reason, I ask the permission of the House to withdraw the Resolution.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : Has the Honourable Member the leave of the House to withdraw his Resolution ?

**Several Honourable Members** : No, no.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The question is :

“ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the claims of the Indian Christian community for adequate representation in the services and for representation on any Committee to be constituted by the Government of India, by the decision of which the political future of the community may be affected, should be recognised.”

The motion was adopted.

#### RESOLUTION RE. APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON THE INDIAN COAL INDUSTRY.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** (Dacca cum Mymensingh : Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I beg to move :

“ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that immediate steps be taken to appoint a Committee to inquire as to how far the present abnormal depression in the Indian Coal Industry is due to the working of the State-owned Railway Collieries and the present surcharge of Railway freight on coal and other causes and to suggest ways and means for its improvement.”

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney, one of the Panel of Chairmen.]

Sir, coal is a national asset. It is a key and basic industry, and, according to the Government of India, it is vital to the economic structure of India. Sir, of all the Empire countries, India ranks second only to Great Britain in the volume of her production of coal ; and what is its position today ? Almost on its last leg and on the verge of bankruptcy. Is this national industry to be preserved and conserved ? The only answer to this will be, at all costs and by all means.

Sir, the problem of coal is to my mind a two-fold one. The first is to raise the low and uneconomic price level by restricting the potential productive capacity of the mines ; the other is to remove certain factors which stand in the way of increasing the demand. Pending the general economic and industrial depression which accounts for about 35 per cent. decrease in the consumption of coal, some form of control of the potential productive capacity of the mines can alone raise the prices to a higher and economic level. The removal of certain other factors which have harmed the revival of the coal trade is essential for effecting an improvement in the demand for coal. These factors are—(1) The acquisition and development of uneconomic State-owned and Company-owned Railway Collieries. The House will bear in mind that the railways are the

single largest consumer of coal in India ; (2) high railway freight, and on the top of that the 15 per cent. surcharge on long distance coal traffic ; (3) differential treatment of Central Provinces coal in the matter of railway freight ; (4) want of cheap and economic railway freight for soft coke ; (5) the increased and increasing substitution of oil fuel in place of coal ; and (6) last, but not the least, the numerous taxes and cesses which no other industry, except coal, is required to pay.

What is the present position ? Briefly speaking, India's immediately available productive capacity is something like 26 to 27 million tons, whereas the consumption of coal in India today will not exceed 18 million tons. India's power of coal supply has developed enormously, whilst the demand has fallen considerably. The trade has, therefore, very justly pointed out that it is this great "disequilibrium between demand and immediately productive capacity, that is at once the cause and the measure of the problem". It is this surplus capacity which the consumers exploit and therein lies the whole crux of the parlous situation in which the industry finds itself today. This contention of the trade is well illustrated by the offer of the industry of over 13½ million tons of coal to meet the State Railway requirements of only 2½ million tons. They offered it knowing that the State Railways and the other Railways want only 2½ million tons. The industry, therefore, sought the assistance of Government for the control of this enormous productive capacity of the mines in India. But as usual Government have turned a deaf ear to this, and has, for the time being at any rate, turned down the scheme proposed for its control, without suggesting any alternative remedy. The worst feature of the Government letter turning down the industry's proposal is to reject the scheme and then send it to the Local Governments concerned for opinion....

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** (Muzaffarpur *cum* Champaran : Non-Muhammadian) : Which scheme do you mean ?

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** : The coal restriction scheme submitted by the industry—the Government of India sent it to the Local Governments for opinion, with this paragraph added in their letter :

"The Government of India are thus disposed to consider that the best course for them to take would be to reject the application for the institution of control."

Then they send that letter to the Local Governments for their opinion. If I may say so, this is putting the cart before the horse. According to the terms of the Government letter, it would take a very strong expression of opinion to change the decision. The chances of acceptance of control were placed by my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, when he visited Calcutta and met a deputation of the coal interests, at 9 to 1 against its acceptance and the chances of its being introduced in this Assembly. Personally, I consider the industry has made out a very good case for control or restriction of output, which is accepted in all large coal producing countries as necessary and desirable, both from the point of view of the producers as well as the consumers. I am firmly convinced that unless this enormous productive power is controlled, it will lead to an era of unrestrained competition between colliery companies for business, which will result in a concentration on the best seams of coal, so that they would soon be worked out. When it is necessary to win coal which is left, it will be found that the costs

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

will be high and the consumer, whose interests the Government have so much at heart, would not be a gainer in the long run but a loser. Surely, it is the duty of the Government to prevent such a contingency.

The Resolution which I have just moved does not touch the question of the control of output which is in a state of suspended animation and is engaging the attention of Provincial Governments concerned in the industry. Neither is it to be treated as an alternative to it; nor should this Resolution be made an excuse for delaying the introduction of a control scheme. A control scheme must be taken up at once and without delay.

My Resolution, however, is limited in scope and its purpose is to remove the other obstacles already referred to, which have been hampering the trade revival. I have behind me the unanimous support of the trade, of colliery interests, large and small, representing four-fifths of the total output of coal in British India, and the backing of the three premier organisations of the industry—the Indian Mining Association, the Indian Mining Federation and the Indian Colliery Owners' Association: they are all agreed and I have their backing behind me. It is impossible for me within the limited time at my disposal to deal exhaustively with all the factors already referred to. Indeed it will be the function of the Committee, if any constituted, to do so. Still, to explain the position I shall briefly touch on few points. The chief demand for coal comes from the Railways which consume about 35 per cent. of the total output. Acquisition of collieries by railways was, therefore, a serious blow to the industry, particularly as such acquisitions coincided with the slump in coal, which commenced in 1923. The position was aggravated by the general depression in trade which made its appearance in 1927-28. According to Mr. Whitworth's memorandum, these acquisitions were justified by Government, because it stated that high rates were charged by the trade for the railway coal during war. Sir, I repudiate that charge. During the war, Mr. Chairman, the Controller of Coal used to fix the price of coal, and not the trade. The trade had nothing to do with the fixing of price in those days. The collieries were commandeered by Government, and the Controller of Coal was a Government servant, and he used to fix the price.

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division; Non-Muhammadan): Who was the Controller of Coal then? Was it Mr. Church?

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi**: Yes, Mr. Church was then the Controller.

Then, Sir, another argument was adduced, that after the war a higher price was charged by the companies. That is also not true. The reason was this. The comparative high price of coal during the immediate post-war period was due partly to the abnormal post-war conditions and partly to Mr. Church's policy of having a three-year contract for railway coal from 1921-22 to 1923-24, instead of annual contracts. That is the reason. I put it before the House. If immediately after the war, Government wanted to buy coal for three years, surely the trade was justified in concluding that there must be something behind it, and asking for higher prices. It was then for Mr. Church to have refused the offer, and to go in for the usual annual contracts for which he would have been offered much lower prices.

It is, however, profitless now to discuss the necessity or otherwise of acquisition of mines by railways originally. The collieries have been acquired. Before I proceed further, let me tell this House that the Railway Board have been buying collieries even in 1929. ....

**An Honourable Member :** Even in 1931.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** Yes, even in 1931, when the coal trade was in an absolutely depressed condition, when they could buy coal in the market at a much lower price, the Railway Board went on buying these uneconomic collieries, for which they had no justification, and for using the coal from these collieries, they had to alter the very fire-boxes in engines in order to enable the engines to use the second class coal, whereas you were actually getting first class coal in the market for half the price. All that, Sir, will come out before the Public Accounts Committee, where I believe Mr. Whitworth's memorandum will be discussed, and where it will be possible for us to demolish every sentence and every line that is contained in it. The Honourable the Finance Member is not in his seat just now, but he will see for himself how much public money has been wasted all these years.

**Mr. Chairman,** it is the contention of the trade generally that the Railways can and do now obtain coal more cheaply from the market than they can produce it, as has been proved definitely by the statement prepared by competent chartered accountants. The trade, therefore, desire that the whole of the railway coal should be purchased from the market. The trade further desire that these Railway Collieries should be placed on a care and maintenance basis to be utilised on an emergency, provided the Railways suffer no loss as regards their investments and have adequate safeguards for their future supplies of coal at reasonable cost. The presence of the Railway Collieries and the possibility of their development constitute perhaps one of the best safeguards against an excessive rise in the price of coal to the consumer, including the Railways.

Sir, in this position of affairs this Resolution, in so far as it calls for a closing of the Railway Collieries, asks that assurances, already given to the trade by Sir Alan Parsons, (then Mr. Parsons) and Sir Guthrie Russell in the past, be now acted upon. ....

**Mr. P. E. Rau (Financial Commissioner, Railways):** Will the Honourable Member please quote those assurances?

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** Yes, Sir, I shall quote them.

Sir Alan Parsons, then Mr. Parsons, in 1930, gave it as his considered opinion that Rs. 4-12-0 per ton was a fair price for coal and had said that if the price fell below that figure he was prepared to consider purchasing from the market the then current production of the Railway Collieries.

**Mr. S. C. Sen (Bengal National Chamber of Commerce : Indian Commerce) :** May I know for what class of coal that price was fixed?

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** I will answer that outside the House. I do not want to waste the limited time at my disposal.

Sir Guthrie Russell, then Mr. Russell, on the 25th April, 1931, addressing the Indian Mining Association said as follows :

"If the coal trade could put forward proposals showing that it would pay the Railways to buy more coal from the open market, then the Board would certainly be prepared to consider them."

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

The Trade has proved beyond contention and put forward proposals since to show that the Railways can buy coal much cheaper and that it would pay the Railways to do so. Then again, what did Sir Alan Parsons say at the same time? "If the Railways were able to obtain at the same price as they were able to raise it from their own collieries, they would prefer to take their supplies from the open market and conserve their own collieries." I stand by that statement,—that they should conserve their own collieries for emergency, they should buy coal from the open market, not at the same cost as your coal, but at a lower price, and buy also first class coal, while you raise second class coal in your collieries. Sir, the Committee of the Indian Mining Association on the 18th July, 1933, submitted to the Railway Board a proposal for the closing of the Railway Collieries temporarily for one year, and placing them on a care and maintenance basis without causing the slightest loss to the Railways, but securing a saving of Rs. 6 lakhs on the Government's system of costing and about Rs. 22 lakhs on the commercial system of costing, after providing for full interest on capital invested at  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and maintenance charges. The Association also guaranteed supply of railway coal of requisite quality at prices stated but Government, as usual, have done nothing in that connection.

Sir, coming to the second point about the surcharge, this surcharge was intended to be temporary and was introduced in 1932 to make up for the depleted revenues of the Railways, due to the abnormal trade depression. What do we find? The abnormal trade depression made it impossible for the railways to balance their budget. ....

**Mr. Chairman** (Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney) : The Honourable Member has three minutes left to conclude his speech.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** : I will not be more than five or six minutes, there is a lot to say. (*Some Honourable Members* : "Go on.") But they did not put the surcharge on any other commodity except coal, because it was very easy to do, a very simple calculation. They wanted Rs. 65 lakhs and the surcharge of 15 per cent. gave them that amount. But the railway earnings have been steadily going up, but this temporary surcharge continues. Though abnormal trade condition was the justification for this burden, yet coal was the only commodity which was called upon to bear such a surcharge to the exclusion of all other commodities. On the other hand, concession in freight, after the surcharge was imposed on coal, has been granted to other industries since the imposition of the surcharge, while coal cannot pass on this surcharge as a whole to the consumer and may, therefore, be said that coal is paying for the concessions in freight made to other commodities. Further, it is to be noted that, while the Government has aided by trade agreements and by the imposition of protective duties such commodities as tea, pig iron, cotton, wheat, sugar-cane, etc., nothing has been done to assist coal in any way. Be it remembered that this surcharge was in addition to the railway freight on coal which had always been considered as very high, and whose reduction had already been pressed by the industry. A careful study of the coal traffic over the Indian Railways would show that coal paid about .150 pie per maund per mile, which is nothing less than 50 per cent. more than the ordinary minima of .10 per maund per mile paid for goods in general.

Even up to 300 miles the rate for coal has been in excess by 40 per cent. over the normal minima. If the terminal charges are also added, the rates are bound to go higher still. It is, therefore, clear enough that coal, which is vital to the economic structure of a country, far from receiving preferential tariff treatment, has been paying far more than most commodities have had to pay.

In turning down the scheme of control recently, the Government of India remembered the interests of the consumers. One may effectively contrast the concern of the Government to guard the consumers' interest against the possible rise in price of eight annas per ton or even one rupee under a system of control, with their action in imposing without the slightest compunction 15 per cent. surcharge on coal freight, the effect of which had been an increase in the price of coal by as much two rupees per ton to consumers in districts removed from the coal producing centres. Then, again, the Government decision must have been influenced by the possibility of the payment of one rupee per ton of coal purchased by railways, which would mean a further liability of Rs. 33 lakhs on the part of the railways, in the event of the control scheme being accepted. But they forget that even if the railways have to pay one rupee more per ton, which I doubt, this loss will be more than compensated by increased railway freights, income-tax and super-tax earnings and various other benefits resulting from an improvement in the industry.

The limitation of time compels me to leave out the other factors included in the Resolution. But I feel that it will not be right for me to conclude without saying a few words as to the abnormal decline in the price of coal. Remarkable has been the decline in the average price per ton of coal in Bengal and Bihar fields. The average price has decreased since 1924 by more than six rupees per ton for first class coal and by nearly five rupees per ton for second class coal, representing decreases of nearly 58 per cent. and 61 per cent. respectively. The average present market rates for steam coal do not exceed Rs. 3-4-0 for first class and Rs. 2-8-0 for second class or even lower. The prices of steam coal must of necessity be adjusted for loss on slack, which unavoidably forms about 25 per cent. of the total output. When this is done, the average prices for steam coal become equivalent to only Rs. 2-12-0 for first class and Rs. 2 for second class coal, at which it certainly cannot be produced, except under exceptionally favourable circumstances.

In order to have a fair comparison between the fall in prices of coal and that of other important commodities, the period for coal should commence from 1923, and not 1927-28. When we do that, we find that the price of coal fell more steeply than prices of other commodities. It will be found that, while coal prices declined by about 62 per cent. approximately during 1923-33, those of other commodities during that period fell as follows :

Jute manufactures about 49 per cent.

Tea about 43 per cent.

Cotton manufactures about 30 per cent.

Iron and steel about 19 per cent.

It would also appear that at the end of 1933, while the annual average index number of coal stood at 53, that of cereals stood at 66, sugar at

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

132, tea at 92, jute manufactures at 77, cotton manufactures at 113, and metals at 99.

The present position of the coal industry, even according to the Government is "very unsatisfactory". The disadvantages of the existing state of affairs have been summarised by the Government as follows:

"(1) Financial losses to the industry, the investing public and Government revenue.

(2) A weakening of the industry.

(3) A tendency to confine production to seams of the best quality coal; and

(4) An undesirable reduction of wages and salaries."

Under these circumstances, and pending the introduction of some kind of control of output, the Government can well remove the difficulties, some of which are of their own creation, which have been hampering trade, such as the closing down of the Railway Collieries and the removal of the 15 per cent. surcharge on railway freight. While contending that they form no alternative to control of production, the trade is unanimously of opinion that, if adopted at once, they will assist the industry in its present precarious position.

**Mr. Chairman** (Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney) : The Honourable Member must bring his remarks to a close.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** : I shall just close. If this House appoints a Committee, the Committee can investigate, first, if it would be cheaper to buy coal than to raise it, if the collieries can be closed without loss to the public interest, what has been the effect of the 15 per cent. surcharge and what will be the effect of its removal, whether without the surcharge, the railway freight is not already too high, whether a cheap or a lower freight for soft coke is not a necessity and what, if anything, may be done regarding oil fuel which is competing with the coal industry. Mr. Chairman, these are some of the points for consideration. Let me appeal to my Honourable friends, Sir Joseph Bhore and Sir Frank Noyce, to come to the rescue of this national industry which is on its last leg. Let me appeal to both of my Honourable friends who are held in high esteem by all sections of the trade and the industry. I invite them in the interest of Bengal and Bihar and in the interests of the coal industry in India to come to its rescue by accepting this Resolution and forming a Committee to go into the particulars, and find out whether they can devise any means to protect this industry from utter ruin. It is entirely in their hands to give temporary relief by closing down their collieries, and withdrawing the surcharge. This will give the trade sufficient time to breathe. Mr. Chairman, I have finished.

**Mr. Chairman** (Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney) : Resolution moved :

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that immediate steps be taken to appoint a Committee to inquire as to how far the present abnormal depression in the Indian Coal Industry is due to the working of the State-owned Railway Collieries and the present surcharge of Railway freight on coal and other causes and to suggest ways and means for its improvement."

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh** : Sir, in so far as the Resolution of my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, asks for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the position of the coal industry in this country.

I have no particular objection to it, but when he goes further and assigns different reasons for the depression, I do not necessarily endorse all his observations. It is admitted that the coal industry is suffering from a serious slump, and this being a key industry it behoves the Government and ourselves to find out a solution for the recovery and development of this industry. The collieries are mostly situated in my province of Bihar and Orissa, and, to that extent, I am interested in the discussion of this question. There is only one point to which I should like to refer and that is with regard to the proposed restriction in the output of coal from different collieries. Sir, with regard to that I should like to state at the outset that I am opposed to this restriction scheme being put into operation. There are different reasons for the depression in the coal trade and I should like to refer to them very briefly. There is in the first place an all-round economic and industrial depression, which has led to about 35 per cent. decrease in the consumption of coal. Now, the general depression in the various industries has had its natural repercussion upon the coal trade of this country, and it has also suffered a depression to a corresponding degree. The second point is the increased and increasing substitution of oil and electricity in the place of coal. In recent years, owing to the increasing use of fuel oil or electricity and other methods, it is likely that the use of coal has gone down. The third point is the high railway freight and the 15 per cent. surcharge on long distance coal traffic which has proved very disastrous to the coal trade. I understand that my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, has referred to many of these points.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** All these points have been referred to.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Therefore, I will not go into them in detail. Then, Sir, the other point I should like to refer to is the want of cheap and economic railway freight for soft coke. And lastly is the over-production in big collieries on account of the introduction of mechanical contrivances for cutting coal. I do not know whether my Honourable friend referred to that point. Now, Sir, if there has been over-production—in the first place I do not admit that there has been over-production—the over-production has been mostly taking place in the case of big collieries, where these mechanical contrivances for cutting coal have been introduced in recent years.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** They are withdrawing them now.

**Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** Now, whether there is over-production of coal or not, I should like to give some figures. In 1923, the total output in British India in lakhs of tons is 187 ; the total output in India including States in lakhs of tons is 196, and the total consumption in various industries in India is 201. In 1924, total output in British India ; total output in India including States is 211, and total consumption in various industries in India is 213. In 1925, it is 199, 209 and 211 respectively. In 1926, it is 200, 209, 205. In 1927, it is 211, 220, 217. In 1928, it is 215, 225 and 220. In 1929, it is 223, 234 and 238. In 1930, it is 226, 238 and 235. In 1931, it is 205, 217 and 213. In 1932, it is 187, 201 and 196. The figures for 1933 are not available. Now, Sir, the excess of consumption over-production in the years 1923—1925 which I have read out is attributed to the fact that some quantity of foreign coal was imported into India during those years. I do not think that the scheme for restricting the output of coal would be the proper way of remedying the drawbacks

[Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh.]

to which reference has been made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi. The Ahmedabad Millowners' Association in this connection says :

“ My Committee is of opinion that the scheme is objectionable in principle. To restrict the output of any industry by a scheme of compulsory restriction through legislation, as suggested by the Indian Colliery Owners' Association, is obviously unfair and unjustifiable.”

A voluntary restriction may be adopted, if they like. Sir, it will be seen that during recent years, a number of small collieries have closed down, and if we impose outside restriction on the output of coal, it is quite on the cards that these small collieries will remain closed for ever, and thus throw a large number of labourers out of employment. I think, therefore, Sir, without taking much time of the House....

Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi : But they have withdrawn....

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh : However, Sir, I have only to state that I do not agree to any scheme, if it is still under consideration, of restricting the output of coal, but I give my general support to the proposal of my friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, asking for some sort of enquiry into the condition of the coaltrade in this country.

Mr. G. Morgan (Bengal : European) : Sir, I rise to support this Resolution. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, has covered most of the ground which I would have covered, had I spoken before him (Ironical Laughter) ; in fact all that I have got down in my notes he has already said. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, I have before me all the papers.....

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

.....referring to the Resolution, the interviews the industry had with my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, the interview that the various Associations in Calcutta had with H. E. the Governor of Bengal, and what I gather is that the industry has no option, at the present moment, but to adhere to their scheme of restriction. They say that the industry must have some scheme of control in order to be saved from complete bankruptcy. Some system of control is absolutely essential. Now my Honourable friend, the Member for Industries and Labour, in the interview he had with the industry at Calcutta, did not say that the door was completely closed, bolted and barred against any scheme. Unfortunately, in the letter to the Local Governments, a paragraph was put in there, in which the Government said that they saw no option but to turn down this scheme of restriction. Personally I think it was a pity that that paragraph crept in, the letter was a very clear statement of the Government's case without that being said. In Calcutta, with regard to paragraph 10 of that letter, the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce, I understand, said that Government visualized the operation of a scheme through a Control Board, containing an equal representation of the producing and the consuming interests, but reserving the fixation of a general quota to the Government of India.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour) : May I ask my Honourable friend from what he is reading ?

Mr. G. Morgan : I am reading from a report sent to me of the meeting.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Report by whom ?

**Mr. G. Morgan :** By the Indian Mining Association Committee.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** I should like to explain that my meeting with the Indian Mining Association representatives was purely informal and that no report of the proceedings was sent to me for correction.

**Mr. G. Morgan :** Then, I shall make one general remark—that I may take it, from the papers I have seen, that the Government of India are sympathetic towards some scheme of control, although they are very definitely against the particular scheme of restriction sent up by the Indian mining interests. Now, Sir, with regard to the appointment of a Committee of Enquiry, the Resolution has three points to consider—the fifteen per cent. surcharge on Railway freight on coal, the Railway Collieries and other causes of the depression. I shall start with the last mentioned of the points. The “other causes” are the causes mentioned by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi; the difficulty of the coal trade at the present moment is that its potential production is 26 million to 27 million tons, and that is a position which can be exploited by consumers. It is not a question of the control of the output as pertains at the present moment: it is a question evolving some scheme, whereby this exploitation by consumers cannot be carried on indefinitely. As my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, pointed out, 13½ million tons were tendered for a quantity of 2½ million tons required by the Railways and the prices seemed to be going down every time these tenders were called for; and what we do want is some control to safeguard against an increase in production to anything like the potential productivity of the mines.

Now, with regard to the fifteen per cent. surcharge, that has been the subject of many questions and of a great deal of discussion. What the coal trade feel is that they have to pay a great deal of money and they are the only commodity which pays enormously in order to make up some of the deficit which the Railways have run into. Now, we have figures showing that recently there have been considerable concessions given by various Railways in India to other commodities,—fuel oil, iron and steel products, sugar, gunnies, to mention only four; and the figures, I have, show that the concessions range from something like seven per cent. up to fifty per cent. Now, unless the various Railways can prove that they are making extra money under these concessions, it really means that the fifteen per cent. surcharge on the coal goes to fill up the gap made by these concessions.

With regard to the consumers, we have definite information that the largest consumers on the Bengal side have no objection to some scheme of control. I think the Honourable the Mover read out the names of these people—viz.: the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, the Indian Chamber of Commerce, the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce, the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation, the Oriental Gas Company, the jute mills, the tea interests and others; that covers a very large proportion of the consumers on that side of India.

**Mr. Goya Prasad Singh :** Why do not they impose a voluntary restriction on the output, if they are unanimous ?

**Mr. G. Morgan :** My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, said that it was very difficult for Local Governments to give an opinion in face of that paragraph in the Government of India's letter; but I do not think

[Mr. G. Morgan.]

that that will deter them from giving their definite opinion on the subject, and as far as I know, Bengal has already sent up its recommendations, but I have not seen any such recommendations; I do not know whether the Government of Bihar and Orissa have sent up their recommendations, but I am quite sure that if they honestly are of opinion that some scheme of control should come in, I do not think they will be biased by the remarks made by the Government of India.

Well, Sir, I have very little more to say on the subject. As I have said before, my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, <sup>4 P.M.</sup> has already covered all the ground; the other causes are quite apparent; the potential production of coal is apparent to everybody and that constitutes a very serious danger. The 15 per cent. surcharge has been threshed out over and over again, and we are definitely of opinion that the coal industry is paying at a rate which it should not pay. With regard to the railway-owned collieries, that again, has been the subject of discussion for the last two or three years and the Government of India have definitely said that they would not consider any question of shutting down the collieries. But the point made by the Government of India about the restriction of output is certainly a true one. They have restricted their output considerably during the last two years. We should like to be perfectly certain that unless they were forced by a rise beyond what might be called a fair level of maximum price and unless they were forced to pay a very high price for their coal, there should be a guarantee from Government that there would be no increase over the last two years' production of the railway-owned collieries. That, at any rate, I think, we might ask Government to assure us. In connection with the railway-owned collieries, the Honourable Mr. Ghuznavi has read out two opinions by Sir Guthrie Russell and Sir Alan Parsons, which were made in 1931, and we should be very glad to see those opinions given effect to. Sir, I hope the Government will view this Resolution, not only with sympathy, but with some practical result and we should like something definite taken in hand. We should like a Committee of Enquiry to be appointed at once, and there should be no delay in the submission of their report to the Government of India.

Sir, I support the Resolution.

**Mr. P. E. Rau :** Sir, though the subject-matter of this Resolution deals directly with the Department of my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, the subject of Railway Collieries has loomed so large in this debate that, I think, the House will pardon me, if I intervene at this early stage in order to make the position of Government quite clear on the point. Sir, this Resolution was drawn in the ballot by my Honourable friend from Bombay but it is in the fitness of things that it is moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, whose name has been identified both in this House and outside with coal for the last two or three years. Sir, I have been, however, surprised at the transformation of my Honourable friend from one whose sole business was to reduce coal prices in the last two or three years to one whose business is to raise up coal prices. (Hear, hear.) Sir, for the last three years in season and out of season he has lost no opportunity of belabouring the Railway Board for their laxness in not taking every advantage of the market to reduce coal prices still further. I have heard of such rapid transformations in the stock

exchange, where bulls have suddenly become bears and bears have become bulls. I had not, however, observed such changes in this House till now. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, was a bear hitherto—I do not refer to his manners, they are very charming—and he has suddenly become a bull.

Sir, while we are talking of railway collieries, I should like to give the House a few figures to bring before them the realities of the situation. We are dealing with collieries the total capital invested in which amounts to four crores of rupees, and the maximum annual capacity of which is six million tons. Taking the State-managed Railway Collieries alone, the total capital invested is nearly two crores, and their annual estimated capacity is 2½ million tons. Notwithstanding that, during the last three years, Government have not allowed more than 1,150,000 tons to be raised from the State-managed Railway Collieries. This represents only one-third of their requirements, and less than half of their capacity. The rest they have bought from the market.

It is unnecessary for me to remind the House of the situation in which Railways were compelled to buy collieries. It was mainly due to the fact that they found themselves unable to obtain coal at reasonable prices in the open market. It is not generally known that just about the time of the war, in 1913 and again in 1917, commercial interests in Upper India themselves urged upon the Government the desirability of railways acquiring their own collieries because in their opinion the large demands of railways on the coal market led to extreme fluctuations in prices and made much of the best coal practically unobtainable for manufacturers up-country. Now, Sir, during the years immediately following the war the prices of coal went up very high. Railway stocks fell to dangerous depths and in 1920, when tenders were invited for coal, one of the biggest firms in Calcutta, which had been in intimate relation with the railways in the past, refused to tender coal at any reasonable price which the railways could even consider. They thought that Deshergur coal was worth Rs. 20 per ton. I recently saw a report of a meeting in 1920 of the shareholders of a coal company at which the Chairman said that he anticipated or prophesied that their coal would be worth Rs. 30 a ton. Then, again, even when railways contracted for coal at high prices, they had no guarantee that they would get the coal. They found that coal companies were slow to fulfil their contracts and preferred to sell their coal to customers, who paid higher prices. The Railways, therefore, merely as a measure of self-protection, were compelled to acquire their own collieries and this policy has been found to be completely successful. Not only have Railways been able to obtain from their own collieries coal at cheaper rates, but the existence of these collieries and the knowledge that if they were worked to their capacity Government could obtain all or practically all their requirements have had a most salutary effect on the prices at which the collieries tendered coal to Railways.

It is true that during the last few years market prices have fallen so considerably that, at the present moment, they are somewhat below the total cost at which Railways produce their own coal, including in the total cost all indirect charges, such as, interest, depreciation and supervision. This is mainly due to the restriction we have imposed on the amount of coal, because the fixed overhead charges have to be distributed over a small output. But in comparing prices we must not overlook the fact that

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

even if we close down our collieries for the time being, there are certain items of expenditure which we have to face. For instance, we have to continue to pay interest on the capital invested. I do not wish to go into the question whether the capital was invested rightly or wrongly, but there it is. Four crores of rupees have been invested in them and whether we keep our collieries or close them and obtain not an ounce of coal, we shall still have to pay that interest. Secondly, we shall have to pay certain minimum royalties fixed under the leases, and it is quite possible that certain of our lessors may claim that by closing down our collieries we have deprived them of their legitimate expectations and may claim compensation. Thirdly, we shall have to incur considerable expenditure to keep our collieries in a fit condition to be opened and ready to work at short notice. A colliery, Sir, is not like a house which we can leave locked up and in charge of a chaukidar and come back after two years and find the house all right. This is not the case with a colliery. A colliery may be flooded; it may be burnt out; and it is essential that a considerable amount of expenditure should be incurred in order to maintain it in a fit condition to be opened at a short notice. Finally, a certain amount of unavoidable depreciation of machinery, etc., will continue.

For the purpose of comparison, therefore, and in order to ascertain whether it is financially sounder to close down our collieries or to keep them working at a certain minimum outturn, it is necessary that we should neglect interest, depreciation and the cost of keeping them fit and compare only the additional cost which we incur by keeping them open, rather than by closing them down entirely. If we compare the prices in this way, which is the only practical way, there is no doubt that the price at which we can produce coal in our railway collieries, taken as a whole, is less than the cost at which we can purchase similar coal in the market. Moreover, by reason of the fact that recently we have reduced the coal raising cost in all our collieries by calling for open tenders, the profit by keeping them open will be increased still further.

Now, Sir, I shall give the House a few figures. It has been calculated that the expenditure which will continue to be incurred if all our collieries were closed, but kept in good condition, will be in the neighbourhood of 41 lakhs a year, of which the interest is 20 lakhs, depreciation 7 lakhs, minimum royalty 2 lakhs and necessary repairs and maintenance 4 lakhs and keeping the works in good condition 8 lakhs. The maximum estimated difference between the total present cost of coal including charges for interest, depreciations, etc., and the price of similar coal from the market is 19 lakhs. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, has said that it is 22 lakhs. Even then it means by closing down all our collieries we shall lose about 20 lakhs.

We should also consider the effect of the policy of closing down the collieries on the large labour force at present employed in these collieries. Especially at Giridih, where they have settled down and have found employment for two generations, I think, speaking for myself, it would almost be a criminal breach of faith if we were to close down all our collieries and turn the labourers out to destitution.

Sir, our railway collieries are not competing with private collieries in the open market. They only provide for a part and a very small part at present of their own needs. What are the grounds that justify the claim

made by private collieries that we should close down entirely the railway collieries. There are a good few private collieries in India the output from which compares not unfavourably with that from anyone of our railway collieries. But I have not observed that these giants of the industry have ever offered to shut down entirely, or even to restrict their output to the same extent as Railways have done, in order to help their weaker brethren. Now, why is it that only the railway collieries are always singled out for attack? Is it because that these belong to a State undertaking and so political pressure can be brought to bear on Government with some hope of success? Or is it that the coal trade feel that they have got an inherent and prescriptive right to squeeze the Railways, as they have done successfully in the past. Sir, I trust that this House which represents the tax-payers will not let the fact be forgotten that the loss ultimately falls on the public who are the principal shareholders in the State undertaking, a fact which is likely to be forgotten in the clamorous demand of a few interested parties.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, is a very hospitable gentleman. I have reason to remember it with gratitude. Even recently, Sir, he took the enormous trouble of bringing Sir Guthrie Russell and myself some sweets from Burdwan at some considerable inconvenience to himself, and, owing to the efficiency of the octroi Department of the Simla Municipality, at some expense. But, before I walk into his parlour, I should like to peep into his larder in order to be able to see whether they are not littered with the corpses of my predecessors and I should like to make sure that I have a line of retreat safely open behind me.

Sir, while Government is convinced that at the present moment the closing down of collieries as a whole is definitely not in the public interest, I may add that the Railway Board are constantly watching the position and examining the results of individual collieries to see whether it would be more desirable in the public interest to restrict raising still further, or even to close them down temporarily. But it will have to be in the public interest. I think the House will approve of our action in holding that in these matters it is the public interest alone that should prevail. If the coal trade comes forward with a scheme by which they can gain advantages without inflicting losses on the tax-payers, then the Railway Board will always be ready to examine it with the greatest care.

Now, Sir, let me turn to the question of surcharge on rates. The Government fully recognise the importance of keeping the coal freights as low as possible, not only in the interest of industry in general and of the consumer as well as of the coal trade. They have given evidence of their sympathetic attitude in the fact that in 1926 and again in 1929, when they could afford it, they reduced coal freights very considerably. It was only owing to the serious financial position of railways that the Government, much to their regret, sanctioned the imposition of a surcharge in 1932. In this, let me point out that coal was not the only commodity that was subject to increased rates. Various other commodities had their freights raised at the same time. Let me also remind the House that even after the imposition of this surcharge, freight on coal for all distances over 300 miles is today lower than what it was before 1926.

It has been argued that the surcharge has had a serious effect on railway traffic, but the statistics in the possession of Government do not

[Mr. P. R. Rau.]

support this view. It is true that in the year immediately following the imposition of the surcharge, the coal traffic fell to a certain extent, but in 1933-34 the public coal carried increased by about six per cent. over the preceding year which corresponds generally with the increase in the general merchandise. In the first four months of the present year when the increase in coal traffic is about 11½ per cent. over the corresponding period of last year, while the increase in the traffic general merchandise is only 6½ per cent. These figures do not suggest that the surcharge has had any such deleterious effect on our coal traffic as has been assumed.

Now, Sir, I am not sure how to reconcile the two statements made by my Honourable friends, Mr. Ghuznavi and Mr. Morgan. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, apparently holds that the surcharge has been passed on to the consumer and has had the effect of raising the cost to the consumer. My Honourable friend, Mr. Morgan, apparently holds that the coal trade has paid the surcharge.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** I said that the coal trade has not been able to pass on this surcharge as a whole.

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Be that as it may, I thought I saw both Mr. Morgan and Mr. Ghuznavi shedding tears over the exploitation by the wicked David namely the consumer of the poor Goliath of the producer.

Sir, I have already said that the Government are fully mindful of the desirability of reduction in coal freights, if possible. They regret that in the present financial position of the Railways, it is impossible for them to sacrifice the revenue derived from surcharge. I cannot hold out hopes of any abolition, or considerable modification, of the surcharge in the immediate future—apart from any modification in the long distance rates that may be decided upon after the investigation which, I told the House the other day, was nearing completion. I can, however, assure Honourable Members that coal will be among the first of the commodities to be considered when railways are in a position to consider major reductions in freights.

Finally, as regards rates of freights on C. P. coal, I have very little to say, except that these low freights were originally quoted in order to stimulate traffic. They have to a certain extent succeeded in their object. The House is well aware that from the beginning of the current year these rates were increased to a certain extent though they are still below the Bengal coal rate. The Government naturally desire to watch the result of these reductions, before they consider further modifications. Moreover, a somewhat connected question is at present before the Railway Rates Advisory Committee and their considered opinion, in the case before them, may have some bearing on a decision of this question.

In conclusion, I would only say this. On the 21st February, 1933, when the Railway Budget was being discussed, my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, in righteous indignation interrupted my Honourable friend, Mr. S. C. Sen, who was talking about the interests of colliery-owners, with these words : " We are here to look after the railway interests and not the interests of the colliery-owners." Sir, I commend these observations heartily to the House. (Applause.)

**Mr. S. C. Sen :** Sir, the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, is rather a mixed one, and it is very difficult either to oppose or to support it on the grounds put forward by the Mover. Sir, he says that a Committee should be appointed to consider, first, the position of the railway collieries in respect of the plight of the colliery owners at the present moment ; and, secondly, the surcharge of 15 per cent. and other causes. What the other causes are, I do not know, but so far as the railway collieries are concerned and the rates which are now being paid by the railways for their purchase which rates are going down from year to year, I should ask Mr. Ghuznavi, who is responsible for that ? Is he responsible in his zeal to favour the railways and to look after the interests of the railways only and not to that of the colliery owners or the public ? Or is it the fault of the other persons concerned ? Sir, having regard to the change in the attitude of Mr. Ghuznavi from time to time, we do not know on whom to fix the responsibility for this rate cutting which is going on in the country. Sir, if I remember aright, as my friend, Mr. Rau, just pointed out, in 1931 or 1932, Mr. Ghuznavi raised the question as regards the coal purchases by the railways, the railways being the largest coal purchasers in India. He raised the question that no option should be given to the Chief Mining Engineer as regards the purchases. He must purchase at the lowest price possible.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** I never said anything of the kind.

**Mr. S. C. Sen :** The proceedings will show that ; and, in the next year, in 1933, Mr. Ghuznavi claimed credit for having saved 57 lakhs of rupees to the railways.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** Sir, on a point of personal explanation.....

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable Member will have a chance to reply.

**Mr. S. C. Sen :** Sir, what is the result ? People then came to know that unless they quoted the lowest prices possible, whether it keeps any profit in their hands or not, they could not get a contract from the railways. The result was that, in the year 1932, the rate for one particular class of coal, viz., Kajora coal, was Rs. 3-12-0. In the next year, in 1933, it came down to Rs. 2-10-0, and the next year again it came down to Rs. 2-2-0. That is the result of the interference by Mr. Ghuznavi. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, in 1933, Mr. Ghuznavi claimed the credit for having saved 57 lakhs of rupees. He did not say a word about railway collieries. Why ? Because,—I do not know,—he was probably interested in some contractors who are to get railway colliery contracts for raising coal. This year he has changed sides again, and, instead of siding with the railways, he is now fighting the railways for not raising the price of coal. Under these circumstances, I should like to know who is responsible for this plight of the coal trade ?

Now, Sir, it is no doubt perfectly correct that the position of the collieries is very precarious. The last price quoted by me as regards the Kajora coal is Rs. 2-2-0, and there is scarcely a pice left for profit. On the other hand, there is a loss. But this loss is not borne by the colliery owners at present ; it is borne by the colliery lessors because they are not paid royalty. But ultimately they will have to be paid ; that is how they are surviving the crisis. Sir, it is absolutely certain

[Mr. S. C. Sen.]

that unless something is done to remedy this state of affairs, some of the collieries will have to go to the wall. As regards the restriction scheme formulated by the collieries associations, at first there was no unanimity. Subsequently I now find that there has been a unanimity. But no constructive programme has come forward after the restriction scheme, which was submitted at first by the Indian Mining Association and afterwards by all the three combines, has been rejected by Government. There is no new scheme put forward meeting the objections of Government, although they knew that Government, in their letter dated the 28th June, 1934, from Mr. Perry to the Secretaries to the Governments of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, etc., a copy of which was submitted to the various bodies concerned, stated that they cannot possibly consider the scheme as submitted by the Associations. But in that letter of the Government of India, they stated this, in paragraph 10 :

“ Although there are many and obvious defects in the scheme of restriction which has been proposed by the Indian Mining Association, the Government of India are not convinced that it would not be possible to establish a method of control which would provide an early and adequate rise of prices and secure the continuance of a satisfactory and not excessive price standards.”

Having regard to this expression of opinion, I may ask Government to consider this part of the case, namely, that a new scheme of control is possible which would provide an adequate rise in prices carefully and quickly, because any delay in the matter would involve the closing down of many collieries in Bengal and will cause immense loss to the public. Sir, I am not much enamoured of Committees. We know in Bengal from time to time that, whenever you want to shelve a matter, the best thing you can do is to refer it to a Committee. That is my experience. In these circumstances, I cannot support Mr. Ghuznavi's proposition to the extent of having a Committee. But I ask Government to take up this matter earnestly and as quickly as possible and to find out a solution which they themselves think is possible in the circumstances. The Government must have some idea of a scheme of control when they made that statement in paragraph 10 of their letter.

Now, Sir, so far as the closing of railway collieries is concerned, I do not think it comes within practical politics. Those who know or are concerned with mines personally or practically will soon say what it costs to keep alive a colliery if you do not work it. If you stop a colliery, you will have to make arrangements for protecting it. Secondly, you will have to make arrangements for pumping it. Thirdly, you must have some sort of coolies and workmen near by on whom you can rely at the time when it is needed. Sir, as regards these railway collieries they are not small collieries. A large number of coolies have to be kept at the colliery who are to be paid, and for nothing. Is it within the realm of practical politics to keep ready 50 or 60 thousand coolies for nothing and pay them, simply because some day or other their services may be requisitioned? So, Sir, I do not think that that proposition is practical. Moreover, what do we find? We know that Government have been kind enough to reduce their output of collieries every year for the purpose of accommodating the trade. Sir, I have in my hand the figures which I will give you. In 1930-31, Government purchased 22,58,000, i.e., 54 per cent. of their requirements; in 1931-32, they purchased 21,41,000, i.e., 53.77 per cent. of their requirements; and

1932-33, they purchased 21,67,000, i.e., 65 per cent. of their requirements. Therefore, you see that every year the quantity purchased by the railways from the market increased. But what about the price? Having regard to the arguments put forward that if the railway coal did not come into the market or if the railways had to purchase the whole of their quantity very likely the market would rise, the experience is entirely different. I find that the price paid by State Railways for their coal decreased—

		Dasberghur.	Selected Jharia.	First Class Jharia.	Kajora.
1930-31	.. ..	5-12-0	5-0-0	4-8-0	3-14-0
1931-32	.. ..	5-12-0	5-0-0	4-8-0	3-14-0
1932-33	.. ..	4-12-0	4-12-0	4-3-0	3-10-0

I do not find the figures for the years 1933-34. But I know that this year the rate is down to 2-2-0 for the Kajora class. That shows that whether you close the railway collieries or you keep them going and take coal from them to the extent that the Government are now taking, that will not affect the coal market in any way. We shall have to go to some other theories and some other plans for relieving the coal trade. As has been pointed out by Mr. Ghuznavi, the potential capacity of collieries is very great. Then, who are the owners of these collieries? They are mostly in the hands of European colliery owners.....

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** No : they are managed by the European companies : the shareholders are all Indians.

**Mr. S. C. Sen :** I know all that ; they are managed by the Europeans ; but in taking contracts from the Government they are treated as European collieries ; in the quota given to the European collieries, they are taken into account—I do not think Mr. Ghuznavi even will allude to that proposition.....

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** (Dacca Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : When these companies do not get the orders that they expect, they immediately charge the Honourable the Commerce Member with racial discrimination.

**Mr. S. C. Sen :** If these colliery owners, who are mostly Europeans, will only raise the quantity which they are now raising and for which there is a market, and do not increase their output.....

**Mr. E. S. Sarma** (Nominated, Non-Official) : For whom are the Europeans raising ?

**Mr. S. C. Sen :** Not raising : the potential capacity is very great ; that is what has been said by Mr. Ghuznavi. So, if they will only come to a pact among themselves and restrict their output to the output which they are now raising, very likely the market will have a change. But such a pact is out of the question having regard to the present atmosphere even amongst the European colliery owners, not to speak of the Indian colliery owners. Last year, we tried our very best to come to a pact, but we failed. Now, as regards the 15 per cent. surcharge, it is a question of 74 lakhs of rupees. I do not know whether it is in the hands of my friend, the Commerce Member, or Sir Frank Noyce, or it will have to be controlled by my friend who is sitting there concealed, the Finance

[Mr. S. C. Sen.]

Member. (Laughter.) We all feel that this 15 per cent. surcharge is the cause of most of the ills in the coal trade, but we have appealed to the Government times out of number : we appealed to the Members personally times out of number ; but their hard heart cannot be softened. They always insisted upon keeping the surcharge which, in fact, is one of the reasons for the present condition of the coal trade.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** Sir, coal debates in this House have unfortunately a tendency to degenerate into wordy duels across the floor. Sometimes we imagine as if we are in an auction room trying to fix the most favourable price for the railways. Sometimes again we feel as if we are at a meeting of the shareholders of a coal company where the shareholders take the directors to task for not having been able to declare a dividend. My remarks will be very brief on this occasion, and I should like to preface them by declaring that I have absolutely no kind of personal interest in the coal trade, but unfortunately I am the recipient of confidences from various contending elements in the coal trade, because I reckon among them very many valued friends ranged on different sides. On the present occasion, I am quite bewildered as to what attitude to take with reference to the question of the coal restriction scheme to which elaborate reference has been made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi—not that it is not easy for me to make a speech taking either view of the matter because in my right hand I hold a bundle of papers which set out the point of view of those who want a restriction scheme and in my left hand I hold another bundle of papers which set forth the opposite view, and they have come from very intimate friends of mine who are very insistent that I should expound their respective causes ; and from what I have heard so far, with the exception of my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, and, to a certain extent, Mr. Sen, nothing has fallen from the Honourable Members who have spoken which cannot be found either *verbatim* or substantially in either of the two bundles of papers. (Laughter.) I know that my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, had a similar experience in Calcutta—I do not want to compare myself to him—he is a man in authority. . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** I should feel flattered by the comparison.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy :** But he also has been approached by the different contending elements in the coal trade, and I do not know whether he has been able to make up his mind as to which bundle of papers to support so far as the restriction scheme goes. I know that, in the Government letter on the subject, there is a definite expression of opinion to which exception is being taken by a very large body of people engaged in the coal trade, because that practically slams the door in the face of any future possibility of reviving the question. As I said before, I am absolutely bewildered so far as this particular issue is concerned as to which is the right course to take. But I may say that I am content to leave the matter, so far as the question of restriction goes, in the hands of my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, because if anybody in the Government Benches knows anything about coal, it is he, and he is yet gratefully remembered, as far as I know, by the coal trade for having presided over the Coal Committee that resulted in the formation of the Coal Grading Board which has succeeded in rehabilitating the

position of the coal trade, so far as the export market is concerned, to a certain extent.

Now, I should like to refer to my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau's speech in this connection. I agree with him to a certain extent when he says that when we approach this question from the point of view of the general tax-payer, we cannot ask the railway collieries altogether to be closed. I do recognise that the railway collieries constitute a measure of insurance against contingencies to which he referred and which happened not very many years ago. Therefore, from the point of view of the tax-payer, I do not think we can give that tall order that all the railway collieries should be closed down. But, I would appeal to my Honourable friend, the Member in charge, as also to my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, to see to it that the raisings are reduced to the minimum possible extent, so that this great national industry may not suffer.

Now, Sir, my friend was rather cautious in his reference to railway collieries. While he gave us the figures regarding the State-owned collieries, he took care to develop his argument only with reference to State-managed collieries; but what about the Company-managed collieries which are owned by the State? Now, Sir, I know that the Government position in this respect is that, whereas they are free to restrict, as much as they like, the output of State-owned collieries which are worked by the State, they are not at liberty to dictate to the companies working the State-owned collieries to restrict their raisings in any way. I remember, Sir, about two years ago a deputation representing the Indian Mining Federation waited upon my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, and made a complaint that the general Government policy with regard to the restriction of the raisings of the railway collieries did not apply to the company-worked collieries which are owned by the State, and, as far as I remember, my friend on that occasion asked the trade to trust to their powers of persuasion with the companies for the purpose of getting more custom from the company lines. Now, Sir, I want to know, is that a satisfactory position? I daresay, my friend realises the parlous state in which this national industry is at present. I should also like to refer in this connection to the figures, which I need not quote at length at this late hour, and which will be found at page 41 of the latest Administration Report of Railways; and these figures show that whereas the raisings from State-owned State-worked collieries have gone down as a result of the Government policy, the raisings of the State-owned company-managed collieries have gone up, the result being that the Government policy is being considerably neutralised by the action taken by the company-managed lines. I should very seriously ask my friend to examine the position of Government with reference to the different companies which are working some of the State-owned collieries and see for himself as to whether it is not within his powers to insist upon the company lines to carry out the spirit of the Government policy.

Now, Sir, I do not think I should take up any more time of the House by referring to the other points which have been raised, but I very much regret, Sir, that neither my friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, who is in intimate touch with all the various sections of the trade, nor my friend, Mr. Morgan, who also, I understand, is in touch with a particular section at least of the trade, took this opportunity to repudiate a vile charge that has been levelled against my Honourable friend, the Leader

[Mr. K. C. Neogy.]

of the House, in the columns of the *Capital* of Calcutta with reference to the manner in which the purchases of coal from the open market for the Railways are made. ....

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** : May I make a personal explanation, Sir ?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : He can make a consolidated reply.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : It is a most scurrilous attack that I have seen in a responsible journal for many a day against a responsible Member of Government. We have our differences, undoubtedly I have mine, which are very deep and vital, with my friend, the Leader of the House, but I daresay that there is no one in this House, wherever he may sit, who would not raise his voice of protest against any slur on his integrity. (Applause from all sides of the House.)

Now, Sir, I was very pleased to hear my friend, Mr. Rau, when he gave the assurance that he would go into the question of the surcharge on railway freight. ....

**Mr. F. E. James** : May I ask one question ? With reference to the quotation from the *Capital* to which my Honourable friend referred, was that contained in an editorial note or did it appear as an anonymous letter ?

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : It was an anonymous letter, which at the same time the editor took the responsibility of publishing at length very prominently. That much I can say.

Now, Sir, I was talking of surcharge. ....

**Mr. E. S. Sarma** : The *Capital* now own company-owned collieries ?

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : I do not know it. My friend is in a better position to speak about it.

Now, Sir, when my friend, Mr. Rau, goes into that question, he will do well to give a proper interpretation to that formula—"what the traffic can bear", which determines the rate for any particular commodity. My friend referred to the fact that although this high surcharge has been put, the traffic has not suffered, but has the Honourable Member cared to inquire as to whether the prices have suffered to such an extent as to make it absolutely uneconomic, or almost absolutely uneconomic, for the producers to produce coal ? Now, Sir, that is where comes in our quarrel with the Railway Department. I maintain, and I have maintained more than once before, that the Railway Department is not interpreting that particular formula "what the traffic can bear" in the spirit in which it was intended to be interpreted by those who laid it down.

Now, Sir, I do not think I can add anything more so far as this Resolution goes. Although I may not agree with all that has fallen from my friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, I am in agreement with this Resolution, and even if the Government do not find it possible to give effect to the Resolution in the express terms in which it finds place on the Order Paper today, I do very much hope that my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Noyce, will associate a few persons with him for the purpose of

making as exhaustive an inquiry into the matter as possible. It may not be a formal Committee, but I have every hope that if my friend, Sir Frank Noyce, were to apply his mind,—and I have no doubt that he will apply his mind very closely,—to this problem, and if he associates with him a few people of varying views, then he is likely to get the very best help in understanding the problem and making his recommendations in due course to Government.

Now, Sir, as I was saying, though I do not agree with all that has been said in support of this Resolution by my friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, I am in agreement with this Resolution, and I may tell the House that the small section of colliery proprietors, who are vehemently opposed to the coal restriction scheme, also want that some kind of inquiry should be made. Here I have a paper in my hand which sets forth their view. This is what they say,—I mean the dissenting minority in the coal trade who do not want to have anything to do with the coal restriction scheme :

“ The first thing that the Government should do is to inquire into the real causes of the present plight of the trade and see if restriction would be the proper remedy for them.”

Not that they want restriction but they want the Government to find out other alternative remedies for this. And it is for all these reasons that I support this Resolution.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce :** Sir, at the outset of my remarks, there is one matter to which I feel I should make some reference. In the course of the discussions this afternoon, references have been made to certain statements that I am alleged to have made in discussions I had with the representatives of the Indian Mining Association in Calcutta. Those references were made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, and also by my Honourable friend, Mr. Morgan. As I have already explained, Sir, my meeting with the representatives of the Indian Mining Association was a purely informal one. The Association did not ask that reporters should be present and that a *verbatim* report of the proceedings should be taken down. Nor did they send to me at the end of the proceedings any report of what had happened for such correction as I might wish to make with a request that they might use it publicly if they so desired. Again, if they had done so, I would gladly have consented. But I do take the strongest objection to a version of what happened, which I have not seen and which I had no opportunity to correct, being sent to any Member of this House for use on the floor of the House. (Applause.) If that procedure becomes common, it will obviously be impossible for any Member on these Benches to have any informal conversations with any individuals or associations.

Now, Sir, I come explicitly to the Resolution before the House. I propose to take it at its face value. My Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, has utilised this opportunity for singing what one might almost call his sessional hymn of hate against the Railway Board and all its works, and if I were to deal with his speech, there would be very little, if anything, for me to add to what my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, and my Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, have said. They have dealt faithfully with all the aspects of the case that he raised in his speech. But

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

I would remind the House that the motion before it recommends to the Governor General in Council :

“ that immediate steps be taken to appoint a Committee to enquire as to how far the present abnormal depression in the Indian Coal Industry is due to the working of the State-owned Railway Collieries and the present surcharge of Railway freight on coal and other causes.”

I would ask the House, after what they have heard from my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, what useful purpose such a Committee would serve. I have no reason to disbelieve in Committees. My Honourable friend, Mr. Sen, has said with a certain amount of truth, that if you want to shelve a question, you refer it to a Committee. But my own experience of Coal Committees does not bear that out. I had the satisfaction of having all the recommendations of the Committee over which I presided accepted by Government within six months. I think that is a record of which that Committee had reason to be proud and which is also creditable to the Government of the day.

Now, Sir, Mr. Ghuznavi asked for a Committee to enquire how far the depression is due to the surcharge and to the working of the railway collieries. It is, I think, obvious from what Mr. Rau has said, that, even if the Committee were to find that the depression was found to be due to the surcharge and to the working of the railway collieries, that would not affect the Government's attitude in the least. I think Mr. Rau has established that the depression is certainly not due to the surcharge ; the amount of coal which is being moved at present is greater than what it was before the surcharge was imposed. And I think he has given very good reasons for holding that there would be no justification whatever in the interests of the country for closing down the railway collieries, even those which my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, suggests are being worked uneconomically. We, therefore, come to the “ other causes ” and how far they can be removed. I think the Government of India have all the facts before them. They know exactly what the “ other causes ” are. They have been mentioned in the course of this debate and they are patent to all who have made a study of the subject. The other causes are, in the first instance, economic depression, and, in the second instance, the constant fear which hangs over the coal trade of over-production. It is not so much that there is any over-production at the present moment. I think the figures show that that is not the case, for the stocks of coal at the end of 1932 were 1,655,000 tons ; at the end of 1933, they were 1,114,000 tons, and today, as I understand, they are 660,000 tons. It is, therefore, obvious that production has recently been considerably less than consumption. But, none the less, there is always a constant fear of over-production, and that is the root cause of the depression in the coal industry. It is for that reason that there is no doubt that a great majority of the collieries are raising coal at a cost which is higher than that at which they can sell at.

I may state, and state very frankly, that Government fully sympathise with the coal industry in its difficulties. They realise, as they have stated in the letter they sent to Local Governments, the disadvantages of this state of affairs. They know that it means a considerable loss, a heavy loss and one that has continued for a long

time, to the industry itself, the investing public and also to Government revenue. They know that it weakens the industry and makes it unwilling to adopt improved methods of extraction. They know also that it brings about a tendency—I am afraid it is very much more than a tendency—to confine production to seams of the best quality, to extract coal in a wasteful fashion and thereby to diminish the value of one of the country's greatest assets. Further, they know what it means to the employees in the coal fields who have had their wages and their salaries reduced. But, none the less, Sir, after a very careful examination of the case, which they had to do from the point of view of the country as a whole, they came to the conclusion that there were very serious objections to any scheme of coal restriction. It has been a matter of very great disappointment to me in the course of this debate that I have not had the benefit of the views of any representatives of provinces other than Bengal and Bihar and Orissa. I should have very much liked to know what the consumers in other provinces have to say about the restriction scheme. It was from that point of view mainly that Government decided that there were very grave objections to it. They frankly do not like the idea of restricting an essential raw material of trade and industry, a basic raw material. (Hear, hear.) We have heard that the Bengal consumers are in favour of restriction. Well, Sir, I should like the views of consumers from other provinces, because one cannot overlook the fact that the Bengal consumers are also very closely connected with the producers, and, in some cases, at any rate, are producers themselves. (Hear, hear.) That is an important factor. Another very important factor which Government had to take into consideration in examining this question was, "What is going to happen when the period for which the coal restriction is proposed comes to an end"? What will the state of the industry be then? And I may say at once and frankly that, in my view, if restriction comes now, it is going to last; I cannot see its being taken off within any measurable distance of time. It seems to me that exactly the same conditions will be present, that the main conditions will be present in five, ten or fifteen years' time and that there will still be the same fear of over-production hanging over the industry. I think that the industry has got to realise that if—I say "if" and it is a big "if"—if Government reconsider their views, it has got to be prepared for an indefinite period of restriction. Whether it will like it or not I cannot say, but it will have to make up its mind as to whether it wants it or not. As was stated in paragraph 10 of our letter to Local Governments, to which reference has been so very frequently made this afternoon, the Government of India do not think that the objections to a scheme of coal restriction are insuperable. I may say that I spent a great deal of time on this scheme. I spent a certain amount of midnight oil and, as the question first came up in the cold weather in Delhi, a certain amount of midnight coal also in dealing with this subject. I feel that, although there are many and very great difficulties, on which I need not enlarge at this late hour of the day, one could formulate a scheme of restriction that would work but there is just one point to which I should like to refer in this connection. We have, in that paragraph 10, discussed the scheme of restriction put forward by the Indian Mining Association and we have pointed out the objections to it but, at the end of the paragraph, we have stated that the Government of India believe that a restriction

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

scheme in British India could be made sufficiently effective if necessary without the co-operation of the Indian States that produce coal. I should like to say that we do not feel quite so sure about that as we did. It appears from the representations that we have received that it is very desirable, if not essential, that the Indian States should come into any scheme of restriction as their potentialities are such that they might easily defeat the working of the scheme. I have been informed that there is one State which could produce two million tons against the comparatively small figure of possibly half a million tons that it produces at present. If that State were not to come into the scheme, it would obviously defeat the effect of a five per cent. or ten per cent. restriction on output in British India. That is a point which will have to be examined very carefully indeed. It is perfectly true, as Mr. Ghuznavi said, that I told the Mining Association that the chances of Government reconsidering this scheme were small. It is possible—I cannot recollect exactly what happened—but it is possible that, being in Calcutta and not very far from the headquarters of the Calcutta Turf Club, the representatives of the Indian Mining Association asked me to give them the odds against reconsideration? I have as I have said no very clear recollection on that point but I did tell them, and I told them nothing that I am not prepared to state here, that the chances of Government reconsidering their attitude were small. But as Mr. Morgan himself has said, although the door was slammed, it was not barred or bolted. We did feel that this was a most important matter and that it was only fair to the Local Governments concerned, the Government of Bengal, the Government of Bihar and Orissa and the Government of the Central Provinces, the most important coal producing Provinces, and also the Governments of the consuming Provinces that the scheme with our objections should be placed before them, but the fact that we placed the scheme before them showed that we were prepared to consider any points that they might raise. I may inform the House that we have received replies from the Government of Bengal and that of the Central Provinces and also a brief telegraphic reply from the Government of Bihar and Orissa. They have come in only in the course of the last three days and it will obviously take time to examine them, especially as we have not received replies from the consuming provinces. I may also mention to the House that the replies are very much what one might have expected. The Governments of Bihar and Orissa and Bengal are naturally more sympathetic to the scheme than are the Government of the Central Provinces, the colliery owners in which are very divided in opinion. I can promise the House that those replies will receive very careful consideration. The first point which has to be determined is whether the Government of India are prepared to accept the principle of restriction. That is obviously not a matter on which I can make any pronouncement now. The case has to be examined in my department and to go before the Government of India as a whole. If the Government of India are so impressed by the views of the Local Governments as to reconsider the whole case then we shall have to consider what shape restriction should take and then will be the time to accept the views of my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy. One naturally could not go forward with any scheme of restriction without thrashing out the details with representatives of the interests concerned or rather

without placing our own conclusions on the details before them for such criticisms as they may wish to offer.

I trust that I have sufficiently explained what Government's attitude is in this matter. I do not know what their decision will be, but, whatever that decision is, I shall accept my Honourable friend, Mr. Neogy's offer of help with the utmost willingness and shall expect him to support me wholeheartedly here and elsewhere. I very much value the confidence that he has expressed in me, and I propose to avail myself of it to the utmost possible extent. All I have to say in conclusion is that I trust that I have shown to the House that the appointment of a committee would lead to no useful results and that if my Honourable friend, Mr. Ghuznavi, presses his motion, there is no option for us on these Benches but to oppose it.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali** (Lucknow and Fyzabad Divisions: Muhammadan Rural) : Will Government give a chance to the representatives of the various Provinces to express their views before they accept any restriction scheme. Today, other Provinces have not had an opportunity to express their views.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : We have to take Local Governments as representing the views of the Provinces, for the time being at any rate. If, as I say, any scheme of coal restriction is accepted by Government, it will obviously have to be embodied in legislation, which will require the sanction of this House and it will be then that the representatives of the Provinces will get an opportunity of objecting to it, if they see fit to do so.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : Might I suggest a *via media* ? After the opinions have been received from the Provinces, but before we disperse from Simla, will it be possible for my Honourable friend to have a kind of informal conference with such Members as may feel interested in the question and who may like to put forward their own ideas, either from the point of view of consumers or other interests ?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I shall be very happy to meet any Members who are interested in the question and to know their views. I shall be very glad to do so, if my Honourable friend so desires.

**Mr. K. C. Neogy** : That might meet Mr. Azhar Ali's point of view.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** : I shall be very glad to meet any representatives of the Provinces who wish to see me. I am always accessible.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** : Sir, at the very outset this afternoon, I want to start by referring to that stupid letter, that atrocious letter that appeared in the *Capital* of the 7th June. In my opening speech, I had the difficulty of the time-limit.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Shanmukham Chetty) : The Honourable Member will have 15 minutes.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi** : Therefore, I intended to bring that matter out in the course of my reply. My attention was drawn to that letter when I was in Simla in June last. I did not read that letter when I was in Calcutta. I can assure my Honourable friends, Sir Joseph Bhore and Mr. Rau, that they are held in great esteem in Bengal by Indians and

[Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi.]

Europeans alike. Sir, I addressed a letter to the Indian Mining Association drawing their attention to that letter of the 7th June which appeared in the *Capital* and I have got this reply from the Secretary of the Indian Mining Association :

“ In reply to your inquiry, I am directed by my Committee to say that the letter under the non-de-plume of ‘ Shareholder ’ appearing in the issue of *Capital* of the 7th June did not emanate from this office, was in no way inspired by the Indian Mining Association, and was one of the points of which my Committee were not in the slightest degree aware until they read it in the papers. I trust that this would be sufficient for you to refute any suggestion, which my Committee greatly deprecate, that they had anything whatever to do with the letter.”

Sir, regarding the purchase of coal, the new reform that was introduced by the Railways is entirely due to me, and I can assure the Railway Board that the method that they have adopted now for the purchase of their coal has the approval of all right thinking men. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, asked—how was it that only a couple of years ago I was fighting in this House to make the Railways buy at the lowest price and what has since happened that I want the price of coal to be raised ? Sir, I have always advocated and I still advocate it today—“ buy your coal at the lowest price if the coal is of the same grade and of the same quality ”. What I objected to then was that while the coal offered to the Railway Board was of the same grade, of the same quality and almost of the same seam, the offer of Mr. A. at Rs. 4-12-0 was accepted in preference to Mr. B.’s offer at Rs. 3-8-0. What business has the Railway Board to buy it at Rs. 4-12-0 and not at Rs. 3-8-0 ? It did not result in reducing the price of coal in Calcutta, it only resulted in a saving to the Railways in buying their coal. It has gone, of course, deep into the minds of sellers of coal in Calcutta that the Railway Board naturally took the coal if it is offered at the lowest price. I see no reason why the Railway Board should not take it provided the coal is of the same grade and of the same quality. Of course unconsciously that had hit my Honourable friend, Mr. Satish Chandra Sen, who used to tender for his coal, and was desirous of getting it accepted at higher prices in the interest, no doubt, of consumers and the Government. He was not successful as the Railway Board were now very carefully considering matters : it is no longer in the hands of Mr. Whitworth or anybody else ; it is in the hands of the Railway Board now to examine these tenders : and if there is anyone tendering the same coal at a lower price, I am afraid Mr. Sen would not have the orders he has been after, and, therefore, he has been to my knowledge rightly deprived of the Railway Board orders since the last two years.

Sir, the object of this Resolution has, to a certain extent, been achieved. Now, the first object for which I wanted this Committee is to inquire about the surcharge. My Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, has given us this assurance that they have collected the figures and are going into the matter and they will seriously consider the surcharge for long distance places and they will come to a speedy conclusion.

Then, Sir, he has also said—in a manner he has assured the House—that so far as the State Railway collieries are concerned—he was very cautious; he did not make any statement whatever about the Company-managed railways—he said that so far as the State Railway collieries are concerned, the output has been restricted and he will see further if those uneconomic collieries can be closed. That also was another object which

this Resolution had in view and which my Honourable friend, Mr. Rau, has said that he is going to look into.

Now, the third point was "the other causes". There are several. What I intend to do is to send to the Honourable the Commerce Member and the Honourable the Industries Member a statement of what the others are, and I ask whether they will take it upon themselves to make an investigation and see how far they can remedy those other difficulties experienced. Sir, with these words—I have one word more to say. (Laughter.) Sir, what I said was that if the letter which the trade wrote on the 18th of July, 1933, submitting a proposal to the Railway Board to close down temporarily, not permanently, for one year, the uneconomic railway collieries and place them on a care and maintenance basis without causing the slightest loss to the railways—because certainly we would not allow, in the interests of the trade, the railways to suffer loss—and, at the same time, showing that by so doing, you save at least six lakhs of rupees if not 22 lakhs—after paying for everything—interest on capital, establishment, etc., it was a matter worthy of consideration : If the trade can prove that by closing down temporarily, even for a year, such uneconomic collieries, you do not lose, your interest, establishment charges, etc., are paid, and still you make a profit, what is the harm in looking into that proposition ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Sir, Government have looked into that proposition, and they found that it was quite impracticable. (Laughter.)

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** Well, if my Honourable friend will look into fresh proposals, if these are submitted, I shall be glad.

(Mr. P. R. Rau nods assent.)

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** You will ?

**Mr. P. R. Rau :** Yes.

**Mr. A. H. Ghuznavi :** With that assurance, Sir, and the other assurances already given, I ask the leave of the House to withdraw my Resolution.

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

---

#### STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhowe** (Leader of the House) : Sir, next week, the House will be asked to proceed with the consideration and passing of the Assam Criminal Law Amendment (Supplementary) Bill, and, thereafter, to consider and pass the Hedjaz Pilgrims (Muallims) Bill and the Indian Army (Amendment) Bill, as reported by Select Committee. It is possible that a Rubber Control Bill will also be introduced during the course of the week.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 13th August, 1934.