

10th March 1936

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

Volume III, 1936

(28th February to 17th March, 1936)

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

**FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
1936**



NEW DELHI
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1936

Legislative Assembly.

President :

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

Deputy President :

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

Panel of Chairmen :

PANDIT GOVIND BALLABH PANT, M.L.A.

SIB COWASJI JEEHANGIE, BART., K.C.I.E., O.B.E., M.L.A.

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

SIB MUHAMMAD YAMIN KHAN, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.

Secretary :

MIAN MUHAMMAD RAFI, BAR.-AT-LAW.

Assistant of the Secretary :

RAI BAHADUR D. DUTT.

Marshal :

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

Committee on Petitions :

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

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

MR. B. DAS, M.L.A.

DR. ZIAUDDIN AHMAD, C.I.E., M.L.A.

MR. M. S. ANEY, M.L.A.

CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—28th February to 17th March, 1936.

	PAGE.		PAGE.
FRIDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1936—		FRIDAY, 6TH MARCH 1936	
Members Sworn	1789	—contd.	
Presentation of the Budget for 1936-37	1789—1805	The Indian Cinematograph (Amendment) Bill—Re-appointments of Mr. A. S. Hands to the Select Committee	1905—96
The Indian Finance Bill—introduced	1805	Report of the Indian Delimitation Committee—Referred to a Committee	1906—2019
Statement of Business	1805—08	Resolution re Non-ratification of Draft Convention concerning the hours of work—Adopted	2019—39
TUESDAY, 3RD MARCH, 1936—		MONDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1936—	
Questions and Answers	1809—45	Questions and Answers	2041—86
Agreement between the Secretary of State for India in Council acting by and through the Governor in Council, Government of the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, and the Reserve Bank of India	1845—47	Unstarred Questions and Answers	2086—2127
General discussion of the General Budget	1848—92	Short Notice Question and Answer	2127—28
WEDNESDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1936—		Message from His Majesty the King Emperor	2128
General discussion of the General Budget	1902—1949	The General Budget—List of Demands	2128—74
Statement of Business	1949—51	Demand No. 32.—Home Department—Bureau of Public Information—the propagandist activities of the Home Department through the Director of Public Information especially the publication "India in 1933-34"	2131—55
FRIDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1936—		Demand No. 31.—Foreign and Political Department—Perilous nature of the forward policy pursued by the Government of India	2195—74
Questions and Answers	1953—89	TUESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1936—	
Statements laid on the Table	1990—92	Questions and Answers	2275—2321
Sir Frederick Whyte's notes referred to by the Honourable the Home Member during the discussion on the Adjournment Motion on the 24th February, 1936	1992—94		
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	1994		
The Decrees and Orders Validating Bill—Introduced	1995		
The Indian Law Case (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1995		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
TUESDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1936—contd.		FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936—	
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads	2222	Questions and Answers	2449—79
The General Budget— List of Demands— contd.		Unstarred Questions and Answers	2479—2507
Demand No. 31.— Foreign and Political Department—contd. Perilous nature of the forward policy pursued by the Government of India.	2222—27	Statements laid on the Table	2507—09
Demand No. 28.— Executive Council— No confidence in the Government	2227—60	The General Budget— List of Demands— contd.	2509—68
Demand No. 79.— Baluchistan— Expenditure due to earthquake at Quetta	2240—69	Demand No. 16.— Customs. Grievances of the Employees of the Customs Department	2511—24
WEDNESDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1936—		Position of Bengal Muslims in the Customs Offices at Calcutta and Chittagong	2522—24
Questions and Answers	2271—2310	Demand No. 17.— Taxes on Income	2524—25
The General Budget— List of Demands— contd.		Demand No. 18.— Salt	2525
Demand No. 39.— Defence Department— Defence policy of the Government of India	2310—47	Demand No. 19.— Opium	2525—26
Demand No. 22.— Home Department— Repressive policy	2347—58	Demand No. 19-A.— Excise	2526
THURSDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1936—		Demand No. 30.— Stamps	2526—27
Questions and Answers	2359—2402	Demand No. 21.— Forest	2527
Amendment of Standing Orders—Representation of the Reports of the Select Committees	2402	Demand No. 22.— Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works	2527
The General Budget— List of Demands— contd.		Demand No. 23.— Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)	2528—50
Demand No. 32.— Home Department— contd. Repressive policy	2402—24	Certain grievances of the employees of the Postal Department, especially the grievances of postmen and the inferior servants of that Department	2528—45
Demand No. 36.— Finance Department— Retention of emergency taxation of 1931 and the urgent necessity of its abolition	2424—48	Position of minorities in Bengal and Assam Postal Circle	2545—47
		High rates for telephone trunk calls.	2547—50
		Demand No. 25.— Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt	2550

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
—contd.	
The General Budget—	
List of Demands—contd.	
Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations	2550
Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General	2550—54
Demand No. 28—Executive Council	2555
Demand No. 29—Council of State	2555
Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department	2555
Demand No. 31—Foreign and Political Department	2555
Demand No. 32—Home Department	2555
Demand No. 33—Public Service Commission	2555
Demand No. 34—Legislative Department	2556
Demand No. 35—Department of Education, Health and Lands	2556
Demand No. 36—Finance Department	2556
Demand No. 38—Commerce Department	2556
Demand No. 39—Defence Department	2556
Demand No. 40—Department of Industries and Labour	2556
Demand No. 41—Central Board of Revenue	2557
Demand No. 42—Payments to Provincial Governments on account of Administration of Agency Subjects	2557
Demand No. 43—Audit	2557
Demand No. 44—Administration of Justice	2557
Demand No. 45—Police	2557
Demand No. 46—Ports and Pilotage	2557
Demand No. 47—Lighthouses and Lightships	2558

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
—contd.	
The General Budget—	
List of Demands—contd.	
Demand No. 48—Survey of India	2558
Demand No. 49—Meteorology	2558
Demand No. 50—Geological Survey	2558
Demand No. 51—Botanical Survey	2558
Demand No. 52—Zoological Survey	2559
Demand No. 53—Archaeology	2559
Demand No. 54—Mines	2559
Demand No. 55—Other Scientific Departments	2559
Demand No. 56—Education	2559
Demand No. 57—Medical Services	2559
Demand No. 58—Public Health	2559
Demand No. 59—Agriculture	2560
Demand No. 60—Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department	2560
Demand No. 60-A—Scheme for the improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India	2560
Demand No. 61—Civil Veterinary Services	2560
Demand No. 62—Industries	2560
Demand No. 63—Aviation	2561
Demand No. 63-B—Capital Outlay on Civil Aviation charged to Revenue	2561
Demand No. 64—Commercial Intelligence and Statistics	2561
Demand No. 65—Census	2561
Demand No. 66—Emigration—Internal	2561
Demand No. 67—Emigration—International	2561
Demand No. 68—Joint Stock Companies	2562

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
— <i>concl.</i>	
The General Budget—	
List of Demands—<i>concl.</i>	
Demand No. 69—Miscellaneous Departments	2562
Demand No. 70—Indian Stores Department	2562
Demand No. 71—Currency	2562
Demand No. 72—Mint	2562
Demand No. 73—Civil Works	2562
Demand No. 74—Superannuation Allowances and Pensions	2563
Demand No. 75—Stationery and Printing	2563
Demand No. 76—Miscellaneous	2563
Demand No. 76-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Revenue	2563
Demand No. 76-B—Miscellaneous Adjustments between the Central and Provincial Governments	2563
Demand No. 77—Re-funds	2564
Demand No. 79—Baluchistan	2564
Demand No. 80—Delhi	2564
Demand No. 81—Ajmer-Merwara	2564
Demand No. 82—Andamans and Nicobar Islands	2564
Demand No. 83—Rajputana	2564
Demand No. 84—Central India	2565
Demand No. 85—Hyderabad	2565
Demand No. 85-A—Aden	2565
Demand No. 86—Expenditure in England—Secretary of State for India	2565
Demand No. 87—Expenditure in England—High Commissioner for India	2565
Demand No. 88—Capital Outlay on Security Printing	2566

	PAGE.
FRIDAY, 13TH MARCH, 1936	
— <i>concl.</i>	
The General Budget—List of Demands—<i>concl.</i>	
Demand No. 89—Forest Capital Outlay	2566
Demand No. 90—Irrigation	2566
Demand No. 91—Indian Posts and Telegraphs	2566
Demand No. 92-A—Capital Outlay on Schemes of Agricultural Improvement and Research	2566
Demand No. 93—Currency Capital Outlay	2566
Demand No. 94—Capital Outlay on Vizagapatam Harbour	2567
Demand No. 95—Capital Outlay on Lighthouses and Lightships	2567
Demand No. 96—Computed Value of Pensions	2567
Demand No. 96-A—Expenditure on Retrenched Personnel charged to Capital	2567
Demand No. 97—Delhi Capital Outlay	2567
Demand No. 98—Interest-free Advances	2568
Demand No. 99—Loans and Advances Learning Interest	2568
Statement of Business	2568
MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1936—	
Questions and Answers	2609—2606
Short Notice Questions and Answer	2606—07
Message from His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General	2607
The Parai Marriage and Divorce Bill—As passed by the Council of State laid on the Table	2607
Statement laid on the Table	2607—09
Election of Members to the Public Accounts Committee	2610
Election of a Member to the Standing Committee on Pilgrimage to Hedjaz	2610

	PAGE.		PAGE.
MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1936		MONDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1936	
— <i>contd.</i>		— <i>contd.</i>	
The Cochin Port Bill— Introduced. . . .	2611	The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	2612—59
The Factories (Amend- ment) Bill—Introduced	2611	TUESDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1936—	
The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill— Re-committed to Select Committee	2611—12	Questions and Answers .	2661—07
		The Indian Finance Bill— Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded	2707—50

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 10th March, 1936.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PROMOTION OF CLASS I CLERKS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1047. ***Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Is it a fact that a very small percentage of grade II posts exists on the North Western Railway for clerical staff in offices and at stations? If so, what steps do Government propose to take to provide chances for promotion by grade I clerks? If not, will Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing the figures of sanctions on North Western Railway in grades I and II, for certain categories—say office clerks, goods clerks, booking clerks, luggage clerks, ticket collectors, shed clerks, train clerks, and works clerks?

(b) Is it a fact that a sub-committee of the Indian Railways Conference Association, under the Chairmanship of Mr. B. L. Cameron, Deputy Agent, North Western Railway, appointed by the parent body, had decided, *vide* minutes of the sub-committee meeting held in October, 1932, that the maximum of the lower grade for the office and station clerical staff be fixed at Rs. 85? If so, why was this over-ruled? Do Government, in view of the above-quoted decision, propose to revise the scales of pay of grade I on the lines suggested by the Cameron Committee? If not, why not?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state the financial effect of amalgamating grades I and II for station and office clerical staff on the North Western Railway?

(d) Is it a fact that the revised policy of Government in regard to the interests on loans, for the railway purposes, as stated by the Board in their memorandum to the Public Accounts Committee, is likely to yield a saving of two crores of rupees during the next four years, and a further saving of three crores of rupees is expected from the operation of the revised scales of pay, recently introduced on the State Railways, and do Government in view of the expected savings, propose to afford relief to grade I clerks, on the North Western Railway, and immediately start with amalgamation of the grades I and II? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I place a statement on the table of the House giving the information readily available. Government consider that the number of posts in the grade is sufficient for normal grade to grade promotions on the occurrence of vacancies.

(b) The reply to the first part is in the negative. The latter part does not arise. I would, however, refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to parts (a) and (b) of unstarred question No. 63 asked by Bhai Parma Nand on the 22nd February, 1935, regarding the scales of pay for the clerical staff in force on the North Western Railway.

(c) Government have not worked out any exact figures but consider that the cost of amalgamation of grades I and II for station and office clerical staff would be considerable; probably running into recurring expenditure of several lakhs of rupees per annum.

(d) Government regret they are not prepared to utilise savings towards expenditure which, they consider, is not justified.

Statement showing the strength of clerical establishment in grades I and II and certain other categories in 1935.

	II	I	Percentage of grade II to I.
			Per cent.
Office clerks	1,064	1,141	93.2
Station clerks	662	5,469	12.1

The sanctioned strength of grades I and II of categories named below as it stood in 1935 with the exception of Works Clerks, information in respect of whom is not readily available, is given below.

	II	I
Office Clerks	1,064	1,141
Goods Clerks	156	1,392
Booking Clerks	67	1,061
Parcel and Luggage Clerks	53	492
Ticket Collectors	80	824
Shed Clerks	44	270
Trains Clerks	48	529

ASSESSMENT OF INCOME-TAX IN CERTAIN DISTRICTS OF THE PUNJAB.

1048. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) What were the respective amounts of income-tax to be levied in the districts of (1) Hissar, (2) Rohtak, (3) Gurgaon, and (4) Karnal, during the years 1931-32, 1932-33, 1933-34, 1934-35, 1935-36, and how much of these amounts was remitted every year?

(b) How many persons in the Hissar district were taxed on their estimated income, and how many of them had their account books properly admitted during the years 1933-34, 1934-35 and 1935-36?

(c) Are there any reasons for which the amount of income-tax in the Hissar district has been enhanced in 1935-36 over and above the amount levied in 1934-35?

(d) Are Government aware that the district of Hissar has been suffering from scarcity of food for the last five years, and that Government had to remit nearly twelve lakhs of rupees in their land revenue, and the people have been badly off during this period?

(e) Are Government aware that on account of the money-lenders indebtedness relief laws, the income of the money-lenders class has been much reduced?

(f) Is it a fact that several respectable persons of the money-lending class made a representation against the officers of the Income-tax Department, in December last? If so, how have Government considered that representation?

(g) Is it a fact that that representation says that the officers of the department advance the fact of large contributions towards the Silver Jubilee Fund as an evidence of their wealth?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) A statement is laid on the table. The information regarding the amounts remitted is not available.

(b) The information is not available.

(c) The year 1935-36 not being complete, the correctness of the assumption underlying the Honourable Member's question cannot be verified.

(d) and (e). Government have no information.

(f) and (g). Complaints in general terms were made in December, 1935, but the Commissioner's request for more detailed particulars has not been complied with.

Statement showing the assessment figures (Demand) for the years 1931-32 to 1934-35 in the Districts of Hissar, Rohtak, Gurgaon and Karnal in the Punjab.

Years.	Hissar.	Rohtak.	Gurgaon.	Karnal.
1931-32	1,72,053	1,28,008	78,851	1,48,968
1932-33	1,90,241	1,24,713	89,576	1,56,606
1933-34	1,62,145	1,05,993	66,821	74,734
1934-35	1,73,635	90,589	75,783	1,30,502
1935-36	The information is not available.			

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: With regard to part (d), did the Honourable Member's Department make an inquiry?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: The matter is primarily the concern of the Local Government.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: After the notice of the question, did the Honourable Member inquire whether actually there were famine conditions prevailing there?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: The Department of the Government of India concerned did not, I think, make any such inquiry, as the matter primarily concerns the Local Government.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did not the Honourable Member enquire whether remission to the tune of 12 lakhs had to be made on account of scarcity?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: No, Sir.

NEW APPOINTMENTS TO BE CREATED IN SIND.

1049. ***Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) how many new appointments are proposed to be created in the Imperial, Provincial, subordinate and menial services in the separated Province of Sind;
- (b) the cost of the new appointments in these various services, separately; and
- (c) whether they have carefully considered the question of the extra expenditure involved in the creation of the new appointments in view of the fact that they will have to pass the Sind budget and give a subvention to the new Province of Sind?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: (a) and (b). Although the staff necessary, to enable the Government of the new Province to start functioning on the first day of its existence, has to be provisionally settled in advance, in the case of a large number of appointments the power to continue, abolish or add thereto will lie with the new Government. It is not possible at present to give details of the number and cost involved.

(c) The necessity for keeping expenditure as low as possible consistently with due regard to efficiency has been, and will be, carefully borne in mind by the Government of India in the exercise of their powers of control and in view of the subvention from the Central Revenues.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: In view of the fact that there is enough material in Sind, have Government taken into consideration the fact that outsiders should not be imported into the Secretariat and other offices?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: My Honourable friend makes certain assumptions about certain materials in Sind. I have not applied my mind to that question. I have no information.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I inform the Honourable Member that he may take it from me that there is material there. Will Government give an undertaking that, if there is material in Sind, they will not import outsiders?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I can give no undertaking at present.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: The Leader of the House has not replied to my question, which is a specific one—how many new appointments are proposed to be created in the Imperial, provincial and subordinate services. He has avoided or evaded the issue altogether.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I have already answered that. I said that it is not possible at present to give details of the number and cost involved.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: Have the appointments not been made vet in the various services, Imperial, subordinate and provincial and clerical?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: No.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatallah: They have been made.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Can Government give a rough idea of the cost on account of the new appointments?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I can give no further information beyond what I have already given. If my friend wants any further information, I must ask for notice.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government have an opportunity of deciding this matter, before the appointments are actually created?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Yes, Sir.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: How then is a deficit of one crore and one lakh arrived at with respect to the Sind Province?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I want notice.

THINLY POPULATED AREAS IN CERTAIN INDIAN PLAINS AND MOUNTAINS CAPABLE OF BEING FORMED INTO SETTLEMENTS.

1050. ***Mr. Sham Lal:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether in the Indian plains and mountains there are thinly populated areas capable of being settled in easily by people from the populous regions of this country; and
- (b) if so, whether any survey is intended to be taken in the matter?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). There are thinly populated areas in Indian plains and mountains, but whether settlement there of people from the thickly populated parts is practicable is open to doubt. In any case, initiative in the matter rests with Local Governments.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the desirability of laying down a uniform policy for the grant of these culturable waste lands which extend up to 154 million acres for settling upon it the depressed classes and other landless classes?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: That question is a matter for the Local Governments.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government take into consideration this question of bringing more land under cultivation, before they make up their minds about birth control propaganda in this country?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: My Honourable friend asked a similar question about birth control the other day, and my answer was that it is a matter for the Local Governments, and not the Government of India.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Will Government consider the calling of a conference of the Ministers of Agriculture from the various provinces with a view to make them arriving at a uniform policy for distributing these lands among the landless classes in the different provinces?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I doubt very much whether a uniform policy is feasible. Conditions vary from province to province, but, in any case, I can only repeat that, unless the Government of India are approached by Local Governments, the Government of India can take no action.

PROHIBITION OF MR. AMARENDRA NATH CHATTOPADHYAYA, M.L.A., FROM ADDRESSING ANY PUBLIC MEETING IN THE MIDNAPORE DISTRICT.

1051. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether they are aware that Mr. P. G. Griffiths, District Magistrate, Midnapore, has issued a notice on Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, a Member of this Honourable House, asking him not to address any public meeting within the limits of Midnapore District;
- (b) whether they have considered the question that Members of this Honourable House should not be prevented from addressing their own constituencies and from ascertaining their grievances; and
- (c) what action they propose to take in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya was not prohibited from addressing any public meeting, but from inciting or encouraging others to oppose the peaceful application of the provisions of a law which had been lawfully put into force in prescribed areas.

(b) and (c). In view of the answer given to (a), these questions do not arise.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, may I ask for some further elucidation of the answer which I imperfectly heard? What was the actual order passed on Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, an Honourable Member of this House, by Mr. Griffiths, the District Magistrate of Midnapore?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I will read my answer again:

“(a) Mr. Amarendranath Chattopadhyaya was not prohibited from addressing any public meeting but from inciting or encouraging others to oppose the peaceful application of the provisions of a law which had been lawfully put into force in prescribed areas.

(b) and (c). In view of the answer given to (a), these questions do not arise.”

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is that law?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I think it is the Village Self-Government Act.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What are the actual terms of the order served on Mr. Chattopadhyaya by the District Magistrate?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have given all the information I have received from the Local Government. I have not got a copy of the actual order.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Did Mr. Griffiths, or did he not interfere, with the right of an elected Member of this House to come into contact with his constituents who have sent him here?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know what was the exact scope of the order?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It merely prohibited Mr. Chattopadhyaya from inciting or encouraging opposition to the enforcement of this law which had lately been put into force in certain districts.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What particular overt acts of the Honourable Member did this order prohibit? Did it prohibit specifically his addressing meetings?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What did it actually prohibit?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It prohibited him from inciting or encouraging opposition to this law. There was no general prohibition of his addressing public meetings.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is the Honourable Member aware that Mr. Chattopadhyaya, an Honourable Member of this House, first of all wrote to Mr. Griffiths, the District Magistrate of Midnapore, asking his permission to come to Midnapore and address his constituency, and, on receipt of the express permission of the District Magistrate, Mr. Griffiths, he went there, and, thereafter, when he wanted to go there a second time, he was served with a prohibitory order that he was not to address any public meeting?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: My information is quite to the contrary. There was no such general order.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Does the Honourable Member realise that I make a difference here? Mr. Chattopadhyaya twice visited the district of Midnapore. On the first occasion, he got a written permission from Mr. Griffiths. He had been in correspondence with Mr. Griffiths, and he told him that he wanted to visit his constituency. Mr. Griffiths made a condition precedent that he should not address them on the formation of union boards, to which Amarendra Babu agreed. He went to his constituency, addressed meetings, and he got his permission. He never talked about anything concerning the union boards. The second time, however, when he wanted to visit his own constituency, a prohibitory order was passed on Mr. Chattopadhyaya not to visit Midnapore, and an order of arrest was passed upon him. Then, the Government of Bengal, at the last moment, intervened: and when Amarendra Babu was about to land in Midnapore an order was passed and the order of prosecution was withdrawn.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have received no information to that effect. I asked the Local Government for information and for material in order to enable me to reply to this question. I have given all the material I have received.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: In view of the momentous issues involved in this matter affecting the privileges of Honourable Members of this House, did the Honourable Member make any specific inquiry as to the allegations made in this question?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, I did.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did the Honourable Member satisfy himself that Amarendra Babu got his permission, that he never tried to incite or encourage anybody to commit any violent or illegal act, and that, in spite of that, Mr. Griffiths banned his entry into the district of Midnapore?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That point does not arise out of the question. What I was asked was—was he prohibited from addressing any public meeting? The information I have received is that that is not the case.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Does the Honourable Member know that the Government of Bengal had to intervene at the last moment and see that a complication is not created by reason of the arrest of Amarendra Babu at the time of his visit to Midnapore?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: No, Sir.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Does the Honourable Member not know that the Government of Bengal did intervene and tried to see that no complication was created by the arrest of Amarendra Babu, at the last moment?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is nothing in the question about that.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Will Government send for a copy of these orders passed on Mr. Chattopadhyaya, and place them on the table?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member ought to have given notice of that question.

The Honourable Member did say that an order was passed but he has not got the text of it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I know whether Government will get the text of Mr. Griffiths's order and place it on the table of this House?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I am quite willing to do that.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that a special messenger had to be sent to stop the arrest of Amarendra Babu? Did the Honourable Member inquire about that?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I have already said that I have placed before the House the whole of the material at my disposal.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member ought to give separate notice of all these questions. Next question.

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER FOR THE RURAL AREAS OF THE AJMER-MERWARA DISTRICT.

1052. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria** (on behalf of Rai Bahadur Seth Bhagchand Soni): (a) Is it a fact that the Ajmer-Merwara district has got no Public Health Officer for the rural area?

(b) Are Government aware that the sanitary conditions in the rural area in this district are very deplorable and the death-rate is exceedingly high in many parts of the district?

(c) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of appointing a Director or Health Officer for rural areas for looking into the public health, hygiene and sanitary conditions of the district?

(d) Is it a fact that the population of Ajmer-Merwara district has been stationary during the last three decades?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) The sanitary conditions in rural areas in Ajmer-Merwara do not compare unfavourably with those in other rural areas. The death rate when compared with the figures for other parts of British India cannot be said to be exceedingly high. (Hear, hear.)

(c) Government are prepared to examine the matter.

(d) No. There was a temporary decrease in the 1921 decade due to the influenza epidemic.

POLICE INFORMERS UNDER THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

1053. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government state:

(a) whether there are regular police informers under the Government of India;

(b) whether they are engaged full time or part time;

(c) whether they are paid monthly or in any other way; and

(d) from which funds they are paid, and whether the accounts of their payment are audited?

The Honourable Sir Henry Orsk: (a), (b), (c) and (d). As I have explained in reply to a recent question, it is essential in India, as in all other countries, for the police to use informers in dealing with certain classes of crime, for confidential enquiries and in the interest of public security. It is, therefore, necessary for the police to have funds for this purpose. The Honourable Member will no doubt understand that further details cannot be given without prejudice to the purpose for which the funds are allotted.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: May I know the answer to clause (d) of the question?

The Honourable Sir Henry Orsk: My answer covered all the parts of the question.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Are the accounts of these payments audited?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member will no doubt understand that further details cannot be given without prejudice to the purpose for which the funds are allotted.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Under what head of the Budget are these amounts spent?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Secret Service. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is there any class or community from whom these informers are normally recruited, and do they possess any minimum or maximum qualifications when recruited for that purpose? (Laughter.)

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

AFGHAN PRINCES DETAINED IN VARIOUS PLACES IN BRITISH INDIA.

1054. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government state:

- (a) how many princes of Afghanistan are detained in various places in British India and for how many years;
- (b) whether princes of any other country are detained here; and
- (c) the total cost of maintaining these princes?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: (a) and (c). Presumably by the words 'princes of Afghanistan' the Honourable Member is referring to Afghans detained in India under Regulation III of 1818. If so, his attention is invited to the reply given to Seth Govind Das in answer to his question No. 589 on the 18th February, 1936. As regards the latter portion of part (a), necessary information specifying the date of detention in each case has been added in column 6 of the statement, a copy of which is placed on the table.

(b) No.

Statement showing the names of non-Indian State Prisoners who are not in Jails, but interned outside and their allowances.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Province or Presidency.	Serial No.	Name.	Allowance (Monthly).	Remarks.	Date from which detained.
Madras Presidency.	1	S. Abdur Rahman Khan.	Rs. a. p. 600 0 0		11-5-26.
	2	S. Ghaus-uddin Khan.	500 0 0		12-5-30.
	3	S. Abdul Hakim Khan.	150 0 0	..	6-2-30.
	4	S. Amin Jan . . .	250 0 0	Rs. 1,500	Do.

1 Province or Presidency.	2 Serial No.	3 Name.	4 Allowance (Monthly).	5 Remarks.	6 Date from which detained.
Bombay Presi- dency.	5	Khan Baba	Rs. a. p. 60 0 0	Rs. 30 per men- sem allowance and Re. 1 daily diet allowance.	21-9-34.
	6	Abdul Qadus	73 4 0	Rs. 32 per men- sem allowance and Rs. 1-6-0 daily diet al- lowance.	Do.
	7	Mohd. Ibrahim	73 4 0	Ditto.	Do.
	8	Mohd. Hassan	73 4 0	Ditto.	Do.
	9	Ali Ahmad	73 4 0	Ditto.	Do.
	10	Mohd. Ismail	60 0 0	..	23-8-34.
	11	Taj Mohammad	60 0 0	Rs. 473	5-11-34.
	12	S. Abdullah Khan	600 0 0	..	11-5-26.
	13	S. Abdul Hamied Khan.	500 0 0	..	Do.
	Central Pro- vinces.	14	S. Abdul Quaum Khan.	450 0 0	..
15		Khwaja Abdul Karim.	86 4 0	Rs. 45 per men- sem allowance and Rs. 1-6-0 as diet allow- ance.	11-12-33.
16		Mohd. Nasir	86 4 0	Ditto	Do.
17		Abdur Rahman Jan	86 4 0	Ditto	15-2-35.
18		Ata Mohammad	60 0 0	Ditto	23-8-34.
19		Sardar Abdul Khaliq	100 0 0	..	6-4-35.
Bihar and Orissa	20	Sardar Ghulam Jilani	60 0 0	Rs. 160	29-4-35.
	21	S. Abdul Aziz Khan	250 0 0	..	30-3-17.
Bengal United Provinces	22	S. Mohd. Azam Khan.	300 0 0	..	16-7-16.
	23	S. Mohd. Akram Khan.	400 0 0	..	Do.
	24	S. Mohd. Afzal Khan.	..	S/o S. M. Akram Khan.	14-1-29.
	25	S. Sultan Ahmad Khan.	300 0 0	..	20-3-17.
	26	S. Sher Ahmad Khan.	250 0 0	..	Do.
	27	S. Mohd. Sarwar Khan.	250 0 0	..	Do.
	28	S. Mohd. Umar Khan.	250 0 0	..	Do.
	29	S. Nur Ahmed Khan.	250 0 0	..	Do.
	30	S. Abdur Rashid Khan.	150 0 0	..	Do.
	31	S. Mohd. Hassan Khan.	200 0 0	..	14-1-29.
	32	S. Abdur Samad Khan.	..	S/o S. M. Hassan Khan.	Do.
	33	S. Abdur Rahman Khan.	250 0 0	..	Do.
	34	S. Mohd. Umar Khan.	100 0 0	..	Do.
	35	S. Gul Mohd. Khan	100 0 0	..	Do.

1	2	5	4	5	6
Province or Presidency.	Serial No.	Name.	Allowance (Monthly).	Remarks.	Date from which detained.
United Provinces —contd.	36	S. Abdul Ali Khan .	Rs. a. p. 350 0 0	..	14-1-29.
	37	S. Abdur Rahim Khan.	250 0 0	..	Do.
	38	S. Abdur Rauf Khan	..	S/o S. M. Hassan Khan.	Do
	39	S. Mohd. Azim Khan	100 0 0	..	Do.
	40	S. Mohd. Mohsin Khan,	100 0 0	Rs. 30 per mensem allowance and annas 10 daily allowance.	Do.
	41	Chulam Nabi .	48 12 0	Ditto .	2-11-33.
	42	Mohd. Din .	48 12 0	Ditto .	Do.
	43	Mohd. Siddiq .	48 12 0	Ditto .	Do.
	44	Abdul Hakim .	68 12 0	Rs. 50 per mensem allowance and annas 10 daily allowance.	Do.
	45	Abdul Majid .	68 12 0	Ditto .	Do.
	46	Mohd. Jan .	60 0 0	..	Do.
	Ajmer-Merwara	47	Syed. Muhammaed Alias Bang & Co., Companions.	400 0 0	..
			8,595 8 0		

	Rs. A. P.
Monthly cost	8,595 8 0
Yearly cost .	1,03,146 0 0

RULES GOVERNING THE ISSUE OF FREE PASSES.

1055. *Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will Government state:

- (a) whether free passes over Railways are issued to anybody;
- (b) whether certain missionaries are given free passes;
- (c) the rules that govern the issue of free passes?

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

(b) Yes, but only for the purpose of ministering to the spiritual needs of certain classes of railway employees.

(c) The rules for the issue of free passes are embodied in the State Railway Open Line Code, Vol. II, but these have been so materially altered from time to time by the issue of supplementary instructions as to necessitate the issue of revised rules which are now under consideration.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Am I to understand that the passes are confined only to Christian missionaries or that they are extended to the religious priests of Hindus and Muslims also?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Then, what does the Honourable Member mean by saying that passes are issued for the purpose of ministering to the spiritual needs of railway employees?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I said certain classes of employees.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Why is it confined only to certain classes?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Because members of this particular class are sometimes posted in small numbers at such stations where the ordinary ministrations of priests of their own communities are not available to them, and, if this provision was not made, they would be left without any kind of religious ministration altogether. This does not apply to classes to whom such ministrations are in the ordinary course available.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: What about the Hindus posted in Peshawar? Are they not inconvenienced for want of priests of their own community?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The Honourable Member does not appear to know that there are a large number of priests belonging to the Hindu community in Peshawar.

“ DUFFERIN ” CADETS.

1056. ***Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Will Government state:

- (a) how many cadets have passed out of the “Dufferin”;
- (b) of these how many are now unemployed;
- (c) whether any company refused to recognise the “Dufferin” training;
- (d) if so, what steps they have taken in those cases;
- (e) how many of the shipping companies engaged in Indian trade have Indian cadets on their ships; and
- (f) whether they are prepared to consider the advisability of asking all companies engaged in the Indian trade to engage trained Indians in their services?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me on the 20th February, 1936, to parts (a) and (c) of Professor N. G. Ranga's starred question No. 700.

(b) The Honourable Member's attention is invited to my reply to part (b) of Mr. S. Satyamurti's starred question No. 1035.

(c) So far as Government are aware no shipping company has refused to recognise the “Dufferin” training.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) Attention is invited to the reply given by me on the 19th February, 1936, to part (b) of Mr. Mathuradas Vissanji's starred question No. 661.

(f) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by me on the 24th February, 1936, to part (a) of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's starred question No. 744.

Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar: Will Government issue circulars to all the companies trading in India that they should appoint only the cadets trained in the training ship "Dufferin"?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I have already replied several questions on this subject put by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satvamurti, that Government are pursuing the matter.

SCHEME FOR THE INAUGURATION OF A PASSENGER SERVICE BETWEEN BOMBAY AND EUROPE BY CERTAIN INDIAN BUSINESSMEN AND FINANCIERS.

1057. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti** (on behalf of Seth Govind Das): (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the speech made by Mr. Rahimtoola M. Chinoy, President of the Indian Merchants' Chamber of Bombay, at the last annual general meeting of the Chamber on the 31st January, 1936, wherein he referred to a scheme for the inauguration of a passenger service between Bombay and Europe by certain Indian businessmen and financiers?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether they are aware of the fact mentioned in the same speech that British shipping interests were not even prepared to discuss such a scheme with Indian businessmen?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state what steps they propose to take to assist the participation of Indian shipping in the overseas trade of the country in pursuance of their own promises in that respect?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Government have seen a newspaper report of the speech referred to.

(b) No.

(c) In pursuance of their declared policy, Government will always be willing to offer their good offices, if invited, in removing difficulties and promoting a settlement of the problem of the participation of Indian shipping in the overseas trade by the method of negotiation and mutual agreement between Indian and British shipping interests.

TENDERS FOR WORKS AT TANDOADAM AND NAWABSHAH STATIONS ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1058. ***Mr. S. Satyamurti** (on behalf of Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha): (a) Is it a fact that the system of inviting tenders for Railway works, done by the Engineering Department of the North Western Railway, was introduced by the Railway Board in 1930, with a view to get works done economically?

(b) Is it a fact that during 1931-32, junction arrangement works at Tandoadam and Nawabshah Stations of the North Western Railway, Karachi Division, amounting to Rs. 50,000 approximately, were sanctioned by the Railway Board, and for such a big work the Divisional Engineer, No. 1, North Western Railway, Karachi, did not invite tenders? If so, why not?

(c) When were the Work Orders (*i.e.*, agreements for works) of the contractor sanctioned, and when were these works finally completed and bills prepared?

(d) Is it a fact that all works at Tandoadam and Nawabshah were divided into sub-works to bring each sub-work, within Rs. 5,000, so that tenders may not be called and all works may be done by one contractor? Is it not against the usual procedure?

(e) Had this procedure, referred to in part (d) above, been only adopted by the Divisional Executive Engineer, No. 1, Karachi, or by other Divisional Executive Engineers on the North Western Railway?

(f) At what percentage, below or above, the schedule of rates were tenders for works at Tandoadam station sanctioned during 1931-32, 1932-33, 1933-34, 1934-35 and 1935-36?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes. This system was, however, introduced by the North Western Railway, not by the Railway Board.

(b) to (f). These questions are based on the allegations in the pamphlet published by a clerk named Isardass Chuharmal, on the Karachi Division, North Western Railway, who was discharged in 1932 for vilifying his superior officer. The pamphlet contains various accusations against railway officers which have been the subject of independent enquiries by the Divisional Superintendent, Karachi, and by the Statutory Audit. Both enquiries found that these charges were baseless. A third enquiry on the same subject was held in connection with a case instituted by Isardass Chuharmal before the Deputy Collector and Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sehwan, which was dismissed on the ground that it was malicious and that the innocence of the railway officers concerned had been more than established.

In view of the above Government do not consider that it is in the public interest to enquire further into the matter, particularly as it is now nearly five years since the alleged incidents took place.

AMENITIES FOR PASSENGERS AT THE MAHENDRA GHAT STATIONS, BENGAL AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1059. ***Mr. Anugrah Narayan Sinha:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the average number of daily passengers booked from Mahendra Ghat, Bengal and North Western Railway, and also the monthly income from the said station?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state what arrangement, if any, there is for the protection and temporary stay of third class passengers and also for intermediate class passengers?

(c) What is the dimension of the room which is used as the station office?

(d) Is there only one arrangement for booking of third class and the higher class passengers? If so, do the authorities concerned propose to take action for booking at separate places?

(e) Is it a fact that the booking office, the station master's office and the goods office at the said station are in only one room 10' x 10'?

(f) What arrangement is there, if any, for the purpose of latrine for third class and intermediate class passengers?

(g) Is there any telegraphic connection between the said station and the stations on the opposite side of the Ganges?

(h) Will Government be pleased to state if there is any verandah in front of the said station to protect the passengers from rain?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Passengers 398; gross earnings monthly average Rs. 12,978.

(b) There is a hall measuring 19½ feet by 13½ feet attached to the station office for third class passengers and a bench is provided in this hall for intermediate class passengers.

(c) and (e). The station office in which all work at the station is performed is 12 feet by 12 feet.

(d) Yes, but tickets for upper class passengers are issued from the door of the station office when so desired.

(f) A municipal urinal and a latrine are provided attached to the adjacent court situated near the Ghat, which are used by passengers.

(g) There is no railway telegraph connection, but there is a Government Telegraph Office very near to the Ghat.

(h) No. Passengers stay in the hall referred to in my reply to part (b) of the question. A new passenger shed is under construction.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Why is not separate latrine provided for third class and intermediate class passengers within the precincts of this particular station?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: For the reason given in answer to part (f) of the question.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Do Government realise that it is inconvenient for railway passengers to go out of the railway precincts and utilise the municipal latrine?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: As the municipal latrine is adjacent to the railway precincts, I do not think any question of inconvenience arises.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: How far is the municipal latrine from the railway precincts?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: The expression used in the reply is "attached to the adjacent court", that would mean not very far, probably a few feet.

SCHEME FOR DRIVING A ROAD FROM TURKMAN GATE TO JAMA MASJID, DELHI.

1060. ***Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** (a) Is it a fact that Government propose to drive a road from Turkman Gate to Jama Masjid, Delhi, to open up congested areas?

(b) If so, how far has this scheme progressed, and to what extent has the Municipal Committee of Delhi agreed to it?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) and (b). With your permission, Sir, I shall answer parts (a) and (b) together.

The Honourable Member is probably thinking of the proposal to construct a road from Connaught Place to Jama Masjid, I would invite his attention to the reply given by me to part (d) of Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar's starred question No. 502 on the 17th February, 1936.

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: Are Government aware that the municipality are prepared to reconsider this question?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: I have read a report to that effect in the Press, but, as I informed Mr. Muthuranga Mudaliar on an earlier occasion we propose now to await the report of Mr. Hume before taking up this and other connected questions.

NON-APPOINTMENT OF CIVILIANS OF THE PUNJAB COMMISSION AS DEPUTY COMMISSIONER AND CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF DELHI.

1061. ***Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami Raju:** (a) Will Government please state whether the local and special laws of the Punjab apply to the Delhi Province?

(b) Will Government please state whether the District and Sessions Judge and the gazetted police officers and members of Provincial Services serving in Delhi belong to the Punjab Services?

(c) Is it a fact that the Deputy Commissioner belongs to the Central Provinces Commission and the Honourable the Chief Commissioner to the United Provinces Commission?

(d) If the answers to the preceding parts be in the affirmative, will Government please state the reason why civilians of the Punjab Commission have ceased to be appointed as Deputy Commissioner and Chief Commissioner?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) When Delhi was created a Province in 1912, all local and special laws in force in Delhi at that time continued, under the Delhi Laws Act of 1912, to apply to Delhi. Since 1912, such laws of the Punjab or other provinces as have been considered suitable have been extended to the Delhi province according as occasion or necessity demanded.

(b) Yes normally; but not necessarily.

(c) Yes.

(d) They are still eligible for appointments but the Punjab Government have been unable to spare officers for these appointments owing to shortage of its cadre.

CASES UNDER CERTAIN LAWS TRIED BY THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF DELHI.

1062. ***Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami Raju:** (a) Will Government please state :

(i) how many cases (1) under the Indian Penal Code and (2) under the local and special laws, have been tried by the Deputy Commissioner, Delhi, himself during 1934 and 1935, respectively;

(ii) how many appeals in security cases, revision applications and transfer applications were heard by him during 1934 and 1935, respectively;

(b) If the figures be negligible, will Government please state the reasons for this state of affairs?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a), (i), (1) None under the Penal Code.

(2) One in 1934 and one in 1935, both under the Child Marriage Restraint Act.

(ii) In 1934 nil, in 1935 two appeals in security cases, two revision applications and one transfer application.

(b) The post of the Additional District Magistrate was created in Delhi in order to relieve the District Magistrate of as much magisterial work as possible, and for the same reason the Additional District Magistrate is invested with all the powers of a District Magistrate.

CASES UNDER CERTAIN LAWS TRIED BY THE ADDITIONAL DISTRICT MAGISTRATE OF DELHI.

1063. ***Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami Raju:** (a) Will the Honourable the Home Member please state how many cases (1) under the Indian Penal Code and (2) under the local and special laws were tried by the Additional District Magistrate, Delhi, during 1934 and 1935 separately, and how many of them were summary cases?

(b) Will Government please state whether it is a fact that there is a Notification of the Punjab Government, embodied in the High Court Rules and Orders, to the effect that the appeals from the orders of first class magistrates shall be personally heard by the District Magistrate and not by the Additional District Magistrate?

(c) Why is this direction not being followed in the Delhi Province?

(d) How many transfer applications were heard by the Additional District Magistrate in 1934 and 1935, and how many of them were accepted during each year and how many rejected?

(e) Will Government please state whether acceptance of such applications is a rule, or rejection an exception?

(f) In how many such cases were the opposing counsels or the prosecuting inspector not notified, and the applications accepted in their absence?

(g) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of asking the District Magistrate to hear these applications himself? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a), (1) In 1934, 22; in 1935, 26.

(2) In 1934, 1258; in 1935, 1301.

Out of these 1252 in 1934 and 1288 in 1935 were summary cases.

(b) The Government are not aware that this is so.

(c) Any such direction would not apply to Delhi.

(d) and (e). The number of transfer applications which were heard and accepted or rejected during the years 1934 and 1935 was:

	1934.	1935.
Heard	156	175
Accepted	79	77
Rejected	77	98

(f) I have not the information but I understand that pleaders are heard as a rule.

(g) No. It is not the habit of the Government of India to interfere in such matters.

†1064*—1065*.

† These questions were withdrawn by the questioner.

EXEMPTION OF INCOME-TAX ON PENSIONS OF CIVIL OFFICERS AND SUBORDINATES WHO CONTRACTED DISEASES ON FIELD SERVICE DURING THE GREAT WAR.

1066. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Is it a fact that civil officers and subordinates when in Field Service Area during the Great War of 1914—18 were a part and parcel of His Majesty's Forces and held relative military ranks according to their substantive pay at that time?

(b) With reference to their reply to question No. 375 of the 16th September, 1935 in this House, will Government please state whether the pensions of civil officers and subordinates who contracted diseases on Field Service during the Great War of 1914—1918, and ultimately retired from Government service on the recommendation of Medical Boards on account of the same diseases, are exempt from the operations of the income-tax or not?

(c) Will Government please state whether a written certificate from a responsible and superior administrative officer of an individual's department, testifying to that individual's retirement from Government service on account of diseases contracted on Field Service, will serve the purpose? If not, will Government please state what course is to be followed in such cases for the exemption of income-tax?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) This was so in the case of certain members of some of the civil departments, but not of all.

(b) The question to which the Honourable Member refers was understood to relate to pensions granted to members of His Majesty's Naval, Military or Air Forces and was answered accordingly. The position in respect of civil officers and subordinates is that exemption from income-tax is given in respect of extraordinary pensions granted to such persons under Chapter XXXVIII of the Civil Service Regulations or under the Army Regulations, India, as the case may be, in respect of wounds or injuries received in the performance of their duties.

(c) Since the exemption from income-tax is limited in the manner just explained, a written certificate, such as is mentioned by the Honourable Member, would not serve to secure exemption in the absence of an order granting the pension under Chapter XXXVIII of the Civil Service Regulations or under the Army Regulations, India.

ASSESSMENT OF INCOME-TAX ON SUPPOSED INCOMES.

1067. ***Bhai Parma Nand:** (a) With reference to their answer to my question No. 241, part (b) given on the 11th February, 1936 to the effect that the Honourable Member concerned was not aware of any case "in which the Income-tax Officers have not cared to comply with the orders of the High Courts", are Government prepared to enquire from Lahore Office regarding the case of one Mr. Badrinath?

(b) Is it a fact that in answer to parts (e) and (d) of the above question, the Honourable Member concerned said that even in cases of failure of prosecution, he is not prepared to issue any general instructions and that he is aware that there are cases in which no refund has been given, and if so, will the Honourable Member state any reason for letting this state of things go on?

(c) Is it a fact that in answer to parts (e), (f), (g) and (h) of the above question, the Honourable Member concerned said that he was not aware of any such case, and if so, is the Honourable Member prepared to enquire from the Lahore Office if there have been any such cases?

Mr. A. H. Lloyd: (a) The Government of India understand that the case of Mr. Badrinath has not been the subject of the order of any High Court but was disposed of in a Magistrate's Court.

(b) The reason is that it does not follow, because a prosecution for making a false statement or declaration has failed that the assessment concerned has been incorrectly raised.

(c) Enquiries had already been made from the Lahore office. In the case which the Honourable Member has in mind there was no charge of extortion.

INDIANISATION OF SUPERIOR APPOINTMENTS IN THE SECRETARIAT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

1068. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) the number of Indian and European officers in the Departments of the Government of India of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary;
- (b) the percentage of Indian officers to the total number of officers of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary in the Government of India Secretariat, according to Departments, for each year from April 1921 to April 1935;
- (c) what steps have been taken since the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri moved his Resolution in the Council of State in 1922 on the subject of Indianisation of the appointments in the Secretariat of the Government of India;
- (d) the percentage of Indian Secretaries and Joint Secretaries (to be mentioned separately) in the total number of Secretaries and Joint Secretaries in the Government of India Secretariat in April 1921 and in April 1935;
- (e) whether in the course of 1936, there will be a change in the incumbency of the post of Secretary or Joint Secretary in

any Department or Departments of the Government of India and if so, in what Departments;

- (f) whether there is any intention to take advantage of that opportunity to appoint Europeans in place of Indians;
- (g) the Departments of the Government of India Secretariat in which posts of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary were occupied during the last two years ending with 1st February, 1936 by Indians, but which are now occupied by Europeans;
- (h) their policy in regard to the appointment to these posts;
- (i) who is the appointing authority, whether the Governor General in Council, or the Governor General, or the Member in charge of the Department concerned, or the Member in charge concerned acting with the Governor General;
- (j) whether up to 1935 the tenure of the posts was three years; and
- (k) whether the tenure now is four years in regard to some of the posts, and if so, which are those posts and the reasons for the change?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) There are at present in the Government of India Secretariat 48 officers holding the posts of Secretary, Joint Secretary and Deputy Secretary, or equivalent posts, of whom 13 are Indians.

(b) and (d). I lay a statement on the table which gives the required information for the years 1921, 1925, 1930 and 1935, which I hope will serve the purpose of the Honourable Member.

(c) and (h). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the explanation given on behalf of Government in connection with Resolutions by the Honourable Rai Bahadur Lala Jagdish Prasad and the Honourable Mr. Jagadhish Chandra Banerjee regarding Indianisation of the Indian Civil Service in the Council of State on the 10th February, 1934.

(e) and (f). It is not possible to anticipate exactly what changes in the incumbencies of these posts will occur during 1936 or how the posts will be filled. In making appointments to these posts the principle of selecting experienced and suitable officers will be followed and the claims of suitable Indian officers will be duly considered.

(g) A statement is laid on the table.

(i) The appointments rest with the Governor General.

(j) Yes, except that for the posts of Secretary in the Legislative and Foreign and Political Departments there was no specified period of tenure.

(k) In some cases the tenure has been extended for administrative reasons, but the whole question is under consideration of the Secretariat Committee.

STATEMENT I.

Statement showing the percentage of Indian Officers to the total number of officers of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary in the Government of India Secretariat, according to Departments, for the years 1921, 1925, 1930 and 1935.

Serial No.	Name of Department.	1921.			1925.			1930.			1935.		
		Total No.	Indians.	Percentage.	Total No.	Indians.	Percentage.	Total No.	Indians.	Percentage.	Total No.	Indians.	Percentage.

SECRETARIES.

1	Legislative	1	1	1	1
2	Defence	1	1	1	1
3	Military Finance	1	1	100	...	1	1
4	Foreign and Political	2	2	2	2
5	Finance	1	1	1	1
6	Commerce	1	1	1	1
7	Railway	3	4	5	1	20	3	1	33½
8	Industries and Labour	1	1	1
9	Imperial Council of Agricultural Research	1	1	100	1	1	100
10	Education, Health and Lands	2	1	100	...	1	1	1	100
11	Home	1	1	1	1
12	Legislative Assembly	1	1	100	1	1	100
	Total	13	14	2	142½	17	3	17.6	15	4	26.7

JOINT SECRETARIES.

1	Legislative	1	1	1	2	1	50
2	Defence
3	Military Finance	2	1	50
4	Foreign and Political	1
5	Finance	1	1
6	Commerce	1
7	Railway
8	Industries and Labour	1	1
9	Imperial Council of Agricultural Research
10	Education, Health and Lands	1	1	100	1	1	100
11	Home	1	1	1
12	Legislative Assembly
	Total	4	1	25	2	5	1	20	7	2	26.6

DEPUTY SECRETARIES.

1	Legislative	2	1	50	2	1	50	2	1	1	100
2	Defence	1	1	1	1
3	Military Finance	4	5	1	20	4	4	1	25
4	Foreign and Political	3	2	2	3	1	33½
5	Finance	1	1	1	1
6	Commerce	2	1	1	1
7	Railway	2	5	6	1	16½	6	3	50
8	Industries and Labour	1	1	1	100	1
9	Imperial Council of Agricultural Research	1	1	100
10	Education, Health and Lands	2	1	50	1	1	100	1	1	100	2	1	50
11	Home	2	1	1	1	100	2	1	50
12	Legislative Assembly
	Total	19	2	10.5	20	3	15	20	5	25	22	9	41

STATEMENT II.

Statement showing the Departments of the Government of India Secretariat in which the posts of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary were held during the last 2 years ending with 1st February, 1936 by Indians and are now occupied by Europeans.

Department.	Whether any posts of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary were held during the last two years by Indian and are now occupied by Europeans.
Home Department	The post of Deputy Secretary which was held by an Indian till May 1935 is now held by a European.
Foreign and Political Department	No.
Finance Department	No.
Military Finance Department	No.
Defence Department	No.
Legislative Department	No.
Department of Commerce	No.
Railway Department (Railway Board)	No.
Department of Education, Health and Lands	Yes. The post of Deputy Secretary which was held by an Indian during a portion of the period mentioned is now held by a European.
Department of Industries and Labour	The posts of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary were held substantively by Europeans during the two years in question, but two Indians officiated for some months.
Legislative Assembly Department	No.
Imperial Council of Agricultural Research	Yes. The post of Vice-Chairman, Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, which has the status and pay of a Secretary to the Government of India and was occupied by an Indian fell vacant on the 26th October, 1935. Pending permanent arrangements which will be made during the current year, the post is held by a European in an officiating capacity.

Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar: In view of the fact that the reply refers to answers given in the other House in 1934, of which we are not in possession, will the Honourable Member be pleased to cause the answers to be printed in the proceedings of this House?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It was not an answer to a question; it was a debate on a Resolution. It is too long to quote, but it is in the official report of the Council of State Debates of the 10th February, 1934. Vol. I, page 28.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Have any of the posts of Army Secretary, Home Secretary, Finance Secretary or the Foreign and Political Secretary been held at any time by an Indian up till now?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: That will be found in the statement I have laid on the table.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: May I take it that no Indian has ever occupied any of these posts?

Sir H. P. Mody: There was one in the time of Akbar. (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: As far as I can see from a perusal of the statement, these posts have not been held by Indians since 1921. I have no information earlier than that.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: How many Joint Secretaries have been Indians in these Departments?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There have been some Indians as Joint Secretaries.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: How many?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: The Honourable Member had better read the statement; it is a long one.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: Has there been no Indian competent to hold any of these offices till now?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: I cannot say; the best man is selected.

Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar: How is it that no Indian has been selected?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is a matter of argument.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What is the answer to clause (h) of the question?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It is in regard to that that I invited the attention of the Honourable Member to the speech in the other House.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I want to know what is the present policy of the Government of India with regard to appointments to these posts. Is it Indianisation, or is it Europeanisation?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: It was stated quite clearly there that experienced and suitable men shall be selected: and, in the majority of cases, a previous training in the Provincial Secretariats is considered necessary.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that there is no definite policy of Indianisation in respect of these posts, that is to say, filling them by the best and most competent Indians?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: There is no preference.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Why not, when this is India, and we are paying the money?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This cannot be carried any further. Next question.

APPOINTMENT OF AN INDIAN AS DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

1069. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudallar**: (a) Is it a fact that no Indian has held the post of Deputy Secretary and above in the Finance Department since 1925? If so, what is the reason for it?

(b) What are the principles governing the appointment to these posts?

(c) Is it not a fact that for the post of Deputy Secretary a knowledge of accounts is essential?

(d) What are the qualifications of the present incumbent of the post?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: (a) The answer to the first part is in the negative, and the second does not, therefore, arise.

(b) to (d). Appointments are and will continue to be made solely on grounds of merit. Beyond that, I have nothing to say.

CONSTITUTION OF THE POLITICAL SECTION OF THE HOME DEPARTMENT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

1070. ***Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar**: Will Government please state:

(a) the present constitution of the Home Department of the Government of India, and the subjects assigned to the different officers of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary;

(b) if there is a 'Political section' and if so, the work done in that section, and the officer in charge of that section;

(c) when it was constituted;

(d) the number of clerks and Assistants, and how many of them are Europeans, Anglo-Indians and Indians;

(e) whether the present Superintendent is an Indian, or an Anglo-Indian, or a European;

(f) whether since the creation of this section, the Superintendent has always been an Anglo-Indian or a European;

(g) whether any special qualifications are required to hold the post of Superintendent, and if so, whether during all the years since its creation, no Indian has been fit to hold it; and

(h) whether they are prepared to consider the advisability of posting an Indian Superintendent to that post?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) A statement containing the information is laid on the Table.

(b) and (c). Yes; the Section was created in 1907 and deals mainly with work of a political nature, *i.e.*, political movements, communal disturbances, passports, foreigners (so far as they come within the purview of the Home Department) and the Information Bureau. The Deputy Secretary is in charge of the Section, but many urgent and important cases are submitted to the Secretary direct.

(d) At present three Anglo-Indian assistants and five Indian clerks are employed in the Section.

(e) He is a European.

(f) Yes.

(g) and (h). No special qualifications are required and Government propose to observe, in the future, the same considerations as they have done in the past in filling the posts of Superintendent in the Department, namely, the suitability and past experience of the person concerned and the administrative convenience of the Department as a whole.

Statement.

The permanent staff of the Home Department consists of 1 Secretary, 1 Joint Secretary, 1 Deputy Secretary, 1 Under Secretary, 1 Assistant Secretary, 5 Superintendents, 26 First Division assistants, 38 clerks and 6 shorthandwriters. There are at present an additional Joint Secretary and an additional Deputy Secretary on a temporary basis. The work assigned to officers of and above the rank of Deputy Secretary is indicated in the list below which is not exhaustive.

1. *Additional Deputy Secretary.*—Questions relating to :

- (i) recruitment for the clerical staff of the secretariat and attached offices.
- (ii) communal representation in the services.
- (iii) High Courts, Chief Courts and Courts of Judicial Commissioners.
- (iv) Civil and Criminal Law.
- (v) The All-India and Central Services in general and the Indian Civil Service in particular.
- (vi) The Public Service Commission.

2. *Deputy Secretary.*—Questions relating to :

- (i) The general political situation.
- (ii) Control of arms and ammunition.
- (iii) The Indian Police, the military Police Forces and the police in minor administrations.
- (iv) The Intelligence Bureau.
- (v) The Bureau of Public Information and general questions relating to publicity.
- (vi) The office establishment of the Home Department.
- (vii) The admission of foreigners into India.
- (viii) The repatriation of Indians from abroad.

3. *Additional Joint Secretary.*—Questions relating to :

- (i) Constitutional matters.
- (ii) High Courts, Chief Courts and Courts of Judicial Commissioners.
- (iii) Civil and Criminal Law.
- (iv) The procedure of the Government of India,
- (v) Prisons.
- (vi) The Andaman and Nicobar Islands (excluding questions relating to forests) and Coorg and the general and judicial administration in Delhi.

... (vii) The Warrant of Precedence and ceremonial matters.

. (viii) Naturalization.

4. *Joint Secretary.*—Matters arising out of the introduction of the new constitution which include the drafting of rules and regulations under various sections of the Government of India Act, 1935, and of the Order in Council under the third schedule to that Act, the amendment of the existing rules relating to the All-India Services and the revision of the Warrant of Precedence.

5. *The Secretary*, is responsible for all the work of the department and in particular deals with all the matters in the Deputy Secretary's list and all the matters except Nos. (iii) and (iv) in the additional Deputy Secretary's list.

APPLICATION OF STATE RAILWAY LEAVE RULES TO THE TEACHERS IN CERTAIN EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1071. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will the Honourable Member in charge of the Railways be pleased to state whether by Railway Board's letter No. E.-34-S.C.—28 of the 11th May, 1935, teachers in the East Indian Railway Schools in the plains have been brought under the State Railway Leave Rules published with the Railway Department's Resolution of the 20th February, 1930 with certain modifications necessary for vacation departments?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes, Sir.

APPLICATION OF STATE RAILWAY LEAVE RULES TO THE TEACHERS IN CERTAIN EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1072. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Is it a fact that by Rule 2(a), the State Railway Leave Rules, when they were introduced, were made applicable to employees appointed on or after the 1st April, 1930 and that they had no retrospective effect?

(b) Is it a fact that by Railway Board's letter of 11th May, 1935, all teachers, even though appointed long before 1st April, 1930, were brought under the new leave rules? If so, why was a departure made in the case of teachers appointed before 1st April, 1930?

(c) Is it a fact that the Railway Board's letter provided that, if there were any staff governed by other rules, they should be given the option of electing to come under the new rules referred to or of remaining under the rules by which they were then governed?

(d) Is it a fact that the Committees of several East Indian Railway Schools have throughout applied the East Indian Railway Leave Rules to the teachers employed therein? Are Government prepared to make enquiries?

(e) Is it a fact that the Superintendent, East Indian Railway Schools, in his minute sheet A. S. 136 of 22nd May 1935, refused to give the teachers the option which the Railway Board had directed, should be given to them?

(f) Are Government prepared to direct such enquiries to be made and, where it is found that certain rules were being applied to teachers, they should be given the option? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) These rules also apply to those employees who were appointed prior to 1st April, 1930, on the condition that when the revised rules for State Railway employees were introduced they would be brought under them. Other staff were, however, given the option to remain under the old rules or to elect to come under the New State Railway Leave Rules.

(b) and (c). Rules were made applicable to all staff who were not governed by any definite leave rules previously as Government considered that teachers in railway schools should be governed by definite leave rules. Staff to whom definite leave rules were previously applicable were given the option to remain on the old rules or elect to come under the new Leave Rules.

(d) The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative and the latter part does not arise. Previously the Committees of Management of certain schools granted leave to teachers, at their discretion, to whom no definite rules were then applicable.

(e) Government are informed that the minute sheet in question referred to European and Anglo-Indian and Indian schools on the plains. As there had been no accepted code of rules for the grant of leave to teaching staff of such schools no question of exercising any option arose.

(f) Government do not consider any enquiry necessary.

APPLICATION OF STATE RAILWAY LEAVE RULES TO CERTAIN TEACHERS OF EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1073. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Are Government prepared to direct that the State Railway Leave Rules shall apply only to teachers recruited on or after the 1st April, 1930, as in the case of other employees? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No. In this connection I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply which I have just given to parts (b) and (c) of his question No. 1072.

APPLICATION OF NEW LEAVE RULES TO CERTAIN TEACHERS OF EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1074. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Is it a fact that the Railway Board has recently decided in letter No. E.-34-SC—28 of the 11th May, 1935, to run the Railway schools on the lines of the Provincial Government schools?

(b) Is it a fact that Provincial Governments have applied their revised leave rules only to teachers appointed on or after a certain date and to those appointed before, if they were appointed provisionally with a warning? Is it a fact that teachers appointed before that date are governed by the old rules?

(c) Are Government prepared to consult the Education Departments of the Provinces, which are also contributing towards the maintenance of the schools, as to whether they consider it reasonable to apply the new leave rules to teachers appointed long ago?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) The matter is still under consideration.

(b) Government have no information.

(c) No. I have already stated that the Government considered it necessary to have a set of rules for teachers employed in railway schools who were not previously governed by any definite rules.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: With regard to part (d), did the Honourable Member make any inquiry to ascertain whether the allegation therein is correct?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Government do not think that any inquiry is necessary.

APPLICATION OF STATE RAILWAY LEAVE RULES TO TEACHERS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY OAKGROVE EUROPEAN SCHOOL.

1075. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Do the new State Railway Leave Rules as modified for vacation departments, apply to teachers in the East Indian Railway Oakgrove European School? If not, why not? And why are they applied only to the Indian schools in the plains?

(b) Do Provincial Governments make any distinction between teachers in Hill schools and those in schools in the plains, or between Anglo-Indian teachers and Indian teachers? Why does the Railway Board make such distinction?

(c) What are the leave rules by which teachers in the Oakgrove European school are governed? Are they governed by the East Indian Railway Leave Rules? When were these rules first made applicable to such teachers?

(d) Are Government prepared to consider the desirability of bringing under the same rules all the teachers in the Railway schools, whether for Indians or Anglo-Indians and Europeans, whether situated in the hills or in the plains?

(e) Are Government aware that teachers in the plains work under more trying climatic conditions than those employed in the hill schools?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes, to the teaching staff of the Oakgrove School appointed on or after 1st April, 1930. The Rules also apply to the teaching staff in European, Anglo-Indian and Indian schools in the plains.

(b) and (d). As regards the first part Government have no information. As regards the second part of (b) and (d) the rules now introduced are applicable to the teaching staff in all railway schools without any distinction.

(c) Teaching staff at Oakgrove School appointed prior to 1st April, 1930, have throughout been granted leave on the basis of the old East Indian Railway Company's Leave Rules on the merits of each case since 1921.

(e) Yes.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know from the Honourable Member, with reference to part (a) of the question, whether the Oakgrove European school is exclusively for Europeans?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I would require notice of that question.

LEAVE RULES OF TEACHERS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS IN THE PLAINS.

1076. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) What are the leave rules which govern State Railway employees recruited between 1925 and the 1st April, 1930, when the State Railway Leave Rules came into force? Are these governed by the Fundamental Rules?

(b) Is it a fact that teachers in the East Indian Railway Schools in the plains were first declared Government servants (and State Railway employees) only in June 1928, by the answer to Pandit H. N. Kunzru's question in the Legislative Assembly on the 1st February, 1928, and by the Railway Board's letter No. 6404-E. of the 26th June, 1928?

(c) Is it a fact that before June 1928, they were considered to be only servants of school committees? If so, why were they not brought under the Fundamental Rules (like other employees recruited at that time) subject, of course, to the provisions of Fundamental Rule 82 (b) applicable to vacation departments?

(d) Is it a fact that Mr. Smith of the Indian Educational Service was deputed in 1931 to inspect the Railway schools in the plains with a view to making recommendations for the introduction of improvements in the existing methods of administration of Railway schools?

(e) Is it a fact that in para. 89 of his report, Mr. Smith recommended that it is desirable that such of the teachers as have been declared to be Government servants, *i.e.*, non-gazetted Railway servants of Asiatic domicile (according to the declaration in the Assembly and the Railway Board's letter referred to above), be allowed to elect the old leave rules and be governed by Fundamental Rule 77 (a) (ii), 80, 81 (c) and (d), 82 (b) and 87 (b) (i), and that even in the case of those who were declared State Railway servants and who elected the new State Railway Leave Rules, a provision *similar* to (certainly not more rigorous than) rule 82 (b) should be added?

(f) Is it a fact that he did not recommend the provision abolishing leave on average pay even in cases of illness supported by a competent medical authority?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons for which the recommendations were rejected?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Government are informed that the subordinate staff, other than school teachers, recruited after the 1st January, 1925, and before the 1st September, 1928, are governed in the matter of leave by the Fundamental Rules. The subordinate staff engaged between 1st September, 1928, and 1st April, 1930, with a warning that they would be governed by the new leave rules when introduced, are governed by the new State Railway Leave Rules.

(b) Yes.

(c) Yes. The fact that they became railway servants even though engaged by Local Committees of the several schools did not necessitate altering their terms of service or granting them privileges to which they were not previously entitled.

(d) Yes.

(e) Yes, with the exception of a few phrases.

(f) and (g). Government did not accept Mr. Smith's recommendation as they did not consider it necessary to bring under the Fundamental Rules staff who were not previously governed by any definite leave rules, and were prior to 1928 considered as servants of the Managing Committees of the several schools who had framed no definite leave rules and granted leave to teaching staff at their discretion.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Did Government apply their mind to the report of Mr. Smith?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes, Sir.

DISCONTENT AMONG TEACHERS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1077. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Were the teachers in the Railway schools Railway servants before the declarations of 1928, and will Government be pleased to state why such of them as had been recruited long before 1st April, 1930 were not brought under the old East Indian Railway Rules?

(b) Are Government aware that this action of Government has caused hardship to and has aroused great discontent among many old teachers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given to parts (c), (f) and (g) of his question No. 1076.

(b) No.

LEAVE ON AVERAGE PAY IN CASES OF ILLNESS FOR TEACHERS IN THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1078. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Is it a fact that under the new rule 24 of the State Railway Leave Rules, teachers in the East Indian Railway schools in the plains, because they have ordinary school vacations, cannot be granted leave on average pay even in cases of *bona fide* illness certified by the Railway medical officers?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the principle behind the said rule?

(c) Are Government prepared to reconsider the position?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Yes, the staff availing of school vacation are not entitled to leave on average pay under Rule 24.

(b) Government consider that a deduction should be made from leave earned in respect of staff who enjoyed full vacation.

(c) No. Government consider that the requirements of the case are met by leave on half average pay which is admissible under the Rules.

SUBSCRIPTIONS PAID BY PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS IN INDIA AND BURMA TO CERTAIN NEWS AGENCIES.

1079. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** With reference to the Honourable the Home Member's reply to Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar's unstarred question No. 295 on April 1, 1935, that a sum of Rs. 61,200 was provided in the budget to meet the cost of subscription to News Agencies, namely the Reuters and the Associated Press of India, will Government be pleased to state:

(i) the amount of such subscriptions, which each of the Provincial Governments in India and Burma pays to the same news agencies;

- (ii) the terms of arrangement referred to in the Honourable the Home Member's reply to the unstarred question referred to above and the period for which such arrangement was entered;
- (iii) whether they consider the desirability of obtaining some relief for the British Indian taxpayer; and
- (iv) whether they are prepared to institute an enquiry into these subsidies?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (i) and (ii). Under the terms of the contract with Messrs. Reuters, Ltd., that news agency is required to supply their messages to such officers of the Government in British India as shall for that purpose be nominated from time to time by the Government of India in return for the payment of Rs. 49,200 per annum. No separate payment is, therefore, made by Local Governments for Reuters messages. As regards Indian News Agency telegrams, these are supplied to Government officials on ordinary commercial terms, namely, on payment of Rs. 30 per mensem for each copy of their news service supplied. The Government of India make provision to meet the cost of the Indian News Agency telegrams supplied to their own officers, while Local Governments make their own arrangements direct with the Indian News Agency regarding their own requirements. I regret that I am unable to give information regarding the amounts paid by Local Governments for this service.

(iii) and (iv). The payments are made so as to obtain for certain Government officers the telegrams issued by these news agencies. The question of reducing this expenditure was carefully examined in 1931 and I do not consider that any useful purpose would be served by a further enquiry now.

PASSES GRANTED TO REUTERS AND THE ASSOCIATED PRESS OF INDIA ON RAILWAYS IN INDIA AND BURMA.

1080. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number of first class complimentary passes granted to Reuters and the Associated Press of India by the State and the Company-managed railways in India and Burma?

(b) Are Government prepared to grant a similar concession to the representatives of other newspapers and news agencies? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) Since the 1st April, 1935, no passes have been granted to Reuters by Agents of State-managed Railways, but it is understood that the Agent of one Company-managed Railway, has given a card pass personal to the General Manager who supplies the Administration with news bulletins twice a day free of charge. The Associated Press were given one return journey pass on each of the following railways:

Burma, Eastern Bengal and South Indian.

The Railway Board have given the representative of the Associated Press, at the headquarters of the Government of India, a card pass over State-managed Railways, but have advised him that the privilege will be for a limited period.

(b) Railway Administrations have been advised that the Railway Board see no objection to their granting occasional cheque passes to press representatives provided, in the opinion of the Agent, the issue of such passes is in the interests of the railway. Passes have accordingly been issued to representatives of various other newspapers and news agencies, e.g., by the Eastern Bengal Railway to representatives of the *Amrita Basar Patrika* and the United Press of India, in connection with excursion trains and for publicity purposes.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Will Government see that this privilege is extended to other news agencies and representatives of other newspapers?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I think that the policy of which Railway Administrations have been advised by the Railway Board meets the situation.

Prof. N. G. Ranga: Are Government aware of the fact that no free passes are issued to the United Press on the South Indian Railway, while they are issued to the Associated Press?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: I am not aware of that, but I have read out in reply to part (b) of the question that Railway Administrations have been advised that, where necessary and where it is in the interests of the railway, cheque passes may be issued by them.

PRICE CHARGED AND ANNUAL RENT FOR THE PLOT OF LAND ON WHICH THE OFFICES OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS OF INDIA AND THE REUTERS ARE SITUATED IN NEW DELHI.

1081. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the price charged by them for the plot of land on which the offices of the Associated Press of India and the Reuters are situated in New Delhi today and the annual rent charged from those agencies?

(b) Is it a fact that on account of these offices being in close proximity to the stone grinding machine at one time, a temporary reduction in the annual rent was made by Government? If so, have the rents been now adjusted to their normal level? If not, why not?

(c) Are Government prepared to grant similar concessions to other newspapers and news agencies?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) The plot has been leased on a premium of Rs. 15,000 with an annual ground rent of Rs. 750.

(b) The reply to the first two parts is in the affirmative. The third part does not arise.

(c) No concession was involved in the premium or ground rent charged for the site, and the operation of the stone-grinding machine, which was the cause of a temporary reduction of rent, has also ceased. The question of granting concessions to other newspapers and news agencies does not, therefore, arise.

PAYMENTS MADE TO THE DELHI/SIMLA BRANCH OF THE REUTERS AND THE ASSOCIATED PRESS OF INDIA FROM THE "REUTBUCK ACCOUNT".

1082. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the nature and purpose of the "Reutbuck Account", which is maintained by the Home Department of the Government of India, and out of which regular payments are made to the Delhi/Simla branch of the Reuters and the Associated Press of India?

(b) What is the total amount paid every year to these two agencies out of this fund?

(c) Are Government aware that Mr. Durgadas of the Associated Press of India is paid a regular salary out of this fund every month?

(d) Are there any other members of the Associated Press staff similarly benefited?

(e) Are Government prepared to make proper enquiries if they are not aware of these payments to individual members of the staff of these two news agencies?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: (a) and (b). The Honourable Member presumably refers to the Cable Service grant which is also known as the Reutbuck Grant and which is provided in the budget for the purpose of making payments to Reuters news agency to enable them to send to England and other countries messages regarding current events in India of greater length than commercial considerations would ordinarily permit. This system was started in 1921 and its justification is that it makes it possible for additional news to be sent to all parts of the world at press rates and at press speed and ensures its publication in a wide variety of newspapers. Prior to retrenchment in 1981 the grant was Rs. 9,000. The retrenchment Sub-Committee recommended reduction to Rs. 6,000 but actually a reduction was first made to Rs. 4,500 and later to Rs. 3,000, at which figure the grant now stands.

(c), (d) and (e). Government have no information about, nor are they in any way concerned with, the objects on which Reuters expends its income.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Are these extra messages sent as a result of this concession, sent on the responsibility of the news agency, or are they censored by Government?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Government indicate on what subject they want more information sent, but the responsibility is the news agency's.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it, therefore, that, apart from indicating the subjects on which they want messages sent, they have nothing to do with the actual contents of the messages?

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

Mr. S. Satyamurti: And what is the criterion by which they judge of the nature of the subjects, on which they want these extra messages sent?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Subjects in which the public in other countries are likely to take an interest or news which the news agency would probably not send in full unless it had some special payment for doing so.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I take it that these messages are not sent with any particular propagandist object?

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik: Yes, broadly speaking, that is correct.

{

"DROP COPY" OF REUTERS TELEGRAMS TO LONDON DELIVERED FREE OF CHARGE AT THE INDIA OFFICE OR THE OFFICES OF THE REUTERS AND THE ASSOCIATED PRESS OF INDIA.

1083. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether a 'drop copy' of Reuters telegrams to London is delivered free of charge at the India Office or the offices of the Reuters and the Associated Press of India?

(b) Are Government prepared to grant similar concessions to other news agencies?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Government have no information.

(b) The question does not arise.

ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED FOR MR. U. N. SEN, MANAGING EDITOR OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS OF INDIA IN THE WESTERN COURT AT NEW DELHI.

1084. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Western Court on Queensway is reserved for the Members of the Central Legislature and Government officials, and whether Mr. U. N. Sen, Managing Editor of the Associated Press of India, has also been given accommodation there for the last six years?

(b) Are Government prepared to provide similar accommodation to the representatives of other newspapers and news agencies? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Quarters in the Western Court, New Delhi, are reserved for Members of the Indian Legislature and Government officials, but any vacant quarters can be allotted to others subject to the condition that they are vacated at 24 hours' notice if required for an entitled person. Mr. U. N. Sen has been occupying accommodation in the Western Court on this condition since the winter season of 1933-34.

(b) Yes, if accommodation is available and the allottee undertakes to vacate it at 24 hours' notice.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS MAINTAINED BY RAILWAY ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE CHILDREN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES.

1085. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state the number and location of educational institutions maintained

by the following Railway Administrations for the education of the boys and girls of their Indian, Anglo-Indian and European employees:

- (i) Eastern Bengal Railway;
- (ii) East Indian Railway;
- (iii) Bengal Nagpur Railway;
- (iv) Assam Bengal Railway;
- (v) Bengal and North Western Railway;
- (vi) Great Indian Peninsula Railway;
- (vii) Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway, and
- (viii) Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the amount spent by each of these Railway Administrations on the education of the children of their Indian employees, as also of the Anglo-Indian and European employees during the last three years?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state what control, if any, is exercised by them over the management of these educational institutions?

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

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE GIRLS OF INDIAN EMPLOYEES OF CERTAIN RAILWAYS.

1086. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that no educational institutions are maintained by the Eastern Bengal, East Indian, Bengal Nagpur, Assam Bengal, Bengal and North Western, Bombay, Baroda and Central India, and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Administrations for the education of the girls of their Indian employees?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government state the reasons therefor?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state the number and location of such institutions, and the costs incurred by the respective railways for their maintenance during the past three years?

(d) Do Government propose to take steps for the establishment of such schools? If so, what? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a), (b) and (c). Separate schools are not provided for girls but girls are admitted in the boys' schools.

(d) In view of the reason given in my reply to parts (a) to (c) it is not considered necessary to provide separate schools for the education of girls, and the policy of the Railway Department is not to incur further capital expenditure on the provision of additional schools.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS MAINTAINED BY CERTAIN RAILWAYS FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE GIRLS OF THEIR EUROPEAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN EMPLOYEES.

1087. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if educational institutions are maintained by the Great Indian Peninsula, Eastern Bengal, East Indian, Bengal Nagpur, Assam Bengal, Bengal and North Western, Bombay, Baroda and Central India, and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Administrations for the education of the girls of their European and Anglo-Indian employees?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state the number and location of such institutions and the respective costs incurred by the Railway Administrations on their maintenance?

(c) If the answer to part (a) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state why no such institutions are maintained?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (c). With the exception of the Bengal and North Western Railway, information regarding which is being collected separate schools for the education of the girls of European and Anglo-Indian employees are not maintained by the other Railways named, but girls are admitted in the schools maintained for boys.

(b) Does not arise.

PAUCITY OF QUARTERS FOR INDIAN TEACHERS OF RAILWAY SCHOOLS.

1088. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that all the teachers of the schools for European and Anglo-Indian boys maintained by various Railway Administrations are provided with quarters, while only a few of the Indian teachers of the schools for boys are provided with the same? If so, why?

(b) Do Government propose to provide all these Indian teachers with quarters? If not, why not?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I lay a statement on the table of the House giving the required information so far as State-managed Railways are concerned.

(b) No. The present policy of Government is to provide quarters only where private enterprise has not adequately met the demand for housing and where the staff concerned are required to live near the place of work.

Statement showing the position as regards the supply of quarters to teachers in European and Anglo-Indian and Indian schools maintained by the State-managed Railways.

N. 1.—At Oakgrove school which is a Boarding school all teachers are provided with quarters.

Schools on the plains both European and Anglo-Indian and Indian are day-schools and the policy with regard to the provision of quarters has been the same for both classes of schools. Quarters are ordinarily provided first for those teachers who have to do work in connection with the school outside school hours. Thereafter in certain cases quarters have been provided where railway quarters were available or where private enterprise had not adequately met the demand for housing.

E. B.—There are only four schools maintained by this Railway for the children of Railway employees and the four teachers of these schools are provided with Railway quarters. They are all European and Anglo-Indian schools. No other school for the children of employees is maintained by the Railway.

N. W.—On this Railway there is no European and Anglo-Indian school exclusively for boys. The three European and Anglo-Indian schools existing on this railway cater both for boys and girls. The teaching staff in these schools consists of eight lady teachers of whom five are provided with quarters attached to the schools.

With regard to Indian schools for boys, there are two such schools on this railway. The teachers of one of these two schools occupy railway quarters as no private quarters are available.

G. I. P.—All school teachers engaged on this railway prior to 1st April 1932, are provided with free quarters or an allowance of 10 per cent. of pay in lieu when quarters are not available. Those appointed after that date are not eligible for free quarters or any rent allowance. No schools are maintained on this railway for Indian children only.

Burma.—One teacher in European and Anglo-Indian school Yamethin and one teacher in each Anglo-vernacular school at Insein and Myittha are provided with quarters.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Are Government aware that all the teachers in Anglo-Indian schools are provided with quarters, and, if so, do Government propose to supply quarters to every one of the Indian teachers in Indian schools?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Quarters are provided in pursuance of the policy which I have indicated in reply to part (b) of the question, both to Anglo-Indian as well as to Indian teachers.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Is it not a fact that practically every Anglo-Indian and European teacher is provided with quarters, whereas many Indian teachers are not provided with any sort of quarters?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: With regard to that, I am afraid, I shall require notice.

CHURCHES ESTABLISHED BY CERTAIN RAILWAYS FOR THE USE OF THEIR EUROPEAN AND ANGLO-INDIAN EMPLOYEES.

1089. ***Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra:** Will the Honourable Member in charge of Railways be pleased to state the number and location of Churches established by the Great Indian Peninsula, Eastern Bengal, East Indian, Bengal Nagpur, Assam Bengal, Bengal and North Western, Bombay, Baroda and Central India and the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways for the use of their European and Anglo-Indian employees and the total cost incurred by them on this account?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Government have no information but are making enquiries.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: May I know if the result of those inquiries will be laid on the table?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: Yes; the information when available will be laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A MEDICAL COLLEGE IN RAJPUTANA.

1090. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria** (on behalf of Rai Bahadur Seth Bhagchand Soni): (a) Is it a fact that there is no medical college in Rajputana and the students from this province wishing to get medical education have to go to other provinces?

(b) Are Government aware that they are refused admission by the Medical Colleges of Lucknow and Lahore?

(c) Are Government prepared to consider the advisability of providing facilities for their training in any of the above Medical Colleges?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The question of obtaining facilities for students from Ajmer-Merwara for medical education in graduate courses is under consideration.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Are Government prepared to open a medical school or college at Ajmer for the benefit of students in Ajmer-Merwara and Rajputana?

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai: No: I do not think that the number of students offering would justify such a step.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A TECHNICAL AND ENGINEERING COLLEGE IN AJMER.

1091. ***Babu Baijnath Bajoria** (on behalf of Rai Bahadur Seth Bhagchand Soni): (a) Are Government aware that there is no technical and engineering college in Ajmer, and the students from this province cannot get such education in institutions of other provinces?

(b) Are Government prepared to provide facilities to students of this province to get admissions in engineering or technical institutions?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: (a) Yes, but except at the Poona College of Engineering there is, so far as I am aware, no specific bar at any technical or engineering institution against the admission of students from Ajmer or any other part of India. At the Poona College only residents of the Bombay Presidency are admitted.

(b) The Government of India decided in 1925 that students resident in centrally administered areas, who obtain from the Minor Local Governments concerned permission to appear at the entrance examination of the Thomason Civil Engineering College, Roorkee, and are admitted to the College, may receive financial assistance from the Government of India. The local Administration have funds for the grant of occasional scholarships to students in other colleges. No further facilities seem to be required.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Are Government prepared to arrange or provide training facilities in the Loco, and Carriage Workshops in Ajmer, for students from Ajmer and Rajputana specially?

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: In the railway workshops?

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce: That is a question for my Honourable colleague, the Railway Member.

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: If it is by reservation of certain seats for students from Ajmer, no.

Babu Baijnath Bajoria: Or in any other way, so that they may get training?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: In the usual way, Sir.

DISBURSEMENT OF THE AMOUNT SUBSCRIBED TO THE VICEROY'S QUETTA RELIEF FUND.

1092. ***Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal:** Will the Honourable the Home Member be pleased to state:

- (a) the total amount subscribed to the Viceroy's Quetta Relief Fund;
- (b) the amounts disbursed so far out of the above Fund under different heads, with special reference to the amounts given directly to Quetta sufferers by way of maintenance, business grants, relief to students, relief to orphans or reliefs to widows, etc.;
- (c) the amounts allotted to each district in each province under different heads;
- (d) how they propose to disburse the balance;
- (e) whether the money subscribed is for direct disbursement to Quetta sufferers or earmarked for other items also concerning Quetta earthquake, e.g., railway expenses, military expenses, salvage expenses, building of Government buildings, etc.;
- (f) the amount spent, if any, out of the above Fund on the railway fare and ship fare of British soldiers or other Britishers from Quetta to Home and the amount, if any, given to them per head by way of relief;
- (g) the estimated loss of life and property, respectively
 - (i) of Britishers; and
 - (ii) of Indians;
- (h) the number of houses salvaged and the time taken in this work
 - (i) by Government, and
 - (ii) by private agencies; and
- (i) the amount, if any, spent by Government out of Government treasury, other than the relief money, on items concerning Quetta Earthquake under different heads?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: (a), (b), (c) and (d). The Honourable Member is referred to the Government of India's press communiqué, dated the 1st February, 1936, a copy of which is placed on the table.

(e) In regard to military and railway expenditure as explained in paragraph 4 of the Press Communiqués of the 6th September, 1935 (a copy of which is also placed on the table) and the 1st February, 1936, the Relief Fund is being asked to bear the costs of food, blankets, medical comforts, etc., supplied from military stores to refugees immediately after the earthquake and half the cost of railway passes issued to them at that time. The Railways are bearing the other half. As stated in paragraph 6 of the Press Communiqué of the 6th September, 1935, the Relief Fund will in no circumstances be devoted to the construction of Government buildings. This is a charge against Government revenues. Government are also bearing, as a measure of relief to property owners who suffered in the earthquake, a large part of the cost of salvage and site clearance operations, and the Relief Fund is not being used for this object.

(f) In regard to the first part, the only figure that can be given without lengthy enquiries is that of £48,000 quoted as the approximate cost of transport of Europeans to the United Kingdom in the reply given to question No. 633 by Qazi Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi. Of this sum it is anticipated that considerably the larger share will fall to be borne by Government in respect of its own servants. In regard to the second part it is important to remember that the Fund is not being administered on a racial basis and that therefore separate accounts are not being maintained in respect of expenditure on Europeans and Indians. A sum of Rs. 54,000 has been placed at the disposal of the military authorities to enable the families of British warrant officers, non-commissioned officers and men evacuated from Quetta to the United Kingdom to replace essentials such as clothing on their arrival in England, and a sum of between £1,200 and £1,300 has been spent on civilian refugees there. Expenditure on civilian Europeans has also been incurred in India, but to ascertain its amount and the figure per head would involve a detailed accounts enquiry which Government do not consider it necessary to undertake.

(g) The Honourable Member is referred to replies given in this House on the 10th September, 1935, to parts (a) and (b) of a question asked by Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.

(h) In Quetta city approximately fifteen thousand shops and houses were destroyed or badly damaged. Systematic salvage thereof started on the 16th September, and is now substantially completed. Salvage by private agency did not commence till about the middle of December.

(i) Approximately Rs. 78 lakhs.

Press Communiqué.

In December last, the Honorary Secretary to the Viceroy's Quetta Earthquake Relief Fund intimated His Excellency's decision to close the collection of subscriptions at the end of that month. The receipts of the Fund amount to Rs. 51,77,910 to which is to be added the sum of £12,500 still to be received from His Majesty's Government.

2. Of this sum about Rs. 15 lakhs have been hitherto placed at the disposal of the local relief authorities. The amounts allotted to each, and the objects to which the expenditure is being devoted are shown briefly below :

(a) General purposes (temporary subsistence grants, medical comforts and appliances, educational grants, grants to restart in business) :

	Rs.
British Baluchistan	3,00,000
Kalat State	10,000
Sind	3,34,000
Punjab	3,70,000
Khairpur State	21,000
N. W. F. P.	22,000
Military authorities	55,000
*Miscellaneous	31,000
	11,43,000
(b) Grants for house-building material—	
British Baluchistan—rural	1,50,000
Kalat State	1,00,000
	2,50,000
(c) Grants for purchase of plough cattle—	
British Baluchistan	25,000
Kalat State	25,000
	50,000
(d) Grants for clearance of irrigation channels (Karezes)—	
Kalat State	50,000
(In British India this expenditure is being met from Government revenues).	
TOTAL	14,93,000

3. Local relief authorities have also been asked for estimates of their total probable expenditure. These show that, apart from Baluchistan and the Kalat State, a further sum of about 1 lakh will be needed, but it is possible that this sum will have to be supplemented. It is certain that further grants will be necessary for measures of rural relief (e.g., housebuilding and purchase of plough cattle) in Baluchistan and the Kalat State.

4. The figures given above do not take into account the very substantial expenditure incurred on measures of relief in the Earthquake area immediately after the disaster, when food, clothes, medical comforts, blankets, etc., were supplied to a large proportion of the civil population. The cost of these measures has been roughly estimated at 15 lakhs, but it is not possible at this stage to give a final figure nor is it yet known what proportion of the expenditure is chargeable to the Relief Fund. Further the value of free railway passes issued at that time to refugees has been calculated at Rs. 4½ lakhs. It has been decided that this expenditure will be shared equally between the Relief Fund and the Railway Department, (this decision involving in effect an addition of over Rs. 2 lakhs to Government's original contribution of Rs. 10 lakhs to the Relief Fund. The Relief Fund has also to bear the cost of passages of civilian refugees sent to their homes outside India. In respect of these no final account has yet been received by the authorities administering the Fund. The provision of transport facilities necessitated by the earthquake including the vessel 'Karanja', chartered by Government, cost, it is understood, about £47,000, but it is expected that considerably the larger share of this sum will fall to be borne by Government in respect of its own servants (civil and military).

5. It will be apparent that after meeting the liabilities against the Fund indicated above a substantial balance will be available for other purposes of relief. By far the most important of these is assistance in the shape of house-building grants to deserving persons who suffered in the earthquake and who desire to settle in the new Quetta. Help in such cases is the more necessary because in the interests of all

* This figure represents smaller sums for relief in this category remitted to the United Provinces, Delhi, Bombay, Madras, Kashmir State and the United Kingdom.

concerned a safer and consequently more expensive standard of building will be insisted on than was adopted in the past. This form of relief was an outstanding feature of the earthquake relief operations in Bihar in 1934 and it is eminently desirable that as large a sum as possible should be kept in hand for this purpose. The distribution of this relief cannot of course commence until the salvage and site clearance operations now in progress are completed and measures have been devised to regulate private building in the new Quetta.

(Sd.) B. M. STAIG,
Relief Commissioner.

NEW DELHI;

The 1st February, 1936.

Press Communiqué.

1. In their communiqué of the 26th June, 1935, the Government of India intimated certain decisions of His Excellency the Viceroy in regard to the administration of his Quetta Relief Fund. These included a statement of the objects on which expenditure from the Fund could be appropriately incurred. Orders have since been issued to relief authorities which authorise them to employ the Fund in giving grants to enable deserving persons among the middle classes (both tradesmen and professional men) to make a fresh start in business, and also to artisans to buy tools and materials with the same object. It is hoped that in this way a large number of individuals who suffered in the earthquake will be helped to resume, in some degree, the normal tenor of their lives.

2. In the earlier communiqué on this subject, it was stated that temporary subsistence grants would be given where there was no other means of support for a period of three months in the first instance. This period has now been extended up to another three months in cases where for reasons such as injury or ill-health or old age the discontinuance of the allowance would involve very grave hardship.

3. Apart from the expenditure incurred from the Fund on the objects indicated in this and the earlier communiqué, grants have been made to the local authorities in Baluchistan and the Kalat State amounting to Rs. 2½ lakhs in all at present, to enable them to meet expenditure on the provision of housing materials for those in the devastated area whose homes are in ruins. A grant of Rs. 50,000 has also been made to the Kalat State for the reconstruction of Karezes (subterranean irrigation channels) a work of pressing urgency in the interests of the next harvest.

4. The total sum already placed at the disposal of local authorities from the Fund for the objects referred to above, including the sum of Rs. 1 lakh contributed by the Punjab Government, and returned to them shortly after the earthquake, for relief purposes in the Punjab, amounts to about Rs. 7 lakhs, and estimates of their further requirements will be dealt with when received. It should not however be concluded that this sum represents the total expenditure debitable to the Fund up to date. It takes no cognizance of the cost of relief measures adopted by the authorities in Quetta immediately after the disaster, (a) to provide food, shelter, clothing, bedding and medical care and comforts for the stricken community, and (b) to evacuate refugees from the devastated area. The measures under (a) involved very heavy draws on military stores of rations, tents, blankets, and medical appliances and drugs, and under (b) abnormal consumption of petrol supplied by the army in connection with transport for relief work in Quetta itself, and the liberal provision outside Quetta of facilities by rail and sea. For the present, all the above expenditure has been charged to the budgets of the departments of Government in which it has been incurred. No reliable figures of its amount are yet available but a very rough estimate of total military expenditure to date arising in connection with the earthquake is Rs. 40 lakhs, of which it is roughly calculated that Rs. 15 lakhs was incurred on behalf of the civil population. No figures have yet been received by the Government of India showing the cost of the free passes issued at Quetta to refugees to enable them to proceed to places where they had relatives or a prospect of employment. It is obvious that a considerable proportion of the expenditure on these relief measures is properly chargeable to the Relief Fund, and not to public revenues. A decision as to the precise allocation of this cost between Government revenues and the Fund cannot be reached until the facts and figures are more accurately known. But it will be apparent that the sum already properly debitable to the Fund is far in excess of the Rs. 7 lakhs placed at the disposal of local relief authorities. That sum

also takes no account of any future commitments that may have been entered into by local authorities in connection with educational facilities (which sometimes include maintenance) for children involved in the earthquake.

5. Detailed information as to the number of cases dealt with and the form of relief given is issued periodically to the press by local relief authorities and it is not proposed to reproduce statistics here.

6. From enquiries received by the Relief Commissioner based, it is understood, on statements appearing in the press, it seems necessary to reassure the public that the Relief Fund will in no circumstances be devoted to the reconstruction of Government buildings in Quetta. This work will be financed from Government revenues.

7. Certain criticisms of the administration of the Fund in regard to the extent of the relief given in individual cases, delay in giving it and the smallness of the total sum disbursed have been adduced in certain sections of the press, with special reference to Sind. Examination of these criticisms has disclosed that the relief given has been adequate and suitable with reference to the status of the beneficiary, and that any appearance of delay in affording it is attributable solely to the working arrangement arrived at between the local authorities administering His Excellency the Viceroy's Relief Fund and the Committee in charge of the Mayor's Fund in Karachi. It was definitely agreed between these bodies that the Mayor's Fund would be applied to immediate relief and the Viceroy's Fund to more permanent relief. Under this arrangement and owing to the existence of other funds in Sind for relief work, it would have involved a grave waste of available resources to have incurred expenditure from the Viceroy's Fund on cases which were being otherwise adequately assisted. The lack of foundation for the criticism as to the smallness of the total amount disbursed from the Viceroy's Fund to date will be apparent from the facts given in paragraph 4 of this communiqué.

8. In this connection it may be observed that some of the requests for assistance which have been received to enable persons to resume business refer to very large sums and appear to be based on the assumption that the Fund will be in a position to compensate the claimant entirely for the loss he has sustained. This assumption is unlikely to prove warranted. Where claims for help on a large scale are based primarily on the idea of compensation, and their examination discloses ground for the view that the claimant is not without other resources, the consideration of the claim must inevitably be delayed until fuller information is available as to the extent of the final demands on the Fund, in order that ultimately its resources may be distributed equitably among the genuinely deserving cases. In cases where pending final consideration the need for immediate help is established, temporary assistance will be given. This assistance will not be confined to refugees in India. The Secretary of State is already disbursing temporary relief to deserving persons who have been evacuated to England.

SIMLA;

The 6th September, 1935.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: May I know what is the balance in the Relief Fund?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: The original receipts were Rs. 51,77,910 to which is to be added the sum of £12,500 still to be received from His Majesty's Government.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: May I know whether Government have decided in the case of people whose houses have been demolished by the earthquake, to give them any relief by lending money as in the case of the Bihar earthquake, on the property for rebuilding their houses?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: It is certainly the intention to give building advances. All that is fully explained in these communiqués which might have been read before and can be read now, because I am placing copies of both of them on the table of the House.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I wanted to know the balance of the money that is in the hands of the Government now, in the Relief Fund.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: Full particulars will be found in these communiqués: if you wish me, Sir, to read the whole communiqué to the House, I can do so. It is a very lengthy document.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I only wanted to know if the communiqué contains that figure. If not, I want to know what it is?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I must ask for notice of that question, because I have not got the figures with me.

Mr. Sri Prakasa: Are Government aware that, in the view of some observers, the funds are not being properly administered? (Opposition Laughter.)

(No answer.)

CASUAL LEAVE FOR THE STAFF OF THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1093. ***Mr. Sham Lal:** (a) Are Government aware that the staff of the North Western Railway generally does not get casual leave in time?

(b) What objection have Government in granting such leave by introducing twelve hours duty as done in sick cases?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

ADDITIONAL PASSES ENJOYED BY THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY OFFICERS.

1094. ***Mr. Sham Lal:** Is it a fact that the North Western Railway officers in addition to their metal passes on which they can travel with their families, get more passes than their subordinates?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: A metal pass covers the journey of an officer when on duty and of his family if accompanying him. If his family travels without him, a cheque pass counting against the number annually admissible to the officer must be obtained as in the case of all other staff.

ADDITIONAL PASSES ENJOYED BY THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY OFFICERS.

1095. ***Mr. Sham Lal:** (a) Is it a fact that the number of passes in the case of officers on railways has been increased from 16 to 24, while in the case of subordinates reduced from five to three?

(b) What principle has been adopted in introducing this change?

(c) Are Government prepared to give to the subordinate officers the same facilities of passes over foreign Railways as are given to officials and the staff of the Clearing Accounts Office?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to the reply given by Mr. P. R. Rau to Bhai Parma Nand's question No. 65 on the 22nd February, 1935. No change has been made in the number of passes admissible to subordinates, but the number of passes admissible to officers has been increased to twenty-four single journey passes.

(b) Prior to 1st April, 1933, there was no limit to the number of passes admissible to officers, but as the principle of limitation had been adopted, it was considered that the subsequent limitation to twelve was somewhat drastic.

(c) I am unable to understand the Honourable Member's question. The number of passes admissible over foreign railways to the officials and staff of the Clearing Accounts Office is the same as the number admissible to other staff.

Seth Haji Abdoola Haroon: Is the Honourable Member aware that on 12 Noon, the North Western Railway so many passes are issued that passengers are not able to get accommodation even in second class compartments?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: No, Sir; passes are issued in accordance with the rules laid down.

RELIEF TO THE TRANSPORTATION STAFF ON THE NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

1096. ***Mr. Sham Lal:** (a) Is it a fact that the number of Transportation staff over the North Western Railway, who fail to pass in class 'A' but pass in class 'B' at the periodical medical examination, are generally discharged and not provided in other departments with 'B' class?

(b) Are Government aware that this practice involves great hardship to the Transportation staff who lose their health on account of night duty?

(c) Are Government prepared to amend the rule in such a way as to give relief to the Transportation staff in this direction?

The Honourable Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan: (a) and (b). Government are informed that figures are not readily available to show the number of Transportation staff failing to pass in Class A, but found fit in class B, having been found alternative employment. Since the economy campaign started in 1931, requiring the absorption of surplus staff and the re-engagement of those retrenched, it has not been as easy to find alternative employment for this class of staff as it was prior to that date. Every endeavour is made to find alternative employment for the staff declared medically unfit for employment in their own category.

(c) If the Honourable Member will specify the rule to which he is referring I will endeavour to reply.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE FOR ROADS.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): I have to inform the Assembly that up to 12 Noon on Monday, the 9th March, 1936, the time fixed for receiving nominations for the Standing Committee on Roads, only seven nominations were received out of which one Member has since withdrawn his candidature. As the number of candidates is now equal to the number of vacancies, I declare the following Members to be duly elected, namely:

- (1) Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand,
- (2) Mr. Umar Aly Shah,
- (3) Mr. Sham Lal,
- (4) Babu Kailash Behari Lal,
- (5) Mr. G. Morgan, and
- (6) Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.

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

DEMAND No. 31—FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT—*contd.*

Perilous Nature of the Forward Policy pursued by the Government of India—contd.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The discussion will now be resumed on the cut motion relating to the frontier policy.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe (Foreign Secretary): Sir, when the session was interrupted last evening, I was endeavouring to refute the suggestion which had been made on the other side that the Afridis never commit any offence of any kind and that it is entirely Government's oppression which leads to trouble with them. I mentioned several offences which they had committed, and I need only say further that the suggestion which was made that we have stopped their allowances is incorrect. The allowances were only held up for a short time, and they have now all been paid out and accepted. The only sum which is still held in reserve by His Excellency the Governor is of payments which are known as *lungis* and *maliki* which are payments intended as rewards to individuals

Dr. Khan Sahib (North-West Frontier Province; General): On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I never said that their allowances were stopped. I said they were going to be stopped, and that negotiations were going on. I never said that they were stopped.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: My Honourable friend is possibly better informed than I am as to the intentions of Government, but I hardly think that is the case. What I said was that allowances were held up only for a

short time and that they have now all been paid out. There are certain *maliki* allowances which are still held in reserve, and the question of their possible re-distribution is still under consideration. That is all that has been done, and I wish to make it quite clear that that has been done, not because they have so far refused to accept the road, but because their behaviour or the behaviour of the *Maliks* has not been sufficiently satisfactory to justify these payments being made immediately. We have no intention,—and I should like to make this quite clear,—we have no intention of pushing through that road by force. We have always said so and stick to that.

Before I leave the question of Afridis, Sir, there is one point which I should like to make, and that is, it has been suggested that the Government of India are entirely responsible for quickening the pace of this peaceful penetration policy. I should like to put a different point of view before the House which will perhaps lead them to take a different view of the reasons for any quickening of the pace that there may have been. Our idea is, and this has the support of a number of Indian gentlemen in the Frontier who have been intimately acquainted with the tribes for many years, that the advent of reforms in the North-West Frontier has reacted on the tribes. The tribes, including the Afridis who are very long headed people, observe the advance of education and democracy among the Pathan population of the settled districts, and the wiser people among the Afridis ask themselves what part they are going to play in these new developments. They realise that they cannot remain for ever outside this new democracy. With no posts for their sons and no tuning of their own democratic gifts to the orchestra of the new Councils, if they have no education, no motor cars, in a word no progress down the road marked out for India, what, they say, is going to happen to them? This feeling, I think, had expression in the agreement which the Afridis made with regard to the road, and although reactionary forces have triumphed for the moment, that feeling will, I think, persist. In the nature of things the new thought has come to stay, and the old belief in isolation is being affected. In any case, the Afridi awakening, however uncomfortable for the Afridis, is not the result of an aggressive policy of the Government of India. Nor is it true, in my view, that the Frontier is really unrestful at the moment. Force has been applied in more than one Frontier area during the past few years, but such force in the Mohmand or lower areas was necessary to resist the aggression of such persons as Badshah Gul and the Faquir of Alingar and to hold the tribes to their agreements. For evidence, that the old spirit of aggression is still in existence, we need go no further back than to 1930, and I maintain that any weakening of Government authority, any hesitation to inflict punishment for misdoing will still bring the tribesmen down in swarms into plains

Mr. M. Asaf Ali (Delhi: General): Has it ever done so before?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: The new idea to which I referred, if we do not use force when it is necessary in order to resist aggression, will fail, because the tribes will themselves feel that it is no use entering a civilization and a system which is unable to protect itself.

[Sir Aubrey Metcalfe.]

I now turn to one or two of the criticisms which were made by individual Honourable Members in supporting this cut motion. One was made by my friend, Syed Murtuza Sahib, who suggested that what we were doing on the Frontier was comparable to what Italy is doing to Abyssinia when we attempt to introduce civilization among the Afridis or others. I maintain, Sir, that that analogy is entirely unjustifiable. The Afridis and all the tribes who live in the tribal belt between the administered districts and the Durand line are subjects of India. They belong to India, and it is, I maintain, our duty, to give them some of the benefits which they cannot obtain elsewhere.

There is one point which I have not yet made which was made by the Honourable the Mover of this motion, and that was with regard to Gilgit agency. The Honourable the Mover said that our recent proceedings in Gilgit had brought us into direct and close touch with an Empire from which we had hitherto been separated by some belt or buffer State. Well, Sir, the facts are not so. It is possibly our own fault that we have not made facts clear, but I should like to take this opportunity of doing so. The Gilgit Agency and the Political Agent there have been in existence for the last fifty years. The Political Agent has always been responsible for the control of certain small principalities, such as Hunza and Nagar, which march directly with the Russian Empire, and although those small principalities are under the suzerainty of the Kashmir Darbar and have always been, the political control over them for the last fifty years has been exercised by the Political Agent. There is another area which lies inside, that is, on the Indian side of those principalities, which is known as the Wazarat. That, of course, is under the sovereignty of the Kashmir State and still remains so, and it was administered, until last year, by a Kashmir official known as the Wazir. That system resulted in a good many difficulties of the kind which are perhaps invariably produced by dvarchry. There was a British Political Agent there who exercised political control and also a Kashmir official, and it was frequently difficult to reconcile the position of those two officials.

An Honourable Member: Is there no time limit for the Honourable Member?

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: Do you wish me, Sir, to observe the time limit strictly?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair understands the Honourable Member took over fifteen minutes yesterday.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: It is very difficult in the space of a few minutes to answer all the questions.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair allows thirty minutes to the Member replying on behalf of the Government, and, if so, the Honourable Member has three minutes more.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I only wished to take this opportunity of explaining certain things which I had not had an opportunity of explaining before

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can seize another occasion for the purpose.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: The position about Gilgit, as I was saying is, that previously there was a Kashmir official side by side with the Political Agent. All that has happened now is that the administration has for a period of sixty years been handed over by the Kashmir Darbar to the Political Agent. It is purely a domestic arrangement, and one in which the Government of India, although they are faced with a certain amount of extra expenditure on civil administration, gained very substantially, and, in fact, even more substantially, on savings with regard to troops. There was previously in this area a number of Kashmir troops, two-thirds of the expenditure of supplying which was paid by the Government of India, and it was largely in order to save that payment that this new system was evolved. It adds no international responsibilities, whatever, to what we had before, and we only hope that it may result in the avoidance of friction when we administer ourselves. We also hope that it may lead to an increase of trade with Chinese Turkestan by providing an easier route from Abbottabad direct to Chilas and Gilgit, which will enable trade from India to some extent to compete with the Russian trade in Sinkiang. I feel sure that that is not a matter which the House will object to, seeing that they have themselves on more than one occasion impressed on the Government of India the necessity of giving assistance to Indian trade with foreign countries.

So much for Gilgit. I should like to have dwelt on the question of expenditure which my Honourable friend raised, but in the short time at my disposal, I am afraid that that will not be possible. I shall, therefore, now conclude with a very few general remarks on the subject of frontier policy.

I have endeavoured to impart information, but it has not been my intention to be dogmatic on the subject of our frontier policy. We fully realise that that policy is not a counsel of perfection. All that we claim is that it is the best, and, on the whole, the most economical solution that we have been able to find for what is admittedly an exceedingly difficult and contentious question. The policy has been evolved as the result of experiment, trial and error extending over a large number of years, and represents an honest and conscientious attempt to fulfil the obligations which we conceive we have to the various parties concerned, including the Indian taxpayer. It is based not at all on imperial considerations, but solely on what is believed to be the interests of India.

An Honourable Member: No.

Sir Aubrey Metcalfe: I claim that and I shall continue to claim it in spite of negatives from the other side. It is subject to constant criticism, not only in this House, but in the press and in the various departments

[Sir Aubrey Metcalfe.]

of the Government of India, and I can assure the House that there is no more argus-eyed critic of our frontier policy than the Honourable the Finance Member himself. I should also like to assure the House that we welcome criticism, particularly, if it is of a constructive kind, and if there is any person within or without this House who can produce a better or a more economical solution for the frontier problem, I shall be only too happy to consider it.

Dr. Khan Sahib: May I say one word, Sir?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. The question is:

“That the demand under the head ‘Foreign and Political Department’ be reduced by Rs. 100.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—72.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
 Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanaam.
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ba Si, U.
 Badrul Hasan, Maulvi.
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
 Nath.
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
 Deehmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
 Fazli-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur
 Shaikh.
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
 Gauba, Mr. K. L.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Giri, Mr. V. V.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.
 Hans Raj, Raizada.
 Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
 Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
 Khan Sahib, Dr.
 Khare, Dr. N. B.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
 Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir
 Sayad Muhammad.
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
 Muhammad Ismail Khan, Haji
 Chaudhury.
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Syed.
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
 Raghunath Narayan Singh, Chou-
 dhuri.
 Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
 Sant Singh, Sardar.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Sham Lal, Mr.
 Shaikat Ali, Maulana.
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
 Nawab.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.
 Thein Maung, Dr.
 Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.
 Viswanji, Mr. Mathuradas.
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

NOES—47.

McCott, Mr. A. S. V.	Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.
Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.	Leach, Mr. F. B.
Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.	Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
Aminuddin, Mr. Saiyid.	Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Ayyar, Diwan Bahadur R. V. Krishna.	MacDougall, Mr. R. M.
Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama.	Metcalf, Sir Aubrey.
Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.	Milligan, Mr. J. A.
Bewoor, Mr. G. V.	Morgan, Mr. G.
Buss, Mr. L. C.	Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.
Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.	Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
Dalal, Dr. R. D.	Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
Das-Gupta, Mr. S. K.	Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
Dash, Mr. A. J.	Rau, Mr. P. R.
Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.	Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.	Sale, Mr. J. F.
Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.	Sarma, Mr. R. S.
Grigson, Mr. W. V.	Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
Hands, Mr. A. S.	Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.
Hudson, Sir Leslie.	Singh, Rai Bahadur Shyam Narayan.
Hutton, Dr. J. H.	Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.
James, Mr. F. E.	Spence, Mr. G. H.
Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.	Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
Khurshaid Muhammad, Khan Bahadur Shaikh.	Witherington, Mr. C. H.
	Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir Muhammad.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 28—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Congress Party will move the next motion under Demand No. 28—Executive Council.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,49,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1937, in respect of the ‘Executive Council’.”

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

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,49,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1937, in respect of the ‘Executive Council’.”

No Confidence in the Government.

Mr. S. Satyanurti (Madras City: Non Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I rise to move?

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced to Re. 1.”

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

Sir, I want to begin by submitting to the House that the constitutional significance of this cut motion is that we want to refuse supplies to the Executive Council. Unfortunately for us, the bulk of that demand is, so far as their salaries are concerned, non-voted, but, to the extent to which this House can constitutionally express its dissatisfaction with the work of the Executive Council today, I want the House to support this motion, and to refuse supplies to the Executive Council. It merely seeks to express the idea that we—I am speaking of the organised non-official Parties in the Assembly, excepting perhaps the European Group, although I shall watch with interest their attitude on this motion, “very interesting” I hope,—and we want to express the opinion that we have no confidence in this Government. (Hear, hear.) Sir, if this vote is carried by this House, and if then the Government be responsible, they ought to resign; but, since I know they are not responsible, I merely want that they should at least reform themselves, if they can.

An Honourable Member: They won't do either.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I recognise the limitations of the Government of India Act, 1919; I recognise that they cannot today accept parliamentary responsibility to this House; but, at the same time, reading that Act carefully, I have not read it to mean that the Act casts upon this Government the duty of being neither good, nor honest, nor efficient in the discharge of their duties. My challenge against this Government is, not that it is not responsible, because it is, parliamentarily speaking, impossible for them, but that, in the discharge of their duties, they have shown neither goodness, nor honesty of purpose, nor efficient management of the affairs of this country. (Hear, hear.) I want to know from the Government spokesmen themselves what they are here for; and I am willing to accept and apply that very test itself, are they here to serve the people? (Voices: “No, no”.) If they are not, then I say that it is not a question of responsibility, but it is a question of their not doing the elementary duty of a civilized Government, responsible or irresponsible. Their attitude seems to be this:

“We know better than your leaders what is good for your people. Your leaders, are all wrong. We are your true leaders and your true masters. Follow us. Ask no questions. Move no resolutions. Move no cut motions, except what we like. And you will be all right.”

Mr. M. S. Aney (Berar Representative): You have left out adjournment motions. (Laughter.)

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, I ask this question—have they served the interests of the people of this country? I ask all non-official Members of this House to answer this straight question with a straight answer: have this Government truly and honestly served the supreme interests of the people? Sir, I have no doubt that the only answer can be an emphatic “no”, to that question. This “responsibility”, Sir, of the “grand-father” asleep, or dead, or awake, is over-done,—that of the Secretary of State for India. Now, they have themselves said that they won't even place on the table of the House the correspondence which passes between them and the Secretary of State.

Sir, I have been the supreme victim of question-time in this House.
(Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: Supreme victim?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I say this, Mr. President, that, time after time, when we ask questions and supplementary questions, in the happy phrase of the Honourable the Home Member, in the manner of police-court cross-examination, we have to do it, because the Treasury Benches have today come to occupy the position of police-court witnesses who will not speak the truth unless they are cross-examined mercilessly. ("Hear, hear" and Laughter.) I know, our methods some times smack of police-court cross-examination, but what is the use? I get no results; they non-co-operate with us. First we are told, "I want notice", then "The question does not arise", then, a second's silence, and then the happy phrase for them drops from your august mouth, "next question, please". They are, therefore, saving themselves again and again by trying to evade answering straight questions with straight answers. Thus, I ask my Honourable friend, the Law Member—"when are the next elections for the Provincial Legislatures coming?", and he says, "I will consult public opinion, as and when we choose, and will tell you later on". Now, is that co-operation? Is that honesty? Is that goodness? Is that efficiency? Then, I ask a question about Indian shipping and what happens to it? My Honourable friend, another Indian Member,—and this is the worst part of it, I need not comment on that further—says: "I want notice. I will examine it, when I get the information. If you will put down a question, I will consider", and Indian shipping stands where it does! On the question of the exports of gold, there is my friend over there, the Finance Member, who assumes the God, affects to nod, and shakes the spheres, says, "No". Sir, I suggest that the Government have consistently ignored the interests of this country, and why? I know that; Britain must live: and, therefore, India must perish. Sir William Joynson-Hicks, now, I think, Lord Brentford

An Honourable Member: He is dead

Mr. S. Satyamurti: The late Lord Brentford spoke the truth when he said:

"I don't agree with the nostrum of these missionaries who say that 'we are in India for the good of the Indian people; we are there, because every fifth Englishman draws and earns his bread directly or indirectly from India.'"

That is, of course, true, and Government know it,—that they cannot serve the interests of the people of this country.

Now, I want to say a word about the Finance Member, but I shall not take long over it, I shall deal with it later on; I rather like the Finance Member, both he and I believe in calling a spade a spade and not a useful, agricultural implement that it is (Laughter); and he spoke, Sir, the truth when he said that he seeks to please nobody here, he seeks to please himself. Now, there, he was more frank than his colleagues. All of them exactly feel the same thing: they want to please nobody, they only want to "please" themselves. (Hear, hear.) Now, I draw their attention to a few tragic facts of Indian finance.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

The military expenditure of this country now stands at Rs. 45 crores, but, if it includes all the items which it ought to include, particularly the two crores' loss on strategic lines, it is nearer Rs. 50 crores than 45 crores, and it is more than half the revenues of the Government of India: and, even then, we are told by the Commander-in-Chief, in another place, that that is a small estimate, it will go up hereafter, to 50 crores, 55 crores. God knows how much! And, do they spend that in their own country, even in their own country, or even in the dominions; and what is this army for? Not to protect India, but to protect British Imperial interests in India. So far as we are concerned, this army surely is not here to protect the skeletons in our villages who have nothing to live on, whose continued life is a dreary struggle with poverty, disease and ignorance, and the dominating features of which are only deaths from epidemics, gross infantile mortality, and the visitations of the exacting revenue officials. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, it seems to me that all this expenditure on the army is merely designed to protect British interests; and I want to say this, that if Britain has no interest in this, then we can cut down our military expenditure by half almost immediately, because we have no enemies and Britain has no friends. Mahatma Gandhi's indictment of the economics and finance of this country, wherein he has truly and significantly described the skeletons in our villages, is one for which this Government, and we, the townsmen, have got to answer. What is our average income? Two annas per head per day, at the most. What is our average life? Twenty-three or twenty-five years. What is the percentage of our literacy? About ten per cent. Where are our village communications and roads? What is the extent of medical relief given to us? What is the amount of water supply to our villages? Today, there are hundreds of villages in this country, for which there is no adequate, much less a protected, water supply, and I want to ask my Honourable friend who dreads the phrase "economic planning", if all the precious occupants of the Treasury Benches have ever applied their minds to these fundamental problems of life and death for this country. Have they framed a programme of universal primary education, a programme of public health and medical relief, a programme of water supply? Have they done anything like these? Have they made any estimate of the cost? My Honourable friend, who wants to play deputy-Providence to Provincial Autonomy, does not think it his duty to bestow any attention on the services which our villagers have a right to get, but which they do not get. Today, in the villages, our villagers pay the bulk of the revenue for provincial revenues. What do they get in return? Nothing, or almost nothing. Now, I want to say one word: look around yourself! Look at all this pomp and pageantry, look at the twenty odd crores sunk on this new Capital—New Delhi—a dead city half the year and half alive during the rest of the year; within ten miles of this very city, you have got villages where people live under conditions under which animals will not be allowed to live in Europe. Yet, the Government feel no responsibility, the Government have none for even thinking about these things.

Then, take the question of the higher national interests. Indian shipping, I have referred to: Indian banking, Indian commerce, Indian insurance, Indian industries: do these get any help from the Government? The Honourable the Finance Member says: "You shall not monkey with

the ratio", but he goes on monkeying with the tariff policy of this Government, limited as it is. Every time he gets a chance, he sheds copious tears for the consumers of this country, and threatens all and sundry that if he has his way, protection shall go. How can Indian industries grow under this withering threat of perhaps the most powerful Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. Then, have this Government followed a consistent and generous policy of Swadeshi, protecting and encouraging Indian industries? I know they have been compelled by public opinion to adopt what is called the stores purchase policy, but I charge them that it is halting, inconsistent, and does not go the whole hog. Have they any policy of creating and developing industries in this country? All this plea of want of money is mere moonshine. They find 20 crores for Delhi and, out of his hat, the Honourable the Finance Member has produced or promises to produce something to the tune of nine crores for rebuilding Quetta on the present site—I am taking all the costs, including posts and telegraphs and railways, and money already spent, and future commitments. Where do they get all this money? When we ask for money for other Departments, the excuse of no money is put forward. But when the Government want money, it comes forth somehow or other.

Unemployment stalks the land. They may deny it, but a former Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, has produced a report which is at once a challenge and a rousing call to this Government. How do they propose to react to it? They will do nothing; I think the idea seems to be to this Government that India should be the happy hunting ground of foreigners; only they will guild the chains of some of us with titles, decorations and jobs, but we must all be political and economic slaves.

As for Indians overseas, I am glad to see the unfamiliar figure of the Honourable Member of Government in charge of this portfolio here, for whom, Sir, my Honourable friend his Secretary, deputises very efficiently here, if I may say so respectfully. But what has happened, in spite of his smiles, in Kenya, South Africa, East Africa, Zanzibar and even in the dominions? Sir, a man may smile, and smile and smile—I will not finish the sentence. But, Sir, the tragic truth was admitted by a distinguished holder of this portfolio sometime ago, I mean Sir Fazl-i-Husain, when he said truly, but tragically:

"We are all Asians, and, therefore, we cannot get proper treatment in these countries."

The Government might say: "What can we do." I make them a present of what a previous Viceroy did in Madras. When Indians were being persecuted in South Africa, and when Mahatma Gandhi was leading the magnificent Satyagraha movement, Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy, said in a public speech in Madras:

"I approve of the movement of Satyagraha by Indians; no Government can help sympathising with it."

Will this Government have the guts to stand up to these Governments, and say: "We are not going to stand this nonsense any further, we shall not tolerate this treatment of Indians as inferiors in those countries".?

Then, Sir, when we take up any work of rural reconstruction, as by the all-India Village Industries Association, the contribution of this Government is the notorious Hallet Circular, warning officials against the

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

activities of the Association. Well, Sir, the Government have been complaining all along that we do not co-operate with them. But when we take up some work in which we can co-operate and we will co-operate with you, their prejudices are so great as to seek to non-co-operate with us. Indeed, if a Congressman says two and two make four, just for the fun of it, the Government will say "No, two and two make three and not four".

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar (Leader of the House): The parallel Government never says two and two make four, but they make twenty-two.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: My Honourable friend goes further than I thought. I said he would recognise that at least they would say two and two make three, while recognising we say four, but they will not even recognise that. The blindness of their prejudice shuts them to all sense of proper values and proper appreciation, they do not want to see even the right in others.

Take, then, the House itself. I am not now talking on Resolutions on which opinion was divided. This House was practically unanimous on the demand that Indo-Burman financial adjustments must be made, as a result of the deliberations of a Committee of this House. What has happened to it? It has gone into the waste paper basket. I should like to know who is responsible for it. We asked for the acquisition of Company-managed railways, and we are told by the Honourable Member that he is still considering it.

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Sir Cowasji Jehangir, one of the Panel of Chairmen.]

He will go on considering it, until, I am afraid, it will be too late. Then, Sir, they certified the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1935, in spite of the predominant verdict of this House against that measure. Is that the duty of the Government that, in spite of the verdict of this House, they should certify an Act like this? They certified the Finance Act last year. I want to say, Sir, that taxation without representation is robbery. Last year when this motion was tabled before the House, my Honourable friend, Sir Joseph Bhore, then in charge of Railways, produced as an argument in favour of the Government accepting the verdict of the House with regard to the third class carriages, a future third class carriage. This has remained in the limbo of creation for a whole year; and yet we do not know when that carriage is to be put on the railway lines, if ever.

Then, the Government are detaining persons indefinitely without trial. On the ground of emergency, it may be necessary even for a national Government, to detain some people for a short time.

Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha (Darbhanga *cum* Saran: Non-Muhammadan): Is it in order, Sir, that you, Mr. Chairman, should preside over the Assembly when the Deputy President is present in the House?

Mr. Chairman (Sir Cowasji Jehangir): I do not know. The Honourable the President asked me to take the Chair. I am afraid he did not notice that the Deputy President was in the House.

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The Honourable the President did not notice that I was here. Perhaps that must be the reason.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, the Government go on detaining persons without trial for years. I was saying that they can detain people in an emergency, but an emergency, when it becomes permanent, ceases to be an emergency. Moreover, take the position of Indian railways. Their finances are parlous, if not perilous; and yet no suggestion of this House is considered, although my friend has affected a new manner; "Oh, I understand your point of view, I entirely sympathise with it, and I will, of course, consider it"; but nothing happens.

Sir, as a matter of fact, this Government have no use for public opinion, unless it agrees with them. They think that those who differ from them must be wrong, if not malicious, in their views. And I want to say this, with regard to the Government of India Act of 1935, that even the memorandum submitted by leading Indians, headed by His Highness the Aga Khan, about whose moderation there can be no difference of opinion, was not so much as looked at by the British Parliament. Moreover, I want to mention, in passing, that the attitude of this Government towards the press is most dangerous. I want merely to refer to the attitude of the Local Government of the United Provinces in the *Abhyudaya* case. So far as this House is concerned, for the present we are bound by the ruling of the Chair; but, I am sure, every section of the House will agree with me when I say that, if we cannot republish our speeches in this House, in the press of this country, without inviting executive wrath of Government, our presence here is made almost a farce. After all, we are here to represent our electorate; they have a right to know what we say and what we do here; and if we are prevented from giving publicity to it, it seems to me that this Government is attacking the very fundamentals of even such forms of parliamentary Government as exist today.

Moreover, Sir, I charge this Government with having interfered in the elections in the provinces. I have known in some provinces Governors actually interfering in the elections. And I want to say this, Sir, that, so far as the next elections are concerned, 35 millions of our people are going to be enfranchised, and it seems to me that Government will have to be very careful that their servants do not interfere in those elections directly or indirectly.

Sir, yesterday, we had a question about the subsidy to the Indian National Airways. Even my Honourable friend, the Industries Member, who is the most polished occupant of the Treasury Benches, really lost his temper when we asked them why they were subsidising this company. And, yet, I am satisfied that the bulk of non-official opinion in this House does not like this subject. What about the Howrah Bridge contract? We are told

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, may I know if the time limit will be observed? My Honourable friend has spoken for 25 minutes now.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Cowasji Jehangir): He has spoken for exactly 23 minutes. He should finish his speech as soon as he can.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I will not take more time than Government Members have done. It seems to me rather graceless on the part of the Leader of the House. My friend has given another argument in support of this motion. They will not even allow other people the latitude which they claim for themselves. We are already working against tremendous odds, as we are in the Opposition; and now my Honourable friend jumps up and tries to stop me.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, on a point of personal explanation, the Honourable the President said that the Government Member was entitled to 30 minutes. (*Cries of "No, no."*) He did. After he spoke for 27 minutes, one Member on the opposite side got up and asked whether the time limit would be observed. That is not repression, that is not bad manners, that is nothing. But just as he wanted to know whether the time limit will be kept, I wanted to know whether that will be done. The President had ruled that the Mover will get 20 minutes and then the Government Member will get 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Cowasji Jehangir): The President ruled that the Mover of a motion will get 20 minutes and he has also used his discretion in the case of the Leader of the Opposition who spoke for more than 20 minutes. And he ruled at first that a Member of Government should have 20 minutes, but, at the request of Members of Government, he said he would allow 30 minutes.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: I will finish as quickly as I can. I am now coming to my Honourable friend. India is an impotent member of the League of Nations. When we ask any questions, we get no satisfaction and they do nothing. And, then, there is the Reforms Office joke. The Act has been passed, but still the office goes on, with a tremendous expenditure, and we are told that something or other is being done all the time. On the question of the customs revenue settlement with the Indian States, my friend, the Finance Member, says he has got a grievance, but when we ask what the Government of India, as a whole, are doing in this matter of customs negotiation with Indian States, we get no satisfaction, indeed no answer.

The last point I want to make is that, apart from the material harm this Government are doing to our country, in the moral sphere they are doing more harm. They have disarmed a whole nation, and they have tried to emasculate us. Thanks to modern nationalist forces, this nation is rousing herself from her sleep. They try to divide this nation and frighten the people, and, above all, Sir, in our own country, we are racially humiliated. If tomorrow the Congress restart the Civil Disobedience Movement, and if you join it, and if you are convicted and sent to prison, you will have to suffer the C class, unless the Local Government gives you the B or A class; whereas, a European murderer or thief will get the B class, because of his pale colour. And, in our own railway trains, there used to be separate compartments for them; there are separate conveniences now in the shape of refreshment rooms, retiring rooms, etc., for Europeans. In our Courts, they have separate trials. Do you think flesh and blood can stand it? Indians in those Benches may stand it, but I appeal to all self-respecting Indians in any other part of the House to consider whether it is right that this Government should perpetuate racial distinctions in our own country?

Then, they never try to appeal to our higher sense, and, according to their dictionary, patriotism is a crime, courage is treason, and nationalism is treachery. But I want to say this. After all, this Government will find that they are at the end of their tether. His Highness the Aga Khan's statement repeated more than once, that communal parties have no future in this country, and that we ought to form political and economic parties on such issues is the death-knell of this Government. The Hindu, Muslim and Sikh Members of this House have every reason to be proud of their record of work in this Assembly. In spite of tremendous odds, they have stood together, and I have no doubt that, in the years to come, they will increasingly stand together. Government feel that, by passing this Government of India Act of 1935, they have solved the Indian question, but they will find that they have not solved it. Government treat themselves as an armed camp in an alien country. Their only ideals are a well-fed and largely mercenary army with a strong British element, well-paid heaven-born and other services, and an army of retainers to repress all public opinion, to divide the people, and to rule as long as they can. A great Englishman said that little minds and great empires go ill together. He never thought of these little minds; and these little minds and even a decent Government go ill together. This motion is not moved, because this Government is irresponsible,—they cannot help it,—but because they have betrayed the trust of the people, they have not served the interests of the people, they have not promoted the greatest happiness of the greatest number. After all, they want to please themselves, but I want to leave them with one ideal, if I may, of even a benevolent despot:

“Yuktha prajananuranjonesyah

Thasmadyasho yah paramam dharam rah.”

After all, even a benevolent autocrat must try to please his people, but this Government have not chosen even to serve the interests of the people. I ask this House to support this motion on the simple ground that, judged by any relevant test, this Government have not promoted the interest, happiness or the welfare of the people, but have gone on in their own sweet way. The passing of this motion will hasten the advent of Swaraj. Hence, I move.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Cowsaji Jehangir): Motion moved:

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced to Re. 1.”

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai (Sind: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the first
 1 P. M. and the very relevant point that Mr. Satyamurti raised was the irresponsibility of the executive in this House. He has given several reasons and illustrations to show how Government are irresponsible to the Members on this side. He said that at question time the answering of questions was evaded, that the answers were flimsy on several occasions, and that no direct and clear answers were given. On that point, I join hands with the Honourable the Mover of this cut, and I submit that there is every justification for the House to join hands with him on this point. To the several reasons he narrated for Government's not giving proper and direct answers, I will add one.

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

Whenever any question is put, and it is inconvenient for the Member in charge or for the head of the Administration concerned to give an answer, they come forward and say that it is a matter of detail or a matter which they were going to send to the Agent or other officer to consider. When we ask for the replies to be placed on the table of the House, they say "No, it is a matter of detail". I submit that those detailed matters are very important for the public. I know there was a ruling in this House by the then President, Sir Shanmukham Chetty, that if any question was admitted by the President it must be answered, and if a reply had been asked for from an Agent or other subordinate officer, it should be obtained and placed on the table of the House. This is not being done. I submit that it is a great impediment in the way of our getting proper and clear answers and satisfying our constituencies. In such circumstances, how can we say that the Government are responsible?

The second question to which I shall refer is Indianisation. This morning, it was made clear to the House that there was no Indianisation at the top. When a question was put to the Honourable the Home Member today whether there were any Indian Secretaries in any of the several Departments of the Government of India, the reply was, first of all, "I do not know", and then he tried to evade an answer. Why not be frank and say that Government wish to act in their own way and not according to the wish of the public? Then, take the question of Joint Secretaries. I asked whether there were any Joint Secretaries who were Indians. The reply given was neither direct nor clear. Has it given us any idea as to how many Joint Secretaries are Indians? The Honourable the Home Member said that the reply was contained in a statement which he was placing on the table of the House. I asked him whether the specific answer as to how many Joint Secretaries were Indians was contained in the statement. A reply to that did not come. How are we to deal with such a Government? Shall we not, therefore, say that the Government are evading their duty and there ought to be a censure on them?

I now come to the question of the economic prosperity of India. The Honourable the Finance Member might think that he has given a subvention of Rs. 1,08 lakhs to Sind, and, therefore, I would give him credit for it. The subvention was given of necessity. It is Government who called for the tune, and they must pay the piper. Of course, they want to placate the majority community, but, all the same, they have ignored the insistent protests of the minority community. Why should I give him any credit for it? Of course, the matter is now over, and Sind has been separated. Let us not look at the gift horse in the mouth. But I may tell the Honourable the Finance Member that it is his duty to give more money to Sind in order to keep Sind in prosperity. All depends upon the Barrage. What are the conditions of the Barrage now? There is not much produce, because land is not being sold. Government want intending buyers to pay for land in the locality the price which was fixed long ago in prosperous days, and, until that price is given, they will not sell land. They are introducing another policy which is condemnable, and that is that they want to introduce foreigners into the area and allow them to form syndicates and take land,—not for cash, but on leases for 30 and 40 years. What will happen? They will have interest in the land only for that period. They will sap out the juice and go out.

Captain Sardar Sher Muhammad Khan (Nominated Non-Official): What do you know? You are not an agriculturist.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I know more than you do. I am an agriculturist also, and I am telling you about the difficulties of the agriculturists. Sind is not Punjab. You may come forward and give the grievances of the Punjab agriculturists. There are similar difficulties there also. So far as Sind is concerned, the lands should be sold to the indigenous people. Why should it be given to foreigners? How is the prosperity of Sind at a higher level than that of other parts of India?

Sir Muhammad Yakub (Robilkund and Kumaon Divisions; Muhammadan Rural): Are not aliens indigenous inhabitants of India?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: You are also an alien, I suppose.

Sir Muhammad Yakub: I am not.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: The prosperity of India depends upon two things. One is the growth of agriculture. The agriculturists must be helped to grow more produce. There will be no prosperity until prices are raised. May I ask what effort has been made in this direction? Nothing has been done. The Honourable Member took shelter in his budget by saying that the economic prosperity of India was now on the rise. We won't be deceived. The Finance Member said that there was demand for more small coins, and that was a sign of prosperity. Does this demand mean that people got money from their produce of agriculture? No, they brought out distress money and purchased their necessities in order to make a hand-to-mouth living. This increase in prosperity is only fictitious and we won't be deceived. The second thing on which the prosperity of India depends is the growth of industries. What help are Government giving to industries? Take sugar, for instance. They gave some protection to it, and we know the reason for it. But I would ask my friends, the people in India, not to be like sheep; if one man starts a sugar factory, other people come and do the same blindly, with the result that you have too many factories and there will be no profit . . .

An Honourable Member: Are you interested in sugar?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am not: but my friend, Seth Abdoola Haroon is. Therefore, I submit that, so far as industries are concerned, they ought to be helped.

I come now to the question of spending money on the reconstruction of Quetta. I do not agree with the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable the Foreign Secretary when they say that Quetta must be rebuilt on the same spot. Public opinion is very strongly against it. Government have not told us what reasons they have: the earthquake has not occurred there only once, but it was affected very much by previous earthquakes also, and now there has been absolute devastation. To stick to the same place, and to rebuild Quetta there, is a grievous mistake that

[Mr. Lalchand Navalrai.]

they will see hereafter and they will repent when it is too late. I asked the Honourable the Foreign Secretary, the other day, whether there were no other sites: he said: "Yes, there are many; but read my communiqué and see what there is in it." I do not know what they have written there and why other places are not acceptable. But, I ask, have they consulted public opinion?

Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri Lal Chand (Nominated Non-Official): Yes.

Mr. Chairman (Sir Cowasji Jehangir): Will the Honourable Member allow the Honourable Member (Mr. Lalchand Navalrai) to go on?

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I say, no. We even put questions to the Honourable the Foreign Secretary

Mr. Chairman (Sir Cowasji Jehangir): The Honourable Member has got three minutes more.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am going to finish. Sir. The Foreign Secretary gave some replies: when I asked whether they have consulted public opinion, he said "no". There is the advisory committee, and there are Members of this House on it: will they say, they have been consulted? I say, they have not been consulted. Therefore, I submit that, without consultation of the people living in the neighbouring provinces of the Punjab and Sind, they should not have started rebuilding Quetta on the same spot. One word more, and I have done. I ask what justification they have for importing architects from England. Is it not adding insult to injury to reply that a man of that qualification could not be found in India? I submit, it is really wrong and irresponsible on the part of the Government of India to say that they are going to import people from England and other places in spite of the protest that is being made every now and then on that question from this side of the House. I, therefore, submit that they do deserve the censure on this cut, and I support it.

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

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

Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta): The discussion on this cut will continue.

Mr. F. E. James (Madras: European): Sir, when I listened to my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, this morning, I only had to close my eyes to imagine myself once more on the breezy beach of Triplicane at Madras where my Honourable friend has made so many of his speeches.

and where, I think, he has to some extent been forced to adopt his present style. My friend not infrequently loses in impressiveness by over-stating his case; here certainly has been a case in point. He has attacked the Executive Council for being neither good, nor honest, nor efficient. He has attacked them on various grounds and has invited us to join him in his attack and vote with him on his subsequent division. Now, Sir, I made a careful examination of the various grounds on which he attacked the Cabinet of the present Government. In the first place, he attacked them, because, in various spheres of social service, they had not done their duty. I would, of course, point out to him that education, public health and various other matters have for some time been in the hands of his own countrymen in the provinces, and it seems perhaps a little unfair to attack the Members of the Executive Council here for the sins and derelictions of duty of his colleagues in the provinces who are Ministers

Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta Paliwal (Agra Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): But who controls the finances?

Mr. F. E. James: I would suggest that his colleagues in the Madras Legislative Council, as far as Madras is concerned, would be a much more appropriate mouthpiece for his point of view.

Then, he went on to say that the Executive Council Members,—and I take it that he was not speaking personally,—did not serve the interests of India, that they served the interests of some vague imaginary bogey which he calls, "British Imperialism". He did not define what he meant by that. The phrase "British Imperialism" is a phrase which is often used by the superficial, but what does it mean? What does he mean by it? Can he define what it is?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: You.

Mr. F. E. James: My friend, the Finance Member, says he means, the Carlton Club; but my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, says he means me. But there is a world of difference between the Carlton Club and myself, which goes to show how confused his ideas are about the very phrases which he uses.

He then went on to attack the Executive Council on the ground that they did not disclose their correspondence with the Secretary of State. He knows perfectly well that they cannot disclose it.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: They can.

Mr. F. E. James: He knows perfectly well that, in any case, in the public interest, such correspondence should not be disclosed.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Which public?

Mr. F. E. James: Now, I ask my friend whether he would be prepared to disclose the correspondence which passes between him as Secretary of the Congress Party and the President,

Mr. S. Satyamurti: They all know what we write. They censor all our letters.

Mr. F. E. James: Then, Sir, he attacked the Members of the Executive Council on the ground that they did not answer questions in the way he wished them to answer them. Those of us, who have had experience of Provincial Legislatures, know that the Members of the Viceroy's Executive Council here, as a matter of fact, go far more out of their way to answer questions than any Indian Minister in the provinces does. My Honourable friend knows it perfectly well. He cannot deny it any more than he can deny that when in Madras, he is in a position to answer questions on one or two bodies, he behaves like a hard-headed bureaucrat.

Then, Sir, he also adduced another reason for attacking the Executive Council, and that reason was some statement alleged to have been made by the late Sir William Joynson Hicks (who is now, of course, dead) in regard to what the British were in India for. May I suggest to him that the Executive Council was hardly responsible for what this late gentleman said in a moment of expansion

Mr. S. Satyamurti: He spoke the truth.

Mr. F. E. James: I am reminded that the late gentleman was a teetotaler. (Laughter.) That perhaps accounts for the austerity of his views on India. But I will give my friend all those things. He was not really serious when he was talking about minor matters for which the Viceroy's Executive Council are not really responsible. When he became serious, he got down to the things for which they are, under the present Statute, responsible. He talked about their military expenditure. He talked about their financial policy; he talked about their tariff policy; he talked about their defence of the interests of Indians overseas. He talked about the League of Nations. He talked about the Howrah Bridge. In fact, there were few things in this country that he did not talk about. I will deal with the main things he talked about, and, in doing so, I wish to remind him of his invitation, more particularly to us, that on this occasion we should join him in expressing our dissent with the very existence of the present Executive Council. Now, any one who offers that invitation to a party to co-operate with him must be open to a counter question. We have always, as a community, been described as being particularly cautious in various matters, and, therefore, before I should be prepared to co-operate with my friend and go into the lobby with him on this occasion, I have to look at the offer he is making. I presume that if we did agree to vote with my friend, we should not only be expressing our disapproval of the Members of the Executive Council and their policy, but we should be prepared, to be logical, to say that they should go, they should retire altogether, that they should actually resign if they could under the Statute. We should also be prepared, if we go with the Mover, to contemplate the possibility that he and his friends would take their places opposite. There is no use being entirely negative. If you want to drive these gentlemen away, you must be prepared to take their places.

Mr. S. Satyamurti and some Honourable Members: Oh, yes.

Mr. F. E. James: I should like to ask my friends exactly what policy they would pursue in regard to these major questions if they were in the places of my friends on my left. As I said, we are rather cautious, and,

therefore, we want to look at these offers, that are sometimes made to us, very carefully before we accept them. What will my Honourable friend do with regard to the military defence?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Cut down by half.

Mr. F. E. James: Immediately cut down by half?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Have a five-year programme.

Mr. F. E. James: After a five-year programme, the military expenditure will be reduced by half, *i.e.*, 22 crores. That, of course, is an extraordinarily impracticable proposition. Again, I take it that he will "monkey" with the ratio. . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No.

Mr. F. E. James: He criticises the Finance Member for saying that he refuses to monkey with the ratio, and from what my Honourable friend says, I assume that he would monkey with it. I am sorry to hear that suggestion from Madras. I thought that that desire was only particularly prominent in Bombay. With regard to the tariff policy, what would my Honourable friend do if he had control of the tariff policy of the Government of India? The country is entitled to know exactly what he would do.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Protect all Indian industries.

Mr. F. E. James: How and to what extent?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: By prohibiting competing British articles here.

Mr. F. E. James: Now we know. That is exactly the kind of programme which my Honourable friend really stands for; yet he has the effrontery to ask us to go into the lobby with him. He is not going to stand merely for discriminating protection; He is not even going to stand for full-fledged protection; he is going to stand for boycott and the forcible prevention of British goods from entering into this country.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: All foreign goods.

Mr. F. E. James: Then, in regard to Indians overseas, what exactly would he do? My Honourable friend has no particular specific to take the place of the policy which is now being carried out by the occupant of that portfolio. In India's present position, what policy would my Honourable friend put into effect in regard to protecting the interests of Indians overseas that is not at present being carried out with the utmost zeal by the present Member in charge of that portfolio? Take the League of Nations. The Honourable Member criticised the Executive Council, because, forsooth, India being an original member of the League of Nations, cannot yet act as an independent country, possessing its own army, possessing its own navy, and being entirely responsible for its own defence and foreign affairs. How does my Honourable friend propose to carry that out?

Dr. G. V. Deshmukh (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): How is it carried out at the present moment?

Mr. F. E. James: If my Honourable friend takes the place of the Government tomorrow, what policy would he pursue in regard to India's position in the League of Nations?

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty (Madras: Indian Commerce): On a point of order, Sir. I should like to know if the Honourable Member is in order in raising hypothetical questions. (Laughter.)

Mr. F. E. James: I am only making one hypothetical speech in reply to another hypothetical speech. My Honourable friend, this morning, waxed indignant, but he was talking with his tongue in his cheek, as he knows perfectly well. I am merely following his lead.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: That is very unfair.

Mr. F. E. James: My Honourable friend and myself come from Madras, and we understand what we say, but there are some Honourable Members who hail from other provinces, and they do not know. Now, in regard to the Howrah Bridge, what would my friend do if he was in charge of Commerce with regard to the Howrah Bridge?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Tell them to accept the Indian combine.

Mr. F. E. James: Suppose they do not?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Dismiss them.

Mr. F. E. James: How can you dismiss them?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Yes, I can.

Mr. F. E. James: My Honourable friend suggested that to carry this motion would hasten Swaraj in this country. Now, we would not wish to do anything that would retard the advent of Swaraj in its proper sense; but I would ask him seriously, does he really think for one single moment that the carrying of this vote in this House is going to advance India one inch further towards the fulfilment of her aims and ideals? No, Sir. I regard this particular motion and the speech which my Honourable friend made as beating the air. If he had come with some specific grievance on which he based his censure of the Members of the Executive Council, perhaps there would have been some rhyme or reason in this debate; but to blame the present Government for the sins and omissions of the provinces, for the constitutional position of the Government of India and for many things for which they are not in the least responsible, surely imparts an air of unreality to this debate and to this House which is very unfortunate.

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

On an important occasion like this, my Honourable friend has invited us to associate with him in this motion. I am sorry that we must decline his kind offer, for the reasons I have stated—not that we have no grievance, but because this country needs to be saved from exploitation by superficialities.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra (Presidency Division: Non-Mulhammadan Rural): Sir, it is embarrassing to have to speak after a finished speaker like my Honourable friend, Mr. James, but my only reason for venturing to speak after him is that my Honourable friend, from the beginning to the end, put a series of interrogations and raised a series of hypotheses on which he demanded an answer from this side of the House, and by this he sought to create an impression that we had no answer to give to them.

Let me tell him that his speech really made us believe that we had been moving in an atmosphere of unreality. He indeed demanded from us categorical answers, as if we are here on the present cut motion to place before him our specific programmes on the various items raised by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti. That is no business of ours at the present moment. No challenge has ever been thrown out to us in that way. You have never asked us up till now,—“Here are our cards. We are playing them in this way. Come forward and take our place and play our cards in your own way.” If the Government can throw out that challenge to us in all seriousness, we shall be only too glad to accept it. You constantly raise the false plea of the defect of the present Constitution, and by that means you try to cover a multitude of sins of the executive. My Honourable friend stated that he would be willing to walk into the same lobby with us and vote against the Government, if we could satisfy him,—as if it is possible for any one on this side of the House to satisfy that side of the House—that the Government are really guilty of the charges we level against them. (Interruption.)

Take, for instance, the financial policy of the Government of India. My Honourable friend, Sir James Grigg, stated emphatically that this country is now on the high road to recovery. If we are really on the road to recovery, if the goal of prosperity is so near, and if it is visible, how is it that we yet see so much poverty, so much misery and distress in the country. You have to advance all manner of specious or plausible arguments to establish this theory of prosperity. If there is prosperity as claimed by you in your budget, that will be reflected in the provincial budgets, in the condition of the masses of the country, and in the lightening of your taxation,—but there is no such thing. You have not got the cheek to do that, or even to admit that. All you say is that there has been a surplus. If there is a surplus, we can legitimately claim that for the relief of the over-taxed poor. But you have not acceded to that. We know that, in the matter of financial policy, the Finance Member is not free. I am one of those who believe, and I think most of us on this side of the House do the same, that he, along with his other comrades in the Executive Council, have to obey the behests of Whitehall. However much they may deny it, the fact remains that they have absolutely no independence at all in the matter. That is the explanation of the whole thing.

[Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.]

Sir, as regards financial matters, last year, on the floor of the House, we debated on the budget and on the Finance Bill. We debated the cut motions and amendments, in all possible ways. It cannot be said, with any show of reason, that we were out to destroy the Government's budget, to mutilate it without examining its merits and demerits. We gave every reasonable criticism, and what was the result? Did you accede to any single motion that we adopted in this House, or do you mean to say that you are so high in your superior wisdom that it outweighs the collective wisdom of the Honourable Members of this House? What is the position this year? In spite of the surplus, you have not been able to do anything. When there is no surplus, when the budget is a deficit budget, you are piling taxes upon taxes upon the people up to the breaking point. When there is a surplus, you give nothing to the people of this country. Do you expect any laudation or commendation from us on this account, or do you deserve censure?

Now, take the case of the Executive Council as represented by the Honourable the Home Member. What is his policy with regard to the country? We have a cut motion about it which will come up for discussion later. What is his policy in the matter of law and order, those two scared phrases which are so often prostituted by the executive in this country? My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyuniurti, has given a catalogue of grievances in this country. It is a gruesome catalogue which constitutes the greatest indictment against this Government. But my Honourable friend, Mr. James' grievance is that he has put in all sorts of things together. We must do it, because our grievances are so many and so numerous in character, that taken together they will constitute the most terrible indictment that one nation can draw up against another. For my part, I shall not, for the present, lay much stress on the financial policy. I will confine myself to one or two grievances on which I feel most.

In the first place, we, the Members of this Legislative Assembly, feel that we are not treated with that kind of consideration, that kind of courtesy which is our due, as representatives of the people and as Members of the Supreme Legislature. After all, most of us have come here after the Civil Disobedience Campaign. We had been seriously invited to come to this Assembly to try constitutional methods; and we came in only to see if there has been any real change of heart. But what do we find here? Last year, we carried as many as 28 motions and Resolutions. Would you tell us frankly and honestly and would you place your hand on your bosom and tell us, which particular cut, Resolution or policy you gave effect to? Do you mean to say that you can count on our willing assent and our uncritical acquiescence in all matters when you on your part refuse to give us any response? Do you mean to suggest that we will simply take all your *ipse dixit* without question? You cannot have that sort of assent from us. Take again, the case of my friend, Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, who is an Honourable Member of this House. This morning, we had a question about the restrictions put upon him by that District Magistrate, Mr. Griffiths, who was for sometime a Member of this House, and whose first speech was applauded in such a way by his bosses and coterie of admirers and interested persons that it got his head absolutely turned. I see my Honourable friend, Mr. Morgan, snugly dozing. He remarked at that time that that was the best maiden speech he had ever heard in his life, but I do not think he has had many experiences in his

life of good speeches, and I pity my Honourable friend's poor experiences in that direction. What happened between this Mr. Griffiths and Amarendra Babu, of late, many in this House may not know. Of course, we will deal with it more fully when we come to deal with the other cuts. I will briefly narrate the facts. Amarendra Babu is the representative from the Burdwan Division constituency of Bengal. He went to see his constituents and speak to them. It must be definitely understood that he never went there to carry on any kind of political propaganda. There was a deliberate and organised effort made by Mr. Griffiths to foist on the people of the Midnapore district a set of institutions known as the union boards, a sort of rural self-governing institutions as they call them. In fact, the people were most unwilling to have them. Groups of villages rejected them. They said: "We will have nothing to do with these union boards. You want to thrust more taxes on us, but we cannot pay. We do not want these institutions." Well, Amarendra Babu wrote to Mr. Griffiths and said that he wanted to speak to his constituents. The reply he got was: "You can come here, provided you don't open your lips about union boards." He had to submit to this humiliation from the District Magistrate. He went there and made certain speeches. Of course, the speeches had nothing to do with high politics, which is a red rag to the opposite side. Thereafter, Amarendra Babu came back and sometime after he again wanted to visit his constituency and speak to his people. What was the result? Mr. Griffiths, the Hero of Midnapore, said: "You cannot come. If you come, you will be prosecuted." Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya took up the challenge and said that he had every right to visit his constituency and that it was a duty which he owed to his constituency. However, good sense dawned at the last moment, and a special messenger had to be sent to call off his arrest. If an Honourable Member of this House is to be treated in that way by a District Magistrate who was also an Honourable Member of this House some time ago, and if the Government of India, as represented by the Home Department and my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Craik, do not interfere in these matters, then where do we stand? Of course, my Honourable friend said this morning, that he had given all the facts in his possession. My grievance against him is that, even on a serious matter like this, he has not tried to elicit all the necessary information which we demanded from him, and that he has apparently not taken any serious view of it at all. It is a serious matter affecting the rights and privileges of the Honourable Members of this House, and this matter cannot be lightly passed over. He has promised us, however, fuller information and the copies of the orders passed by the District Magistrate, and we will have them. Take, again, another case, the case of my Honourable friend, Mr. Krishna Kant Malaviya, and the publication of his speech in the *Abhyudaya*. I am not going to criticise in the least, Mr. President, the ruling given by you, but the Government of India had a duty of their own in this matter. If an Honourable Member of this House makes a speech in this House, it only stands to reason that his constituents and people at large in the country should be in a position to know what their representative has said on a particular question or how he has been discharging his duties as their representative in this House. What happened in this case? A security was demanded from him and it was a huge amount. My grievance is that the Honourable Member, representing the Home Department, should have intervened and told the Provincial Government: "Look here. This is a matter in which you should not interfere." In these times of peace and tranquillity, the

[Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra.]

Honourable Member permitted the Local Government to infringe the elementary rights of a Member of the Legislature which no other country had done before, and, thereby, he has set up a precedent which is most damaging to the rights and privileges of an Honourable Member of this House. Then, there is another thing

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only two minutes more.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: and that is the increasing tendency of the executive to usurp the functions of the judiciary. You may not know how things are going on in my province, Bengal, but as an Advocate of the Calcutta High Court, I can tell you a lot about what is going on in the Calcutta High Court itself, which used, at one time, to be looked upon as the palladium of justice in this country. Besides, the High Court authorities have issued a series of circulars, published in two volumes, and they have also published one more volume called "Practical suggestions to the Subordinate Court". All these compilations, together with numerous unprinted and verbal instructions, have made administration of justice in the High Court and in the Subordinate Courts absolutely a farce. The position is that, in the province of Bengal, where appears a deliberate policy by the Britishers to crush it, administration of justice also has been cast to the four winds by this series of circulars, and there has been not a whisper of protest from the Honourable the Home Member to check the vagaries of the authorities of the Calcutta High Court in that direction. This is how justice is being administered now

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member must not criticise the High Court in that way.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: I am not directly dealing with the Honourable High Court. I am incidentally referring to the administration of justice which is said to be controlled by my Honourable friend, the Home Member, Sir Henry Craik; and my grievance against him is this, that he, as the man controlling the administration of justice in this land, should have interfered, and he should even now interfere, so that justice may not be butchered in the way it is suffered to be done now.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's time is up.

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Sir, as my time is up. I will conclude
3 P. M. by saying that so numerous, so many are the grievances against this Government that I would ask every Honourable Member of this House, at least every elected Member, regard being had to his own sense of self-respect, to censure this Government, as censure is the only thing which this Government deserves. (Loud Applause.)

An Honourable Member: I move that the question be now put.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I promise not to take more than four or five minutes, as I do not wish to cast a silent vote, lest I should be misunderstood. Sir, there is not

a single Honourable Member in this House who is in any way satisfied with the present Constitution. There is not a single school of thought that is satisfied with the Constitution which has now been presented to us. (Hear, hear.) As you very well know, Sir, even a man like the Aga Khan, yourself and others made suggestions which were turned down. After all, the future Constitution is a constitution for which His Majesty's Government alone are responsible, it has not been framed by common consent, and, therefore, I do not think that there can be anybody in this House, whether on this side or on that, who can challenge the statement that there is no section of public thought in India, which has accepted the Constitution which we are going to work, I trust, in a very short time; and this is not the first time that these opinions have been expressed. They have been expressed on the floor of this House times out of number, long before my Honourable friends on my right had the honour of being amongst us, and they have been expressed from the public platform long before they ever dreamt of agreeing to come to this House. (Laughter.) Sir, the crux of the question is—under the Constitution under which we work, what is the position of the so-called Honourable Members of Government (Laughter)—I will repeat what I said—the so-called Members of Government? In the real sense, they are not Members of the Government of India. Their financial policy is not their own; their military policy is not their own; their tariff policy is not their own. (Hear, hear.) They hear our criticisms with great attention, and I feel sure they pass those criticisms on to the real Government of India—the Secretary of State for India: and if the Secretary of State for India is pleased to accept any of our suggestions, we hear that acceptance echoed from the Opposite Benches. Sir, I have known of a case where a Member of Government could not accept the change of a comma or a fullstop in a Bill without consulting the Secretary of State.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Is that so?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Yes, I have known of such a case, as I sat on the Select Committee. Well, Sir, under these circumstances, what is the use of saying that it is your duty to move this vote of censure upon the Government?

An Honourable Member: Now the cat is out of the bag.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What is the use of moving a censure upon the Government? What is the use of raising this sort of debate? My own view is—and I expressed it definitely last year—that it serves no useful purpose. Let us now forget the past, and let us look to the future. (Hear, hear.) Let our eyes be towards the horizon, to the future; the past is gone. (Hear, hear.) Sir, if there had been no new Government of India Act, I would have agreed that there would be some reason for this debate, but there is going to be a new Government of India Act; we are going to work it for good or for evil (Hear, hear), and we are going to extract from it (I speak for myself and my Party at least), whatever good we can get out of it. If we fail to get any good out of that Act, well, I will be, if I am still in the land of the living, a party to any censure motion that Honourable Members may bring up. But, at this stage, I desire to forget the past. I trust that, in a few years' time, I shall forget even what is going on today. I shall look to the future, and I would ask my

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

countrymen to do the same. Sir, many of the defects pointed out by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, may be correct, but they are the result of the present Constitution, the illogical and unreasonable Constitution under which we work, under which we are supposed to be the Opposition when we are no Opposition at all; under which the Government is supposed to be a Government when it is no Government at all. (Hear, hear.) The whole position is illogical. If we pass a vote of censure here it means nothing; if we cut off supplies, it means nothing (Laughter): under the circumstances, we try to do the best we can

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Namely?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Namely, to get whatever we can. (Laughter.)

An Honourable Member: Including kicks from the other side.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Including kicks from both sides (Laughter), but we may join one side or the other in the kicking. Under these circumstances, just as I did last year, I regret I shall not be able to vote in favour of this censure motion, as I see in it no real solid foundation.

An Honourable Member: We are sorry for you!

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I have no doubt that after my Honourable friend, the Deputy Leader of the Independent Party, has made his speech and explained his position, his conscience is clear. Sir, he is a businessman, and, therefore, I can quite understand his point of view, but we are in this Legislature *vis-a-vis* the constitutional position of the Government as well as of the Opposition, and let us get to the realities—not a business deal—what are we here for, and what is the Government here for?

Sir, we know perfectly well that we are censuring the Government of India in the form in which we propose to do it, namely, a vote of censure by means of withdrawing supplies. From whom are we withdrawing these supplies? Not from the executive, not from the Honourable Members who sit here, but from the Government; and what is the Government of India? Not merely the executive; they are only the agents; the Government of India means the Governor General in Council, the Secretary of State for India, and Parliament, that is ultimately responsible to this country; therefore, let us really get to that real issue before us: Now, if I am right in my position, that we have got to express our views as to what we feel, what we think as to the policy of the Government of India, as I have described it, undoubtedly this Constitution is one which is a very anomalous Constitution; it is not a full-fledged Parliament, far from it; I have always said over and over again that the position of the elected Members in this House is purely that of influencing the Government, advising the Government. But, Sir, when we have failed in any influence being felt, when we have failed in every advice that we have given, and when we have exhausted every avenue, every channel, and, at the end of the year, we stand *vis-a-vis* the Government as Opposition, have we not got to give our verdict? What is going to be the verdict of this House? It is said: "Oh! make a token cut". I cannot understand this coming

from the spokesmen of the European Group. There, again, it is a purely business mind that cannot understand this large issue that is involved and implied by this motion when they suggest a "token cut", but say let us examine the most extraordinary Constitution that we are working under. Let us examine this. If I am dissatisfied with the amount of the grant and I think that it ought to be reduced, because it is excessive on the ground of economy, then naturally my proper course is to say instead of ten lakhs, it should be nine lakhs, and I can then try and satisfy the Government that this is an excessive amount. Well, then I make the motion that it be reduced by one lakh on the ground of economy, on the ground that it is excessive. That is one method. If I have any specific grievance with regard to any particular Department in relation to the administration of one specific item, then I raise that issue, and I say that I move a cut of Rs. 100 as token cut, in order to raise that issue with regard to that one specific matter. But this is neither the one nor the other. I am not taking up my stand that I want this amount to be reduced, because it is excessive. I am not taking up my stand that I have got one specific grievance with regard to any administrative action of the Government, but my grievance is this, that the policy of the Government in every Department and the policy of the Government generally—when I say the policy of the Government, I mean the policy of the Government of India as I have defined—is one which compels me to resort to this very last course, namely, refusal of supplies. (Hear, hear.) (Applause.)

Now, it is, I admit, so far as this House is concerned and so far as this Legislature is concerned, it is a fiction, a pure fiction, I admit. But it is by means of this fiction alone that I can show to the world and show to Great Britain and the British Parliament the displeasure of the House. (Applause.) Now, Sir, whether I am justified or not depends upon the facts. What are the facts? Let us take every department. Let us take the British Parliament, let us take the Secretary of State for India. Is there—and I would be extremely grateful and I would stand corrected—is there one single first class issue, not the details—I do not care whether you treat me rudely or respectfully when I am asking questions, I do not care whether you answer these questions or not, that is a matter of indifference to me, that is nothing—and many other matters of details do not matter—is there one single first class issue on which the Government have not or acceded to the wishes of the Opposition? Will the Honourable Members who represent here the Government of India point out any such case or cases—and these are the only Members we can get hold of as accused in the dock and who are within our jurisdiction (Hear, hear) that we can deal with, I cannot bring the Parliament here, I cannot bring the Secretary of State for India here—I ask the Honourable Members sitting on the Treasury Benches who are on their defence to satisfy me and tell me whether, on any one single issue of first class importance, they met the wishes of this House. (Hear, hear.) Point that out to me, and I shall stand corrected.

The Honourable Sir Henry Craik (Home Member): Banning of Miss Mayo's book. (Laughter.)

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Well, if I were the spokesman of the Government, I shall be ashamed of pointing out that instance (Hear, hear) as meeting the issue that I am raising. It shows that the Honourable Member has

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

got no sense of proportion at all (Hear, hear)—that is all I can say. Please try and understand; if Government are not prepared to meet us or cannot do it, if you are helpless—I know the executive are helpless, I know that perfectly well, please try and understand my point and if you do not wish to do it or cannot do it, then we understand where we stand, but do not give silly excuses. I was going to say, Sir, therefore, how am I to show my displeasure at this Government? What is the method open to me to show this that I want to show? There is not a single Department—take the Army, take the Finance, the Commerce, the Industries and Labour, the Railways, there is not one Department, I venture to say, that has met the wishes of this House on any first class issue. But, then, it is said: "Oh! these Congress Benches are really most irreconcilable. It is so difficult for us to meet their wishes". What my Honourable friend, the Leader of the House, over there, meant when he said—I am putting it politely—that two and two never make four with the Congress, that means they are very difficult to meet. Well, it is no use putting forward that argument. Sir, in one breath it is said that the Congress is impossible, in another breath it is said that my Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, is not reasonable when he says anything not palatable to Government, again when another section of the House says anything, which does not suit the wishes or the interests of Government they are quite wrong. Then, Sir, it seems to me that there is nobody in this country, there is no section which is right—we are all wrong in the eyes of Government. Can't you find anybody in this country that may be in the right? Have you met the wishes of anybody in this country? (Hear, hear.)

I do not wish to take up the time of the House, and I say, Sir, that I shall be perfectly justified in supporting this cut motion (Hear, hear), and that is the only way in which this House can express its displeasure with the Government of India. (Applause.)

Mr. M. Asaf Ali: I move that the question be now put.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is a very important debate, and the Chair cannot stifle discussion by accepting the closure.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan (Agra Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I was really very pleased when I heard this morning my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, on this cut motion. I think he ought to be congratulated for making a beautiful speech and for making the best out of a very bad case. This showed the marvellous capacity of my Honourable friend and also his ability in tackling a question on which he could not convince anybody even by making a very very good speech. There is really one great difference which I noticed in the arguments which my Honourable friend advanced this morning and in the arguments which have been advanced this afternoon by the Honourable and learned Leader of the Independent Party. Sir, there is a great deal of difference in the view of the two. The Leader of the Independent Party wants to refuse supplies on political grounds, and he said that he would not enumerate the grievances, he or the country felt, as he has none against the individual Members of the Government, while the Honourable the Mover of the

cut motion gave a graphic description of these grievances. Taking these two speeches, I think I can say that the two parties do not see eye to eye on this matter except that they must join hands against somebody.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Sir, I may just point out to the Honourable Member that he is quite right. My reasons may be different, but the conclusion is the same.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I never said the conclusion is not the same. I say the reasons are absolutely different. And I have to consider the merits of the question on the grounds urged by the Honourable the Mover of the cut, and not on the grounds given by the Leader of the Independent Party.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: Sir, on a point of personal explanation. I accept all the grounds urged by the Leader of the Independent Party as my own. I wish I had stated them myself.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: I am glad the Honourable Member accepts his defeat.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: No.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: If he says that he accepts the grounds put forward by the Leader of the Independent Party, which are not based on the grounds put forward by the Honourable the Mover, then his case is absolutely destroyed. If the Honourable the Mover had moved a hundred-rupee cut and then enumerated those grievances, he would have been all right. But when he wants to refuse all supplies, he should have given reasons why the Executive Council should not exist at all. If he wants that they should not function at all, he would be justified in refusing supplies. But he only mentioned grievances. And what are the grievances? That certain railway compartments are reserved for Europeans. Can that be a reason for doing away with the Executive Council? And, I am sure, there is not a single line managed by Government on which that practice occurs at present. It used to be done in the old days, but it does not happen now. Then, another grievance on account of which he wants to get rid of the Executive Council is that he asked a supplementary question and the Government Member wanted notice.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member should remember that Government will have to reply to the debate.

Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan: Yes, Sir, I will finish in time for them to reply.

Sir, I think, in ventilating these grievances, it would have been more proper for the Honourable Member to have moved a cut of Rs. 100. But when he wants to refuse all supplies, I do not think he can get the support of the House. And, then, my Honourable friend, Mr. Jinnah, came to his rescue by putting up a different case on political grounds saying that, because this Executive Council is really subordinate to the Secretary of State, therefore it must be taken as a censure on the whole Government

[Sir Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

including the Secretary of State. A hundred-rupee cut would have served the purpose. This entire refusal of supplies will create no impression on those who really guide the destinies of the country. By carrying this, the House will not enhance their value or do any good. They may create some sensation in the country, but it will do no good to the country. Sir, I am unable to support this motion.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, it is rather difficult to reply to a debate on which is raised,—I do not say not legitimately raised,—all possible important questions. We had an attack on the financial policy, an attack on the military policy, an attack on the tariff policy, an attack on the question of treatment of Indians overseas, and what not. We got a notice yesterday signed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, to the effect:

“Congress desires and requests that there should be a division at 3 P.M., and the only speaker other than the Mover will be Seth Govind Das.”

Sir, when you were not here, and before Seth Govind Das had spoken,—he has not spoken at all,—a motion was made for closure. I think it will be abundantly clear to the House that it is not really the idea of the Mover to have a debate on the questions he has raised.

Seth Govind Das (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, on a personal explanation, because my name has been mentioned, let me tell the Honourable Member that I did not want to speak, because my son was seriously ill, and I was not, therefore, in a mood to speak. It was not in order to have an early division that I did not speak.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am sorry to hear that my friend's son is ill, but I made no personal reflection on him. The point is that, so far as we are concerned, not knowing all the domestic arrangements, we could naturally believe that we were not to reply until Seth Govind Das had spoken. That is the position I was going to lay before the House, and I repeat that Congress Members do not want any debate. However, that is immaterial. No one is bound to speak. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, started the debate, first of all, which consists of violent and wild declamation, by referring to the Council and saying that, among other things, they are not honest. I believe that the book, with which my Honourable friend professes to be very familiar, is May's Parliamentary Practice, and I am sure that, if he turns up that book, he will find that that is not a parliamentary expression.

An Honourable Member: But that is true.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I would have made no reference to it, because we have treated abuse very often, and we shall often continue to treat it, with silent contempt; but it was only the other day that my Honourable friend said that whatever language they used was parliamentary. Now, having begun by pointing out that we are not honest, the specific grievance which he wanted to make, first of all, was that he never got a straight answer

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks what the Honourable Member said, at least how the Chair understood him, was not that any Member of the Executive Council was not honest, but that the Government's policy was not honest in their policy. That is how the Chair understood him.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: May I respectfully say that that was my intention? Otherwise, I would not have used that word, except in that sense.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am glad that he has taken the hint from the President.

Mr. S. Satyamurti: On a point of personal explanation, Mr. President. I used that word well knowing the parliamentary sense in which it should be used. I deprecate very strongly the idea that I took the hint from you. I think it is not right to cast such reflections on Honourable Members of this House.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not think the Honourable Member did cast any reflection.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not know if to say "take a hint from the Chair" is another wild term of abuse. That shows how excessively touchy my friend is. However, I shall pass on. My friend's complaint was that he was never getting straight answers to straight questions. I will not pause here to argue if the questions were straight, but the answers were as straight as the questions permitted. You will remember the number of supplementary questions which are asked, and we try our best to answer them on the materials before us. My Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, said: "When I ask questions, I am told that this is a matter of detail, we are referred to the Agent and what not". I am sure, my Honourable friend never realises the situation which is created by some of these supplementary questions. If I may give a typical instance, when some questions are asked about a railway, my Honourable friend may get up and says: "Supplementary question; may I know why Mr. A. B. C. got an increment of only Rs. 3, whereas a foreigner, a Punjabee, who is not a Sindhi, got an increment of Rs. 5?"

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: When was that asked?

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: We are not supposed to have all details of this type, and, therefore, it is inevitable that an answer of that kind is given, and the Honourable Member is referred to the Agent or asked to give notice of the question.

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: The Honourable Member should remember the ruling given by Sir Shanmukham Chetty.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, may I venture to state that if my friend has read it—I assume he has—he has not understood it? (Laughter.) He has not said anything of the kind which my Honourable friend told the House was the purport of the ruling. He could not have done that, he was an intelligent man—nor was he thinking of the situation I described.

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

After the grievances of unfair treatment, there was a passing reference by the Mover to general dissatisfaction with the conduct of the Members of the Executive Council in their treatment of the inoffensive people who sit facing them. I would ask this House to remember that it is said—it has been reiterated times without number—that it is the one business of Members of the Executive Council to go on offering unprovoked insult to certain Members of this House. So often has it been repeated that I think in the end my friend will come to believe it, just as a man who had never been outside England, at the relevant time, by continual repetition, actually came to think that he took part in the battle of Waterloo—that was His Imperial Majesty George IV. (Laughter.) Sir, we indeed are wild people. we abuse, we lack in courtesy, we are arrogant, we have no consideration for feelings of others, and we do not know how to behave. But let me turn to the people who complain. I will not mention any names, because no point is gained by mentioning any particular name. One on the front Bench opposite—I am reading from official proceedings—made this statement:

“The Railway Member”,

—he was then Sir Joseph Bhowe, not my friend who is here, who is supposed to be after all not half so bad as some of the others (Laughter)—

“has not thought of the 47,000 people thrown out of employment. Nothing can be more stupid, more irresponsible . . .”

May I remind you of the storm which raged over this House, because some officer used the word “stupid” in connection with his subordinate? I am not protesting against the use of this word at all, but I am pointing out that some of my friends on the other side think that the treatment which they mete out to others should not be dealt out to them. “Nothing more stupid, nothing more irresponsible” was said. Then, Sir, the Leader of the Nationalist Party came to the help of the speaker, from whose speech I was reading. I know that Mr. Aney’s interruptions are delightful, especially the one he made yesterday regarding “under-estimating” by the Finance Member. About the Railway Member Mr. Aney used the word “callous”. (Laughter.) Then the other speaker takes it up. After all, I am not complaining. The Nationalist Congress and the Nationalists mean one and the same thing: twin souls in double bodies. Their dispute is over a matter which is not only dead, but which has been cremated and the ashes have been thrown into the Ganges. (Laughter.)

Sardar Sant Singh (West Punjab: Sikh): My Honourable friend is mistaken in that: he will hear more about it tomorrow.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Mr. Aney said “callous”. Then, the other speaker said “callousness of the most brutal nature”. Of course, if the Finance Member on this side suggests that a Member facing him is guilty of irresponsibly circulating a rumour, that is wild invective, violent abuse, and so forth, but when language, a thousand times worse, is used on the other side, it is supposed to be parliamentary pleasantry.

Now, Sir, I have no desire to take any notice of my Honourable friend, Mr. Sri Prakasa, that amiable young person, who is so lovable outside, but who poses as a wild man inside this room. (Laughter.) I have no desire to go on quoting one abusive passage after another, used by Congress Members, but I hope what I have said will give some idea as to the high esteem in which some Members place themselves. The least breath of criticism is intolerable, hypersensitiveness has throughout marked some of my friends on the other side. At the same time, it has been open to those Honourable Members to behave in any way they like, and they are the people who complain of ill-treatment in the House. I believe it may be said of some Members that their idea of a fair fight is that a Congress Member should be armed with a bludgeon, while his opponent should be expected to fight with his hands tied behind his back. That is their idea of fair play, and the complaint is that they have not received that kind of fair play.

If my speech is discursive, the only reason is that nothing very coherent has been said by any Honourable Member opposite so far

An Honourable Member: Thank you for the confession.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: It must be so, no thanks are needed.

Now, I got another very valuable information from my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, who said "India has no enemies". I think he ought to have completed the sentence by saying "India not only has no enemies, but never had any, at any time". For instance, when Darius and Alexander came to India, they were attracted by a violent desire to investigate the caste system on the spot as they could not find the system in force in any other part of the world. (Laughter.) I believe it will be said that Mahmud of Gazni's one anxiety was to contemplate Southern Indian architecture of its Temples. That may be so. We never had any enemies: we shall have no enemies: our national solidarity is so great that we need not be afraid of any enemies. Talking of national solidarity, after my Honourable friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, had spoken and used the word "nationalist", it rather jarred upon my ears when he talked of the "foreigner from the Punjab" (Laughter).

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I never said that: I said foreigner from abroad.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I am extremely sorry that every one misheard him. The next point Mr. Satyamurti made—I am taking his specific complaint—was that he put a question to the Law Member, that is, his humble servant, as to whether he was going to consult public opinion, and the Law Member, as usual, would not give a straight answer. He said: "He will see what can be done: he will take proper steps and what not", but he never got a fair answer. I say deliberately that this is a parody of the answer that I actually gave. But the trouble is that, whenever my friend talks of public opinion, he does not recognise as public opinion any opinion which is in the slightest way divergent from his: that is not public opinion at all. On another occasion, very recently, there was some interchange of pleasantry between my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, and the Home Member, as to

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

who in the House represented public opinion. I gathered from him that he claimed—(if he did not use the exact words, that was the sense really of the observation)—that he alone claimed to represent public opinion.—and may I add—“and nobody else”. That is all very well. I know in public it is said that the Congress represents public opinion, and no other opinion need be seriously considered. But, in their unguarded moments, they sometimes disclose the real state of affairs as to how much of the public is represented by them. I read, I think, only two or three days ago, in the issue of the *Tribune* of the 4th March, a letter which purports to have been issued by Mr. A. Satyarthi, General Secretary of the Punjab Congress Nationalist Party, and I will read four or five lines from that letter:

“Punjab Muslims being deadly opposed to Congress politics can and shall never join the Congress for a long time to come. They cannot afford to incur the displeasure of their British masters”.

I stop here for a moment. This is the formula which we have heard repeated so often that whether the other fellow is a Muslim or a non-Congress Hindu or is a European or an Anglo-Indian, if he does not agree entirely—16 annas in the rupee—with the view of the Congress, then he must have sold himself to the British masters—he must be a traitor. That is the arrogance which leads some of the Honourable Members opposite to think that they and they alone represent public opinion. Once it is conceded that the Muslims are not in the Congress,—and it does not matter if 70 of them out of 70 millions have joined the Congress—if it is proved and admitted that the Europeans and Anglo-Indians are not in the Congress, that there is a large body of people who do not belong to the Congress and who are Hindus—I say it is fantastic to claim that if we have received other opinions, they are not to be regarded as opinions at all. Therefore, the grievance is not that public opinion is not consulted

Dr. N. B. Khare (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): On a point of order, Sir: is the Congress under discussion or the Executive Council?

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): An attack was made on the Executive Council mainly on the ground that they did not heed public opinion as voiced in this House.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: May I remind my medical friend, Dr. Khare, that I think some of my friends said—at least I remember one speech of my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, which is not surprising, knowing that he makes eight speeches outside the House every week, and I think I read in one of his speeches that his business was—I do not purport to give the exact words—to strengthen the parallel Government. Now, when this Government is attacked, is it so very irrelevant to show how the parallel Government is behaving? Congress, after all, claims to be the parallel Government. It cannot object to attention being drawn to its activities.

I think it was my friend, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra, from Bengal, who had something very trenchant to say—that does not mean reasonable—about the question of privilege. He repeated language—which has been

repeated *ad nauseam* in the press—that what has been done here in this House, that is the purport of the ruling of the President, introduced a state of things which is unknown in any part of the world. That is absolutely wrong. My friend has got to devote a little time to read books of other countries to find out what the law there is, and he has to understand what Walter's case means.

Then, Sir, my Honourable friend made an attack on the administration of justice being paralysed in Bengal by High Court circulars. Sir, this House has not been told how any circular has in any way paralysed the administration of justice. No indication has been given to show that a particular circular has in any way paralysed the administration of justice in Bengal

Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra: Time was short. Circulars are published in two volumes by the Calcutta High Court. I could not refer to them in detail within the brief time at my disposal.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Circulars may be published in 95 volumes, but the point is, what is the circular which is paralysing the administration of justice? Some indication of that should have been given to the House if it was contended seriously that the High Court was interfering with the administration of justice in Bengal. (Interruptions.) I do not propose to give way now, as I have only ten minutes more left. I don't see the relevancy of the misbehaviour of the High Court in a particular way by reason of certain circulars being issued, being fastened on to the Members of the Executive Council.

Then, Sir, I think it was my friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai, (Laughter),

Mr. Lalchand Navalrai: I am glad you are remembering me so often.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: Sir, how can I forget him? I can never forget the generous hospitality of my friend at Larkana. How can I forget him?

Mr. S. Satyamurti: This is the reward for it. (Laughter.)

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: How can I be so ungrateful as to forget him? Moreover, Sir, he has been so much in the limelight recently and so many newspaper articles have been written over his remaining neutral in this Session on a certain division ("Hear, hear" from Opposition Benches), that I can forget everybody, but I cannot possibly forget my friend, Mr. Lalchand Navalrai. (Laughter.) But, Sir, I am really glad that my Honourable friend has spoken today. I am really glad that he has indicated that he is hostile to this Government, because, Sir, most baseless insinuations were made against him that he was after a Ministership in Sind, and that was responsible for his remaining neutral. (Loud Laughter.) I never for one moment believed in such false calumny, and I am indeed glad that my friend has now shown his tiger qualities by attacking this wretched Government. (Laughter.)

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

Now, Sir, before I resume my seat,—I have got only a few minutes left,—I would like to give a serious answer to a question which was put by my friend, Mr. Jinnah.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Don't become serious. You will spoil all the effect.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I cannot help it, as, now, I am coming to the man who dealt with the matter seriously. So far I have been dealing with Mr. Satyamurti, and I was compelled to adopt a style called forth by his incoherent and wild abuse. Now, my friend, Mr. Jinnah, I think, put a question,—I am not quoting his exact words,—and asked: Will you show me any single major issue

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: First class issue.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: first class issue on which you have accepted the verdict of this House? I think that is the purport, I may not be accurate. I don't mean to say that, whatever views the House has urged, Government have accepted them in their entirety, but the question is, whether, on any first class or major issue, the view of this House has been accepted by the Government. Speaking off-hand, I venture to give a few examples. I will take for instance, the recent legislation,—when I say recent legislation, I am referring to legislation which has taken place during the last seven or eight years,—relating to factories, legislation relating to labour, mines, and so on, which affects the destinies of tens of thousands of workmen, labourers, industrialists. There, Sir, the views of this House were, I understand, generally speaking, accepted by the Government. Of course, the House is not expected to be unanimous on every question that comes up before it. Then, take another case, a very important matter of "indiscriminate protection", which was perhaps a slip of my friend, the correct expression being, I understand, "discriminating protection". That has been the view of this House, and whatever the personal view of any Member, who occupies the post of Executive Councillor, may be, the fact remains, that the principle has been adopted in this country, is due mainly to the influence of this House and to the views expressed in this House. If I may give smaller instances,—I won't say they are of first class importance in the sense in which my friend used an expression, even in smaller things like removal of income-tax from incomes

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I am not disputing that there are very many matters relating to administration on which Government have, from time to time, tried to meet the wishes of this House. That was not my point. What I meant by first class issues was I meant issues which involved big policies, big principles. That is what I meant.

The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar: I do not think I misunderstood my friend. I still think, with all respect to my friend, the question of discriminating protection is a big issue, it is a major issue, and a first class issue. It involved big policy, big principle. It is not a minor issue which

can be brushed aside as trivial and not involving big policy. Labour legislation also involves a very big issue. I submit, when I made that statement, I was labouring under no misapprehension.

Then, I have one more word to say, Sir. It was said by Mr. Jinnah that this Executive Council, being part of the Government of India, is really a subordinate body in the sense that the Government of India is under the control of somebody else by reason of the provisions of the Government of India Act. That that is the correct legal position, I do not for a moment dispute, in fact, it was on that assumption that I addressed the House on the last occasion. Well, Sir, if that is so, then the grievance is not really against the Executive Council, but against this Constitution which, as is conceded on all sides, is unsatisfactory.

I am afraid, Sir, my time is up, and I must conclude. I submit that no case has been made out for refusing supplies to Executive Council, and, if carried, the motion will amount to a censure of the Government of India Act, and of nothing else.

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

“That the demand under the head ‘Executive Council’ be reduced to Re. 1.”

The Assembly divided.

AYES—68.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.
Azbar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
Ba Si, U
Badrul Hasan, Maulvi.
Banerjea, Dr. P. N.
Bhagavan Das, Dr.
Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
Nath.
Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
Chunder, Mr. N. C.
Das, Mr. B.
Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
Gauga, Mr. K. L.
Giri, Mr. V. V.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.
Hans Raj, Raizada.
Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
Khan Sahib, Dr.
Khare, Dr. N. B.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Mangal Singh, Sardar.
Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
Syed.
Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta
Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
Parma Nand, Bhai.
Raghubir Narayan Singh, Chon-
dhri.
Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
Ranga, Prof. N. G.
Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
Sant Singh, Sardar.
Satyamurti, Mr. S.
Sham Lal, Mr.
Shaukat Ali, Maulana.
Sheodass Daga, Seth.
Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
Nawab.
Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.
Sri Prakasa, Mr.
Thein Maung, Dr.
Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
Varma, Mr. B. B.
Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

NOES—62.

Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.
 Acott, Mr. A. S. V.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.
 Aminuddin, Mr. Saiyid.
 Anwar-ul-Azim, Mr. Muhammad.
 Ayyar, Diwan Bahadur R. V.
 Krishna.
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.
 Venkatarama.
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Das-Gupta, Mr. S. K.
 Dash, Mr. A. J.
 Fazl-i-Haq Piracha. Khan
 Bahadur Shaikh.
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya
 Ananda.
 Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Grigson, Mr. W. V.
 Hands, Mr. A. S.
 Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 Hutton, Dr. J. H.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
 Khurshaid Muhammad, Khan Bahadur
 Shaikh.
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.

Leach, Mr. F. B.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 MacDongall, Mr. R. M.
 Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir
 Sayad Muhammad.
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.
 Mody, Sir H. P.
 Morgan, Mr. G.
 Muhammad Ismail Khan, Haji
 Chaudhury.
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
 Makhdum Syed.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sale, Mr. J. F.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain
 Sardar.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur Shyam Narayan.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir
 Nripendra.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Witherington, Mr. C. H.
 Yakub, Sir Muhammad.
 Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
 Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir
 Muhammad.
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Before the Independent Party is called upon to move their cut motion, I have to say a word about an incident that happened this morning. When I asked Sir Cowasji Jehangir to take the Chair, when I left at a quarter to one, I was informed that the Honourable the Deputy President was indisposed and I did not find him in his seat during the question hour, nor did I notice when he had come in.

 DEMAND No. 79—BALUCHISTAN.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 66,31,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1937, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

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

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 66,31,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1937, in respect of 'Baluchistan'."

Expenditure due to Earthquake at Quetta.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Sir, I beg to move:

“That the demand under the head ‘Baluchistan’ be reduced by Rs. 27,69,100.”

Mr. President, after the exciting debate we have had, I desire, with your permission, to bring the House back to a point which really touches the budget. We have heard from the Honourable the Finance Member that he proposes to finance the reconstruction of Quetta from loan funds

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: No, from revenue.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I am sorry, from revenue, and I have contested that position when I had the privilege of speaking during the general discussion on the budget. We are not against the reconstruction of Quetta. There may be differences of opinion as to the site. I am not concerned just now about that. There may be differences of opinion as to how much should be spent. I am not concerned with that just now. The only point I am concerned with is how this amount is to be provided. We are told that out of the civil budget, about 40 lakhs will be required, of which 12 lakhs will go for clearance, etc., which is a legitimate charge upon revenue and that 28 lakhs will be used for reconstruction. That is the amount I have picked out of the budget and desire to delete. Now, Sir, I do not know really whether there can be any difference of opinion on a question which appears to me so simple and so plain. When you reconstruct a city, you should not place the burden upon one generation but you should spread that burden over several generations. I quoted certain instances when I last spoke on this point, instances in England. I gave the instance of a big public building. I gave the instance of a bridge. I was told that they related to local bodies and not to Government. While reading the debate, I noticed an interjection from my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, asking me to supply him with an instance for military works and I am surprised at that interjection, considering that just now the Government in England are considering the question of a big loan of 200 million sterling for the expansion of defence.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: They have not said so.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: I read it in a speech. Reuters may be wrong but I read it definitely in the speech of Mr. Neville Chamberlain. I have not got the facts and figures before me. I shall give a better instance, a better analogy, the earthquake in Japan. The reconstruction in Japan was financed from capital, and I have got facts and figures about that before me. The reconstruction of all damage done by the earthquake in Japan was financed from a loan of 550 million yen and partly from another loan of 350 million yen.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Most of their budget is financed from borrowing. Half their budget is uncovered. Do you want that example followed?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, wants to put me off my point. I am not going to do it. Because a country is financing some other projects from capital, he says that the instance I give of Japan financing this particular project from capital is not worthy of consideration. I consider the interjection not worthy of consideration. I contend most strongly that the Finance Member's proposal is bad budgeting and bad finance especially for a poor country like India. He wants us to pay out of revenues a crore a year for seven or eight years. It may be more. Your surpluses will be reduced by a crore, your deficits, when you have them, will be increased by a crore for some years to come. I do not think, Sir, that a poor country like India should finance big projects in this way. (Hear, hear.) I admit that, if you had enormous surpluses, if your people were not heavily taxed, you might be able to finance such projects out of revenue. Sir, a Government budget of this sort is very much like the budget of an individual. He builds a big house for himself, and if he cannot afford to build it out of his income—and very few men can—he builds it out of capital. My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, wants to build a city out of our income, and the worst aspect of it is that we are still suffering under a load of taxation which was thrust on to us in times of emergency and by this proposal of his he will continue that state of emergency for some time to come.

An Honourable Member: For seven years at least.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: After all, I would point out to this Honourable House that a crore a year is no small sum. Why, Mr. President, when my Honourable friend gave a crore of money for the relief of the agriculturist, he was proud of that fact, and perhaps rightly so. It was only one crore for one year that he gave. It may have risen through circumstances not under his control to a very much larger sum than one crore, as a matter of fact it amounted to 2 crores 81 lakhs. He desires that we should, out of revenue, pay the same sum for seven years to come, for the building of a city. That will show how big that sum really is in the Government of India's opinion. I know my Honourable friend has been accustomed to dealing in millions, he has had something to do with a budget of £800 million . . .

Mr. S. Satyamurti: What have we got to do with that?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir . . . but, after all, we are dealing in much smaller figures; a million sterling a year out of revenue is a great deal of money for us, and we desire, by this cut, to bring this pointedly to the attention of the Government and we desire that they shall build, if they choose to, a city anywhere they like—it may be on the same site or on any other site—but they shall divide the burden equitably. (Hear, hear.) That is all I have got to say at present. I know that this House cannot touch the bigger sum in the military budget, the bigger sum of fifty lakhs of rupees; it is really 60 lakhs, 50 lakhs for reconstruction and 10 lakhs for clearance; we cannot touch that, it is non-votable, but the same principle applies; we can get at this sum of about 28 lakhs, we can cut it out; we very much regret we cannot cut out the other, but when my Honourable friend moves his cut on the army, we shall have something to say about that fifty lakhs. For the present I trust the Honourable House will accept my argument as fairly sound and will insist on this money being financed out of capital.

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

"That the demand under the head 'Baluchistan' be reduced by Rs. 27,69,100."

Dr. P. N. Banerjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I rise to support this amendment, and I do so on two grounds. The Honourable the Finance Member, in the course of his budget speech, said:

"It is contrary to strict financial orthodoxy to borrow for expenditure which does not yield a cash return."

This, Sir, is not wholly correct. If my Honourable friend will read the literature on this subject, he will find that the great economists of his own country are divided in opinion on this question, and even the most orthodox amongst English economists admit the necessity, in certain circumstances, of incurring expenditure of an extraordinary character out of loan funds. I may mention J. S. Mill, who admits that there is such a necessity. Even Adam Smith does not deny such a necessity. Another economist, an eminent writer on Public Finance, Bastable, after pointing out the different aspects of the question, says that it is sometimes necessary. Coming to other countries, I find that the great American economist and writer on Public Finance, Professor Seligman, says definitely:

"In the case of non-recurring non-self-supporting capital expenditures the utilization of public credit is clearly permissible"—

and he gives certain instances, such as the Chicago fire and the Boston fire. He then goes on to assert:

"Since the outlay needed to keep these communities alive or to repair the ravages of a conflagration may not be expected to occur again or certainly not for a long future, it would be manifestly improper to saddle the entire burden upon the unfortunate taxpayers of that particular year."

He also mentions instances like floods and famines. Therefore, this theoretical objection does not hold good. Sir, the other day, I had occasion to examine his proposal with regard to the provincial finances, which is his second ground for objecting to the incurring of expenditure out of loan funds. I pointed out on that occasion that provincial finances would benefit greatly if the Quetta expenditure was financed out of loan funds, because, during the first five years of the new experiment, provincial finances will have to stand a very great strain. Therefore, during these five years, it will be desirable not to burden the Central Exchequer with the whole of this amount at the rate of one crore of rupees a year. If the whole of this amount can be transferred to the Provinces it will do a great deal of benefit to them. Sir, on these two grounds, the grounds urged by the Honourable the Finance Member himself, I support this motion.

Mr. Sami Venkatachalam Chetty: Sir, I rise to support this motion as briefly as possible. I am rather surprised that the Honourable the Finance Member is a worshipper at the altar of orthodoxy, whether financial or otherwise. Our impression of the Honourable the Finance

[Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty.]

Member was anything but an orthodox man. We have all been the victims of orthodoxy of one kind or another, and this time financial orthodoxy has come to the rescue of the Honourable the Finance Member to put down the people of this country and to make them pay tax which is no more required for the purpose of revenue expenditure of the Government of India. Sir, if he is really a worshipper of orthodoxy, I would rather like that he should respect his promises before becoming so superstitious as to worship orthodoxy of this kind. On more than one occasion he assured the House that emergency taxation, which he had to resort to, on account of emergent circumstances, would be relieved the moment when that emergency ceases.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member cannot produce any quotation to that effect from my speeches at all.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: I thought the Government of India had a continuity of policy.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: When the Honourable Member says that I gave assurances he means my predecessor. I quite see.

Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty: Last year, he did say, in view of the promises made by his predecessor, he was restoring the cut, because the emergency had ceased to exist. I, therefore, take it that what his predecessor has said in respect of this emergency taxation, he had adopted at least last year. If he is willing to go back this year on what he said last year, that is a different matter. Sir, after having fulfilled one half of the promise which is advantageous to the services, he hesitates to continue the policy which has been promised to the people of this country by his predecessor. Apart from that, the new theory which he has propounded of the manner in which the loan funds should be spent and revenue amounts be spent is one at which I am rather taken aback, and it is like throwing a bomb shell on the people of this country. Sir, it is stated that, unless there is a guarantee of return of interest on the sinking fund of any project that would be undertaken, it would be far better to take that amount from the revenue. If that should be the policy of the Honourable the Finance Member now, the net result of that would be that there is no chance of any relief from this excessive taxation for at least eight years to come on account of Quetta. If one crore of rupees should be allotted every year and if the amount required would be about eight crores, it follows, as day follows night, that there cannot be any relief in taxation for the next eight years. I would like to ask the Honourable the Finance Member, if he is going to strictly follow the maxim he has now laid down, what would happen if there had been no surplus this year. Would he have levied fresh taxation in order to reconstruct Quetta? It is because there is a surplus, his theory or his maxim may have a plausible excuse. But, in case there is no surplus, would the Honourable Member be justified in asking this House to vote for increase of taxation? Today, if this House should accede to the demand that this amount should be taken from the revenue funds, it only means that this House is agreeing for increase of taxation, not only now, but also for all time to come. Whether the taxation is just or otherwise, it is a different matter. So far as emergency taxation is concerned, so far as that continues to be a source

of revenue to this Government, there is absolutely no justification for the Honourable the Finance Member to take this money from the revenue. Now, may I ask what was done in the case of the reconstruction of New Delhi? Was the amount taken from revenue or from capital? What is it that is being done in various Provincial Governments in respect of such big projects which would have a permanency at least for two generations to come? I suppose in several Provinces a development fund is being created and money put into it by way of loans and in the same way we pay in the course of years. With regard to Quetta, any reasonable man would take it that the life of the new City would be at least 100 years. Is it fair that a generation should pay in eight years for what would last about 100 years? This seems to be a very unreasonable financial policy. What he calls orthodoxy is not real orthodoxy, but unwillingness to part with public money. That is the bare truth of it. It is unfortunate and unjust that the Honourable Member should be still adhering to this excessive taxation and dissipate the revenues for the purposes for which monies should be got from other sources. The level of taxation is indeed very high, and it would have been in the fitness of things that the Honourable the Finance Member should be looking to reducing the burden of taxation; instead of that, he is piling up taxation, not only piling up, but laying down a rule which rather creates a great stir in the minds of the tax paying community. I think the vote of this House on the question of Pusa Institute should have been a sufficient warning for the Honourable the Finance Member to put down this money under capital expenditure instead of revenue. But the Honourable the Finance Member is not orthodox in the matter of observing due regard to this House, and, therefore, it is that he merely poohpoohed the verdict of the House. I expect that today at least he will change his so-called orthodox views and be more modern and be more up-to-date than to stick on to so-called orthodoxy which is merely superstition. (Applause.)

Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad (United Provinces Southern Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I very much appreciate the arguments put forward by my Honourable friends, Sir Cowasji Jehangir and Dr. Banerjee, but there is one point to which I should like to draw the attention of the House. I think it is the earnest desire of the Assembly, and probably every economist would agree, that we should make every attempt to pay off our debt if we can possibly do so. This is a proposition which nobody would challenge. If, at any time, through economy, we can pay off our debt, I think we should always welcome it. My Honourable friend advocates that particular item should be debited to capital expenditure. I say, all right, let it be paid out of capital account, and pay so much money to the capital fund out of revenues of this money. So it is practically a question of plus and minus. We may pay so much money into the avoidance of Debt account in order to pay off our debt, which we borrowed for this purpose. Had the question been to avoid payment altogether, I think everybody would have welcomed it. To pay out of loan and provide so much money for the payment of loan is only a question of plus and minus. This argument, which has been advanced, resembles the argument which is advanced by certain educationist about examinations. It is said that it is useless to examine the answer book of a candidate. The roll number of candidates may be put on one side and all the marks in the other book and marks may be drawn by ballot. This appears to be a very hypothetical proposition, but it is based on the

[Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad.]

following argument: when the same answer book is sent to different examiners, it is found that examiners give varying marks from 20 to 80 on the same answer. Why decide the luck of students by the choice of examiners, why not draw the lot of numbers, why introduce the bogus element of an examiner, why not give them marks by ballot at once? In the present instance, the argument appears to be of the same type. We first pay money under the head of "Reduction and avoidance of debt" account and then take it back in the shape of new loan. Why not remove unnecessary accountancy in the same manner as unnecessary factor of examiners in examination theory. Sir, it is a question of plus and minus and it does not substantially affect the pockets of tax payers.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Sir, I do not propose in this debate to go over again the remarks which I have already made at great length on this matter on two occasions. It is a very simple issue, and the Honourable the Baronet from Bombay put it very neatly in a sentence which I unhesitatingly accept. India is a poor country, and, therefore, it must borrow. That is exactly the point. We must go and borrow and derive benefit from expenditure and leave other people to pay for it. That has been the history of Indian finance, both Central and Provincial, for many years. That is the reason for half, if not more, of the financial difficulties of India. In my view, it is essential to the maintenance of the credit of India that orthodox finance should be preserved, and orthodoxy requires you to provide for a gradual reduction of your debt burdens year by year. And this is merely a proposal to increase the debt burdens when the provision for debt reduction is already inadequate. The provision laid down, when the present debt was much smaller and when the railways were paying, when the credit of India had far less risks ahead of it, was the figure of seven crores or round about seven crores. That was regarded as the requirement of the debt service of this country in order to maintain the credit of this country and to allow conversions taking place at the due dates with comfort and with profit. Now that the sinking fund has been reduced to three crores, on a very much larger debt, it is proposed that it should in effect be reduced still further, and all the excuse given is, India is a poor country, it cannot afford to pay for what it has got to spend, and, therefore, it must borrow; never mind who has got to pay for it; we cannot afford it, but never mind; let us have it and let somebody else pay for it. It seems to me absolutely essential for the maintenance of the credit of India that that doctrine should be exploded. And then the Honourable Member produced the case of Japan as an example. Japan borrowed for its earthquake expenditure. Japan is borrowing for about 60 per cent. of its present budget. Does he want that example followed? He would get a terrific lot of money to reduce taxation that way.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Why not take your own country?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: The Honourable Member produced Japan, and I am entitled to ask him if he thinks that the financial policy of Japan is one which he wishes to see followed in this country.

Another thing that strikes me about the speeches that have been made is that, though there may be a certain amount of concordance as to charging this expenditure to capital, there is certainly no concordance as

to the object for which the money realised shall be used. The Honourable the Baronet from Bombay naturally wants taxation reduced; the Honourable Member from Madras, belonging to the Congress Party, also naturally wants taxation reduced; the Honourable Member from Bengal perhaps equally naturally wants the money devoted to the provinces, and so on. Of course, I do not know what decision the House will come to on this, but, before we finish with the budget debates, I have not the slightest doubt that these 28 lakhs will be made available about ten times over for serving various objects. The Honourable the Baronet from Bombay is himself a business man. I notice that in his analogies he did not use the analogy of business. As he is running a business, may I ask him if he would incur capital expenditure if it promised to make no return at all?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: If it was necessary for the business and if it were going to last for a hundred years, undoubtedly so.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: How can it be necessary for the business if it does not make any return and shows a loss?

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: Then the business would not undertake such a thing and you need not undertake it.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: That is exactly the point. Take, as an example, welfare expenditure which may be forced upon you by legislation. To do that out of capital

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: What an example! There is certainly a difference between welfare expenditure and building a new city?

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Of course, welfare expenditure is a case where the question arises as to whether it is to be charged to capital or to revenue.

Sir Cowasji Jehangir: You might as well say that my expenses on food should come out of capital.

The Honourable Sir James Grigg: Of course, there were various Honourable Members who quoted the precedent of New Delhi against me. I do not think it is a particularly happy one. They themselves are always bemoaning the extravagance of it, and I should have thought that people would want to pay for their extravagances out of revenue. But still, be that as it may, the question of the provinces was also brought up and the example of the provincial borrowings pointed out. Well, practically every province, except about two, are in deficit. Practically all of them have very heavy debt charges; and I personally think that one of the main reasons for their difficulties is improvidence in days gone by. And if the taxpayer of the present generation has got to pay for the expenditure, he will exercise a much closer check on it. The Honourable Member from Madras said that taxation is very high and it must be reduced. I think I am right in saying that where it is a question of protective taxation, where the burden falls on the consumer without any benefit to the exchequer at all, he has done nothing ever since he has come to this House, but demanded that it should be increased. So that he is not quite consistent in his demands for reduced taxation. Reduced taxation for me by all means, but let us increase it for the other fellow.

[Sir James Grigg.]

Dr. Ziauddin made a point which does seem to me to go to the root of the matter. He said that if you are going to charge this to capital,—as far as I understood his argument,—there is an obligation on you to increase your provision for debt redemption accordingly, because charging this to capital is merely an attempt to raid the sinking fund. This was the argument which I have tried to put before the House on two occasions now, and as I do not wish to keep the House from coming to an early decision on the matter, I will not repeat my argument. But it is, in fact, the crux of the matter that, by adding to your capital expenditure for Quetta, you will, in fact, be raiding your sinking fund and leaving the amount of that quite inadequate for the preservation of your credit.

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

“That the demand under the head ‘Baluchistan’ be reduced by Rs. 27,69,100.”

The Assembly divided:

AYES—73.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.
 Aboola Haroon, Seth Haji.
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthassayanam.
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.
 Badrul Hasan, Maulvi.
 Bejoria, Babu Baijnath.
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.
 Bhagawan Das, Dr.
 Chattopadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra
 Nath.
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.
 Chunder, Mr. N. C.
 Das, Mr. B.
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.
 Gauba, Mr. K. L.
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.
 Giri, Mr. V. V.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh
 Hans Raj, Raizada.
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kailash Behari Lal, Babu.
 Khan Sahib, Dr.

Khare, Dr. N. B.
 Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.
 Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.
 Mody, Sir H. P.
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.
 Muhammad Ismail Khan, Haji
 Chaudhury.
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Syed.
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.
 Raghunath Narayan Singh, Chou-
 dhri.
 Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.
 Sant Singh, Sardar.
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.
 Sham Lal, Mr.
 Shaikat Ali, Maulana.
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib
 Nawab.
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.
 Som, Mr. Surya Kumar.
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.
 Umar Aly Shah, Mr.
 Varma, Mr. B. B.
 Vissanii, Mr. Mathuradas.

NOES—52.

Acott, Mr. A. S. V.
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major
 Nawab.
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.
 Aminuddin, Mr. Saiyid.
 Ayyar, Diwan Bahadur R. V.
 Krishna.
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.
 Venkatarama.
 Bajpai, Sir Girja Shankar.
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.
 Buss, Mr. L. C.
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.
 Das-Gupta, Mr. S. K.
 Dash, Mr. A. J.
 Fazl-i-Haq Piracha, Khan Bahadur
 Shaikh.
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya
 Ananda.
 Ghuznavi, Sir Abdul Halim.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.
 Grigson, Mr. W. V.
 Hands, Mr. A. S.
 Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.
 Hutton, Dr. J. H.
 James, Mr. F. E.
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur
 Sardar Sir.
 Khurshaid Muhammad, Khan Bahadur
 Shaikh.

Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur
 Chaudhri.
 Leach, Mr. F. B.
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 MacDougall, Mr. R. M.
 Metcalfe, Sir Aubrey.
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.
 Morgan, Mr. G.
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya
 Charan.
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. C.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Khan Bahadur
 Makhdum Syed.
 Rau, Mr. P. R.
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.
 Sale, Mr. J. F.
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain
 Sardar.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur Shyam Narayan.
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir
 Nripendra.
 Spence, Mr. G. H.
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.
 Witherington, Mr. C. H.
 Yamin Khan, Sir Muhammad.
 Zafrullah Khan, The Honourable Sir
 Muhammad.
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

The motion was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 11th March, 1936.