

28th March 1935

# THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

(Official Report)

---

Volume III, 1935

(9th March to 28th March, 1935)

---

FIRST SESSION

OF THE

FIFTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,  
1935



NEW DELHI  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS  
1935

# **Legislative Assembly.**

---

## *President :*

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

## *Deputy President :*

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

## *Panel of Chairmen :*

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

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

**LIEUT.-COLONEL SIR HENRY GIDNEY, KT., M.L.A.**

**SARDAR SANT SINGH, 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.**

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

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

**RAJA SIR VASUDEVA RAJAH, KT., C.I.E., M.L.A.**

**MR. N. M. JOSHI, M.L.A.**

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME III.—9th March to 28th March, 1935.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>SATURDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1935—</b>		<b>TUESDAY, 12TH MARCH, 1935—</b>	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	1959—91	Questions and Answers . . . . .	2159—96
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	1991—2023	Short Notice Questions and Answers . . . . .	2196—98
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Arrests in Calcutta of prominent workers connected with the All-India Trade Union Congress—Ruled out of order . . . . .	2024—29	The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
Statement of Business . . . . .	2029—30	Demand No. 39—Army Department—	
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>cont'd.</i>		Indianisation and over-expenditure . . . . .	2198—2244
Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses)—		Demand No. 79—Baluchistan—	
Grievances of the Inferior Services . . . . .	2031—57	Repressive policy in Baluchistan . . . . .	2244—48
Position of the Bengal Mussalmans in the Office of the Postmaster General, Bengal and Assam Circle . . . . .	2057—63	Demand No. 16—Customs . . . . .	2248
Demand No. 18—Salt—Damage done to the poor Zamindars of the Khushab and Pind Dadan Khan Tahsils in the District of Shahpur and Jhelum in the Punjab on account of the Salt Range and the Khewra Salt Mines . . . . .	2064—75	Demand No. 17—Taxes on Income . . . . .	2248
<b>MONDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1935—</b>		Demand No. 18—Salt . . . . .	2249
Members Sworn . . . . .	2077	Demand No. 19—Opium . . . . .	2249
Questions and Answers . . . . .	2077—2113	Demand No. 19A.—Excise . . . . .	2249
Short Notice Questions and Answers . . . . .	2113—15	Demand No. 20—Stamp . . . . .	2249
The General Budget—List of Demands— <i>cont'd.</i>		Demand No. 21—Forest . . . . .	2249
Demand No. 28—Executive Council— <i>cont'd.</i>		Demand No. 22—Irrigation (including Working Expenses), Navigation, Embankment and Drainage Works . . . . .	2250
Grievances of working classes . . . . .	2115—32	Demand No. 23—Indian Posts and Telegraphs Department (including Working Expenses) . . . . .	2250
Necessity of adapting the administration to meet modern economic needs . . . . .	2132—57	Demand No. 25—Interest on Debt and Reduction or Avoidance of Debt . . . . .	2250
		Demand No. 26—Interest on Miscellaneous Obligations . . . . .	2250
		Demand No. 27—Staff, Household and Allowances of the Governor General . . . . .	2250
		Demand No. 28—Executive Council . . . . .	2251
		Demand No. 29—Council of State . . . . .	2251
		Demand No. 30—Legislative Assembly and Legislative Assembly Department . . . . .	2251

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>SATURDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1935—</b>		<b>TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1935—<i>contd.</i></b>	
Statements laid on the Table . . . . .	2531—37	Election of Members to the Court of the University of Delhi . . . . .	2762
Election of Members to the Central Advisory Council for Railways . . . . .	2538	Government's Right to make any modification in the business of the House . . . . .	2762
Election of Members to the Standing Committee for Roads . . . . .	2538—39	Demands for Supplementary Grants in respect of Railways . . . . .	2763—90
Election of Members to the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research and its Governing Body . . . . .	2539	Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .	2790—2825
Bill passed by the Council of State . . . . .	2539		
The Indian Finance Bill—Discussion on the motion to consider not concluded . . . . .	2540—65, 2567—96	<b>WEDNESDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1935—</b>	
Statement of Business . . . . .	2565—67	Questions and Answers . . . . .	2827—55
<b>MONDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1935</b>		Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .	2853—57
Questions and Answers . . . . .	2597—2639	Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Reservation of the Highlands of Kenya for Europeans—Withdrawn . . . . .	2857—59
Unstarred Questions and Answers . . . . .	2639—58	Election of a Member to the Council of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore . . . . .	2859, 2898—2913
Short Notice Question and Answer . . . . .	2659—61	Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .	2859—98
Statement of Business . . . . .	2662—65		
Election of the Public Accounts Committee . . . . .	2665	<b>THURSDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1935—</b>	
Statement laid on the Table . . . . .	2665—70	Questions and Answers . . . . .	2919—57
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion to consider adopted . . . . .	2671—2714	Statement <i>re</i> Tribunal for Indo-Burma Financial Settlement . . . . .	2958—60
<b>TUESDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1935—</b>		Motions for Adjournment <i>re</i> —	
Questions and Answers . . . . .	2715—58	Working of the new Constitution by Indians despite disclaimers—	
Motion for Adjournment <i>re</i> Financial adjustments between India and Burma—Adopted . . . . .	2758—61, 2802—25	Ruled out of order . . . . .	2960—64
Election of the Standing Finance Committee for 1935-36 . . . . .	2761	Confidential report made on Members of the Legislative Assembly—Ruled out of order . . . . .	2965—68
		Demands for Supplementary Grants . . . . .	2968—3025



# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Thursday, 28th March, 1935.*

---

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.

### INSURANCE BUSINESS IN INDIA.

1089. **\*Seth Govind Das:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state what is the amount of premium income earned in respect of Insurance, Fire, Motor, Marine and Life by (i) Indian companies, (ii) foreign companies, during the last five years?

(b) Are Government aware of the fact that great competition is being experienced in insurance business in India owing to the unrestricted entry into India of Colonial, American, Continental and Japanese Insurance Companies?

(c) Will Government be pleased to state whether they consider 'Insurance' as an important national industry and, if so, will Government be pleased to state what steps they contemplate taking to protect this industry and to prevent its progress being given a set-back by foreign competition?

(d) Are Government aware of the restrictions placed against foreign insurance companies by several countries on the Continent and in America? What steps do Government propose to take against those countries which impose restrictions on the admission of Indian Insurance Companies thereto?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** (a) On the presumption that the Honourable Member refers to premium income earned in India, a statement showing the information so far as available is placed on the table.

(b), (c) and (d). The question of the amendment of the existing insurance law in India is under the consideration of the Government of India.

*Statement showing premium income earned in India in respect of Life, Fire, Marine and Miscellaneous insurance businesses by (i) Indian Companies and (ii) non-Indian Companies during each of the financial years ending in 1928 to 1932.*

(In thousands of rupees.)

		Life.	Fire.	Marine.	Miscellaneous*	Total.	Grand Total.
1928	Indian Companies . .	3,34,78†	16,44	10,76	14,10	3,76,08	8,79,79
	Non-Indian Companies . .	2,90,25	1,28,17	43,52	41,77	5,03,71	
1929	Indian Companies . .	3,89,07†	22,88	11,25	17,61	4,41,41	10,31,53
	Non-Indian Companies . .	3,42,91	1,31,63	56,97	58,61	5,90,12	
1930	Indian Companies . .	4,09,02	25,22	10,16	25,59	4,69,99	10,81,71
	Non-Indian Companies . .	3,88,90	1,20,58	41,32	60,92	6,11,72	
1931	Indian Companies . .	4,51,00	28,42	7,19	24,11	5,10,72	11,09,92
	Non-Indian Companies . .	4,10,39	99,89	35,56	53,38	5,99,22	
1932	Indian Companies . .	4,96, 0	28,48	7,30	28,28	5,60,26	11,65,23
	Non-Indian Companies . .	4,23,46	97,64	36,47	47,40	6,04,97	

\*All classes of insurance business other than Life, Fire, and Marine are included under this head, separate figures for motor insurance business are not available.

† This includes figures for business outside India for which separate figures are not available.

**Seth Govind Das:** May I ask, Sir, when the Government will be able to say anything definite on this matter after due consideration of the case?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** Perhaps my Honourable friend is not aware of the fact that the same officer who has been dealing with the question of the companies law is now dealing with the insurance law. References have gone out, I understand, not only to Local Governments but to public bodies inviting their observations, and I should say that his report would be ready by about August.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Are Government aware that in America and in some European countries large amounts to the extent of nearly £50,000 are required as the initial deposit by foreign insurance companies who want to carry on their business in those countries?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** That may be so. I will not say that my Honourable friend is wrong.

**Mr. O. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Are Government aware that in England they impose an initial fee of £20,000 on any Insurance Company which does its business in England?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** I will not contest my Honourable friend's information on that point.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Is any such deposit required here?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** I shall have to ask for a notice of that question.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the proceedings of a Conference held in Bombay recently about Indian Insurance Companies? I believe it was presided over by Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, and they passed several resolutions, asking for protection to Indian Insurance Companies.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** All those matters will be taken into account before the revision of the present law is undertaken.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government answer the second part of the question contained in part (d), namely, whether they propose to take any steps against those countries which impose restrictions on the admission of Indian Insurance Companies thereto?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** That, Sir, is not a matter connected with the revision of the ordinary insurance law, and, as I said in connection with the question which was put pertaining to Italy, the matter was under our consideration.

**Seth Govind Das:** Will Government consider the advisability of imposing a large amount of deposit on foreign companies who want to trade in this country?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** Well, Sir, as I said, the whole matter is receiving consideration, and I am not prepared to say what steps will or will not be taken.

#### IMPORTATION OF SILVER INTO INDIA FROM KUTCH TERRITORY.

1090. **\*Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether importation of silver into any part of India from Kutch territory is prohibited?

(b) Is it a fact that Government instead of proving that the silver was so imported from Cutch, throw the burden on the people to prove from where they obtained the silver? If so, under what authority?

(c) Is it a fact that the Collector of Karachi decided that no one should be prosecuted for past transactions, but some people are still being prosecuted?

(d) Do Government propose to issue orders that no one should be put to trouble and expense by being prosecuted on the mere allegation of some past transactions without such silver having been seized, or found in the possession of the person implicated? If not, why not?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** (a) The import of all dutiable articles by land from Cutch into British India is prohibited.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. The second part does not arise.

(c) No. The decision to which the Honourable Member refers related to the facts of a particular case. It did not apply, and was not intended to apply, to all cases irrespective of the amount of evidence which might be obtained regarding past transactions.

(d) Proceedings are not taken on mere allegations. Government are not prepared to make the seizure of silver a necessary condition precedent to the institution of proceedings.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** May I know from the Honourable Member that, although silver may not actually be detected in the possession of an importer, yet he could be prosecuted after two or three years?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** I think, Sir, it is improbable that evidence would be forthcoming after two or three years. At the same time, it is not impossible. As I have said in my previous reply, it is not essential that the silver should actually be seized, if there is other evidence of a convincing nature which establishes the fact that the crime has been committed.

**Mr. Lalchand Navalrai:** Does the Honourable Member propose to give instructions to the officers there to prosecute only when they have got very satisfactory and convincing evidence?

**Mr. A. H. Lloyd:** No such instructions are necessary. They are well aware of the necessity of having clear proof.

#### CERTAIN RAILWAY SURVEY WORKS.

1091. **\*Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state:

- (i) when the following survey works were first undertaken;
- (ii) the mileage extent of each;
- (iii) whether survey was completed;
- (iv) whether budget estimates were prepared, if so, how much for each;
- (v) whether budgets were sanctioned; and
- (vi) why the projects work were not begun in each case:
  - (1) Cumbum—Kalabasti,
  - (2) Nandyal—Atmakur,
  - (8) Nandyal—Koilkuntla,
  - (4) Yerragudipad—Prodattur,
  - (5) Kanivihalli—Swamihalli,
  - (6) Kalikiri—Royachoti,
  - (7) Madras—Tirupati,
  - (8) Kalabasti—Udayagiri,
  - (9) Renigunta—Tirupati via Chiratanur,
  - (10) Cumbum—Kanigiri,
  - (11) Yerragudipad—Nandyal,
  - (12) Trichinopoly—Madura Electrification scheme, and
  - (13) Trichinopoly—Puducottah—Karaikudi?

(b) In view of the famine conditions prevailing in the area where the projects from (1) to (11) were surveyed, are Government prepared to take up these works immediately in order to give work for the starving labourers?

(c) In view of the survey of Trichinopoly—Madura Electrification scheme, are Government prepared to take up the work in hand?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) A statement giving the information required is laid on the table. I might add that two of the thirteen lines mentioned have been constructed.

(b) It is for the Local Government to take the initiative in this matter.

(c) It was not established at the time that the scheme was necessary, as it was doubtful whether electrification or doubling the line would be the most suitable solution. The present traffic does not justify the expenditure involved.

Project.	When survey was first undertaken.	Mileage.	Whether survey was completed.	Whether Budget estimates were prepared, if so, how much for each.	Whether budgets were sanctioned.	Why the work on the projects was not begun.
1. Cumbum-Kalabasti	Reconnoitred in 1925.	238.00	The reconnaissance was completed.	Yes. The cost was estimated to be Rs. 221.15 lakhs.	No.	The project was unremunerative.
2. Nandyal-Atmakur	1909	80.14	Yes	Yes. Rs. 20.54 lakhs	No.	The prospects of the line were poor.
3. Nandyal-Koilkuntla	1909	18.78	Yes	Yes. Rs. 12.58 lakhs	No	The prospects of the line were poor.
4. Yerragudipad-Podatur.	..	11.27	..	No, but cost roughly placed at about Rs. 12½ lakhs.	No	The prospects were not promising.
5. Kanivhalli-Swamihalli	1924	12.00	Yes	Yes. Rs. 6.12 lakhs	Yes	Line completed and opened on 15th March 1928.
6. Kalikiri-Royachoti	1899	34.42	Yes	Yes. Rs. 10.76 lakhs	No	Was unremunerative and was held in abeyance.
7. Madras-Tirupati	1912	78.68	Yes	Yes. Rs. 80.93 lakhs as brought up to date in 1928	No	Financial stringency.
8. Kalabasti-Udayagiri	..	..	..	....	..	The consideration of this project, among others, was with the concurrence of the Local Government abandoned in 1928 in favour of a line from Nellore to Kani-giri.

Project.	When survey was first undertaken.	Mileage.	Whether survey was completed.	Whether budget estimates were prepared, if so, how much for each.	Whether budgets were sanctioned.	Why the work on the projects was not begun.
9. Renigunta-Tirupati via Chiratanur (Realignment).	1928 . .	4.4	Yes	Yes. Rs. 1.74 lakhs	No	The prospects were found to be poor.
10. Gumbum-Kanigiri . .	..	..	..	....	..	<i>Vide remarks against Item 8 above.</i>
11. Yerragudipad-Nandyal	1909 . .	71.5	Yes	Yes. Rs. 40.85 lakhs	No	It was found to be unremunerative.
12. Trinichinopoly-Madura Electrification.	1925 . .	96.00	Yes	Yes. Rs. 81.54 lakhs	No	The scheme was not established to be necessary at the time.
13. Trinichinopoly P u d u-cottah-Karaikudi.	Part in 1887 and part in 1908.	94.22	Yes	Yes. Rs. 133.61 lakhs for whole line from Trichy to Manamadurai.	Yes	Line completed and opened in full on 1st July 1930.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government give preference to these railway projects when additional funds are available for development?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** No, Sir. Government propose to utilise any funds that are available for remunerative projects.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** May I know what is the answer to sub-clause (vi) of part (a) of the question?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** The answer will be found in the statement I am laying on the table.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Sir, when statements are laid on the table and we are not given a copy of them, we are not able to put supplementary questions.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can put supplementary questions afterwards, by putting down these questions.

#### EXTENSION OF THE ELECTRIFICATION SCHEME FROM TAMBARAM TO CHINGLEPUT.

1092. **\*Mr. O. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Are Government prepared to consider the feasibility of extending the electrification scheme from Tambaram to Chingleput, the district headquarters, at a distance of 20 miles?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I have forwarded the question to the Agent, South Indian Railway, for consideration.

#### ELECTRIFICATION SCHEME BETWEEN MADRAS AND ARKONAM AND PONNERI.

1093. **\*Mr. O. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** Are Government prepared to consider the feasibility of an electrification scheme between Madras and Arkonam and between Madras and Ponneri in the suburban area of the Madras City?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** No such scheme has yet been suggested: but I am forwarding a copy of the question to the Agent, Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway, for consideration.

#### IMPORT DUTY ON INDIAN RICE AND PADDY IN CEYLON.

1094. **\*Mr. O. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether the Government of Ceylon impose an import duty on Indian rice and paddy? If so, how much?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state on what commodities from Ceylon, an import duty is levied in India, and the rates for each?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** (a) Yes, Sir. The rates of import duty on paddy and rice in Ceylon are 66 cents and Re. 1 per cwt. respectively.

(b) All commodities from Ceylon or elsewhere, excepting those which are duty-free under the Indian tariff, are subject to import duties. The rates of duty are given in the First Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act, 1934, to which the Honourable Member is referred. A copy of the Act is in the Library.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** May I ask, Sir, what commodities are duty-free?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** I should have to go through the list which is a fairly long one. If my Honourable friend will refer to the publication to which I have referred, he will see at a glance what are duty-free and what are dutiable articles.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** May I know the name of the publication? I could not hear it.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** Sir, this is the first time that I have been accused of being inaudible in this House. The rates of duties are given in the first Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act of 1934, a copy of which is in the Library.

**Mr. C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliar:** I did not mean that. I want to know the Schedule in which duty-free articles are mentioned.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** My Honourable friend will find it there. He can get the information from the Schedule.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** May I ask, Sir, if there is any preferential treatment shown in Ceylon to Indian goods?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** Not, Sir, by Ceylon.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Why not, Sir?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** Because that matter is still under consideration with the Ceylon Government.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Is it since 1932?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** Since the Ottawa Agreement was entered into.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Why do not this Government take reciprocal measures until it is settled?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** For the simple reason that we hoped that the Ceylon Government would give us the preferences which were given to us under the Agreement itself.

**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** When do Government expect to have a definite settlement from the Ceylon Government?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** I cannot say that.



**Mr. M. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar:** Do this Government propose to wait indefinitely?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Is it not a fact that the Indian rice going to Ceylon is taxed, whereas the Ceylon rice coming to India is not taxed?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** I do not know that any Ceylon rice does come to India.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Are Government giving any preference to Ceylonese articles?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bore:** Coconut and copra.

# BUILDINGS OF HISTORICAL IMPORTANCE OCCUPIED BY THE MILITARY AUTHORITIES.

1095. **\*Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** (a) Will Government please state how many buildings of historical importance are at present occupied by the military authorities?

(b) Are Government aware that such occupation of the historical buildings tends to deteriorate them? If so, are Government prepared to evacuate these buildings and to use them as national museums, etc.?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** Information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Will Government consider the advisability, from a historic and artistic point of view, of stopping the occupation of historical buildings by military authorities?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** As far as I am aware historical buildings of archaeological interest are not occupied by military authorities.

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Are Government aware that the Delhi Fort has been definitely disfigured by the military barracks being put up there?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** That is another matter. It does not conflict with the answer which I gave. These are new structures that have been put up within the precincts of the Fort. That is another point.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Do Government realise that they form an ugly spot and they disfigure the whole beauty of the buildings of the great Emperors, who constructed these Forts and their very ideas?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** Aesthetically, I am inclined to agree with my Honourable friend here.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** Is it not a fact that the mausoleum of Anarkali at Lahore is already occupied by a Government office?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** The question was about the occupation by troops, not as regards the use of buildings as an office.

**Sir Muhammad Yakub:** That is the same.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Are Government aware that the Tirumal Nayak Palace at Madura, one of the greatest architectural buildings in Southern India, is occupied by the District Munsif's Court there?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** As far as I know, there are about 1,900 protected buildings under the Ancient Monuments Preservation Act, and if Honourable Members seek to cross-examine me regarding the archæological value of each and the use to which they are put, I regret that I shall not be able to answer.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** All these show that they are put to very bad use.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Is the great Fort at Agra, which we all go and see often, occupied by the military authorities, and, if so, why?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** According to my information, even in the Agra Fort, it is not the historical part of the building that is occupied by the military authorities, but modern structures.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** What is the answer to part (b) of the question?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** I have answered parts (a) and (b) together. I have asked for information and will lay a reply on the table in due course.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** It is a declaration of policy and no information is required to be called for.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** My Honourable friend will agree that Government cannot enunciate a policy *in vacuo*.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali:** Is it not a fact that the military authorities were thinking of evacuating the Delhi Fort at any rate some time ago?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** I am not aware of that.

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Sir, I must get an answer to part (b) of my question.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member says that he is in communication with the authorities and will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** At least with regard to the Delhi and Agra Forts, which are now occupied by the military authorities, will Government ask them to vacate these buildings and allow them to be used as national museums?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** My Honourable friend's question is that buildings of historical importance which may be occupied by the military authorities and which are under the protection of the Archaeological Department may be evacuated. As I have submitted for the information of the House, the buildings which are occupied in the Delhi Fort are not historical buildings, but modern structures. If my Honourable friend's suggestion is that even these modern structures should be evacuated, then I am quite prepared to take up the matter with the military authorities, but I cannot give any assurance as to what the outcome of the consultations will be.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will Government see that these modern structures are not such eye-sores as they are now, and will Government at least reconstruct them so as to be in consonance with the historical structures all round there?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** I am sure, the House does not desire that these modern structures should be pulled down and other structures put up in order to harmonise them with the older buildings.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** If they are an eye-sore, they should be pulled down.

#### KING'S COMMISSIONED OFFICERS SECONDED FOR THE MILITARY DAIRIES AND GRASS FARMS.

1096. **\*Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** (a) Will Government please state how many King's Commissioned officers are seconded for the Military Dairies and Grass Farms?

(b) How many of them are Indians? If there are none, is there any rule against having Indian King's Commissioned officers for these posts? If so, are Government prepared to consider the removal of this rule?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) 17.

(b) None, but there is no rule against their serving in these appointments.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** May I know why the King's Commissioned Officers, who evidently possess high military qualifications, should be put on duty at the military dairies and military grass farms? Do they require any military genius or military training for this purpose?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** The policy is now tending in the direction of employing civilians to an increasing extent in place of soldiers, and we have seven or eight Indian civilians who are occupying appointments which previously were held by Commissioned Officers.

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Will Government consider the appointment of persons holding Commissions in the Army in India Reserve of Officers to these posts in military dairies and grass farms?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** No, Sir, I do not think it is at all necessary.

**Mr. M. Ghiasuddin:** Even if these persons are qualified diploma holders in agriculture, Government will not appoint them?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** If they have got the qualifications, they might be appointed as people who possess qualifications, but not as people who belong to the Army in India Reserve of Officers.

#### PURCHASE OF MATERIALS FOR THE ARMY.

1097. **\*Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state whether all things required by the army are purchased through the Indian Stores Department? If not, why not?

(b) What percentage of Army stores are purchased by the Indian Stores Department, London, and the Indian Stores Department in India?

(c) What percentage of the purchases made in India, of the Army stores, is Indian made and what percentage foreign?

(d) What percentage of the total purchases of the Army stores in India and outside is Indian and what percentage is foreign?

(e) Are any articles available in India and made in India, purchased in foreign countries or of foreign manufacture? If so, what are the articles, and for what reasons are they purchased in foreign countries or of foreign manufacture?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) No. Because it is considered desirable to maintain a Directorate of Contracts at Army Headquarters to make certain purchases for the Army particularly of food grains.

(b) I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reports of the India Stores Department, London, and the Indian Stores Department, India, copies of which are in the Library.

(c) and (d). I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply I gave to Mr. Asaf Ali's starred question No. 119. It is impossible to say within the percentage there quoted what the proportion is between Indian-made and foreign-made.

(e) I don't think I need say more than that the Government Stores Purchase Rules are followed in making purchases for the Army.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Except food grains, are other purchases made through the Indian Stores Department?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I have tried to explain the position before. Practically all our requirements for the army are purchased or manufactured in India. About 89 per cent. of our requirements for the army are purchased in India or manufactured by firms in India or by our own Ordnance Factories. We purchase a certain amount of stuff through the Indian Stores Department in this country and we purchase a certain amount of stuff through the India Stores Department in London, but the majority of our requirements such as foodstuffs and lethal stores are either bought by our own Contracts Directorate or manufactured by our own Ordnance Factories.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member explained this fully the other day.

**Sardar Mangal Singh:** Do Government try to manufacture. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. Next question.

**INCREASE OF THE SPEED OF TRAINS AND REDUCTION OF FARES ON THE MADRAS AND SOUTHERN MAHRATTA RAILWAY.**

1098. **\*Mr. S. K. Hosmani:** (a) Are Government aware that the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway's 'Frontier Mail' train takes only 24 hours to run from Bombay to Delhi, a distance of 861 miles?

(b) Are Government aware that the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway mail train takes 88 hours and 45 minutes to run from Bangalore to Poona, a distance of 626 miles?

(c) Are Government aware that the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway third class rates for the mail train are 4  $\frac{20}{168}$  pies per mile?

(d) Are Government aware that the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway third class rates for the mail train are 5  $\frac{1}{2}$  pies per mile?

(e) Are Government prepared to ask the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company to reduce the fares? If not, why not?

(f) Are Government prepared to ask the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway Company to increase the speed of their trains? If not, why not?

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

(b) The time taken is approximately 32 hours and 45 minutes.

(c) I am not aware how my Honourable friend has arrived at this average. The basis of the third class fares by mail over the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway is as follows:

Miles.	Pies.
First 50	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Plus 51-200	4
Plus 201-300	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Plus over 300	3

(d) This figure seems unquestionably wrong, even as an average, since it is higher than the maximum rate charged. The basis of the third class fares by mail over the Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway is as follows:

Miles.	Pies.
First 50	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Plus 51-250	4
Plus over 250	3 $\frac{1}{2}$

(e) I am forwarding this suggestion to the Agent for consideration.

(f) It is not always either possible or desirable to provide uniformity in the speed of mail trains on different railways. Varying conditions have to be taken into account in deciding on the speed at which a train should be run, such as the volume and nature of the traffic to be carried, the grade of the track, convenient times for the departure from the originating station and for the arrival at the terminal station, connections with other

trains at junction stations *en route* and the additional expenditure which would be necessary to accelerate the service. If my Honourable friend has any definite suggestions to make, I shall be glad to forward them to the Agent, for consideration.

#### MILEAGE OR RUNNING ALLOWANCE PAID TO THE STAFF ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1099. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state whether mileage or running allowance paid to the staff on State Railways in India is within the provisions of sub-clause (iii) of clause (a) of Rule 9 and Rules 15 and 23 of the Fundamental Rules, made under section 96-B of the Government of India Act? If not, by what rule or direction is it governed?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Mileage or running allowance does not fall within the provisions of the rules referred to by the Honourable Member. Running or mileage allowance is governed by paragraph 359 of State Railway Open Line Code, Volume II. I have placed a copy of this paragraph in the Library.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Under what sub-clause of rule 359 does it fall?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Under-sub-clause (d) of paragraph 359 which governs running or mileage allowances.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** I do not find the word "pay" at all in this sub-clause. May I suggest that this would more appropriately come under "other emoluments"?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** I do not follow my Honourable friend.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** I will read sub-clause (d) of paragraph 359. It runs:

"Mileage allowance is admissible to Guards and Brakemen at a rate per 100 miles run with a train and is granted on the condition that they shall provide at their own cost uniform in accordance with such patterns as may be approved."

The word "pay" is not at all mentioned here. So am I right in assuming that it will fall under any other emoluments clause?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** The reference is to mileage allowance and I do not follow why the word "pay" should come in the definition of mileage allowance.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** The other day I put a question, No. 866, which reads as follows:

"Will Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the old Travelling ticket Inspectors of the Accounts Department on the East Indian Railway were paid mileage allowance which unlike all other forms of travelling allowances was treated as pay for all practical purposes."

Here I mentioned specifically the word "pay" and said that the emoluments were treated as pay for all practical purposes. The reply was:

"Yes, up to the end of May 1931. These allowances up to a limit of 75 per cent of pay proper were treated as pay for the purpose of leave salary provident fund and gratuity."

Therefore, I say the word "pay" is not found in this sub-clause.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot discuss a question of interpretation now.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali**: It is a question that if it does not fall within that clause, will it not be. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is a question of interpretation.

#### RESTORATION OF SUBSTANTIVE OLD GRADES OF PAY ON STATE RAILWAYS.

1100. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali**: Will Government please state whether the restoration of substantive old grades of pay *ipso facto* means a claim towards advancement to next higher stages in the old scales of pay of that class of employee on State Railways? If not, under what rule or direction?

**Mr. P. R. Rau**: A decision on the point must depend on the merits of each case. I am unable to give a categorical reply applicable to all hypothetical cases that may arise.

#### CERTAIN RETRENCHED EMPLOYEES ON EAST INDIAN RAILWAY RE-EMPLOYED AND BROUGHT UNDER THE REVISED SCALES OF PAY.

1101. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali**: Will Government please state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that in 1931 certain employees on the East Indian Railway working in the Crew System, both temporary and permanent, were discharged from service due to reduction in establishment;
- (b) whether it is a fact that this reduction of establishment was analogous to the retrenchment of the staff for administrative purposes;
- (c) whether it is a fact that some of such retrenched employees were taken back or re-engaged and offered the same rate of pay which they were drawing at the time of discharge and were fixed in the newly sanctioned grades of the Moody-Ward system;
- (d) whether they were given any warning at the time of their re-engagement or re-appointment that their scale of pay will be subject to a revision, if and when introduced;
- (e) whether it is a fact that now they are brought under the new (revised) scales of pay, which are much less remunerative; and
- (f) whether this is not a contradiction of the orders on the subject and a repeal of the rights and privileges enjoyed so far?

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

(b) So far as temporary staff are concerned, these reductions bear a greater analogy to discharges of staff engaged for a temporary purpose who in cessation of the work for which they were employed are discharged.

(c) to (f). Government have no definite information on these points, but have issued general orders on the applicability of the new rates of pay to employees in service before their discharge and borne on a waiting list. The staff concerned will be dealt with under these rules.

#### PROMOTION OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1102. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state:

- (a) whether promotions from grade II, Travelling Ticket Examiners on East Indian Railway to grade I are made according to seniority or on some other factors;
- (b) whether uniform rules on the subject are in force on all Divisions of the East Indian Railway;
- (c) whether these posts are time-scale or selection grade posts; and
- (d) whether the duties of Travelling Ticket Examiners grade I and grade II are same or different; if different, in what respects?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Government have no information. These promotions are governed by rules laid down by the railway administrations to whom full powers have been delegated.

#### SENIORITY LIST OF TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINERS AND TICKET COLLECTORS ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1103. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** (a) Will Government please state whether it is a fact that the seniority list of the Travelling Ticket Examiners and Ticket Collectors has been communicated in some of the Divisions on the East Indian Railway Administration and is kept confidential in others?

(b) Will Government please state why the staff should not know their position in respect of seniority?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** Government have no information, but are making enquiries, and I will lay a reply on the table of the House in due course.

#### RATE OF PAY ADMISSIBLE TO A TICKET COLLECTOR WORKING AS TRAVELLING TICKET EXAMINER ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.

1104. **\*Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Will Government please state the rate of pay admissible to a Ticket Collector, grade III, when ordered to work as Travelling Ticket Examiner grade II on the East Indian Railway Administration?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** The actual rate of pay will be determined in each case by the Accounts Officer at the time having regard to all the circumstances. The scales of pay are as follows:

	Rs.
Ticket Collectors, grade III . . . .	37—2—52
Travelling Ticket Examiners, grade II . . . .	55—2—64



**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** Are the allowances referred to in clauses (c) to (e) of paragraph 359 to be determined at the time the person is engaged and are final in each and every respect during the term of service in that class?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** It is quite impossible for me, by way of an answer to supplementary question, to interrupt every Article of the State Railway Code.

**Mr. Muhammad Azhar Ali:** It is a simple question and my friend himself referred to paragraph 359. I am asking whether this is to be determined at the time the person is engaged and are final in each and every respect during the term of service in that class.

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** I have not referred to paragraph 359 in reply to this question. My Honourable friend's supplementary question might be relevant on another question, but not on this.

†1105\*—1109\*.

PRODUCE OF THE LAND OF THE ISTIMRARI AREA OF SATHANA, AJMER-MERWARA.

**1110. \*Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please place on the table of this House a comparative statement showing the rate of rent payable (a) by the tenants of the *Khalsa* area of Ajmer-Merwara, and (b) by the tenants of Daulatpura in the Istimrari area of Sathana (Ajmer-Merwara) in respect of (i) per *bigha* of *chahi* land and (ii) per *bigha* of *Barani* land?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** With your permission, Sir, I shall answer questions Nos. 1110 and 1111 together. The information is being collected, and a reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Is there any legislation to regulate the relations between the Istimrardars and their tenants in this particular area?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** There is no legislation at present.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Do Government propose to bring forward any legislative proposal before this House to regulate those relations?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** My Honourable friend had better wait for the next question where this point has been raised.

PRODUCE OF THE LAND OF THE ISTIMRARI AREA OF SATHANA, AJMER-MERWARA.

†1111. **\*Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Will Government please enquire and state what proportion of the earning of the tenants from the land is realised as rent (i) in the *Khalsa* area (Ajmer-Merwara) and (ii) in the village Daulatpura, in the Istimrari area of Sathana (Ajmer-Merwara)?

†These questions were disallowed by the Honourable the President.

‡For answer to this question, see answer to question No. 1110.

### ENQUIRY ABOUT THE CONDITION OF THE TENANTS OF THE ISTIMRARDARS OF AJMER-MERWARA.

1112. \*Maulvi Syed Murtaza Sahib Bahadur: (a) Is it a fact that a committee of enquiry was appointed in Ajmer-Merwara to enquire into the condition of the tenants of the Istimrardars of Ajmer-Merwara?

(b) Is it a fact that one of the members of the said committee of enquiry was Rai Sahib Mithan Lal who has been, for many years, the legal adviser and counsel of the Raja Sahib of Pisangan and other Istimrardars of Ajmer-Merwara?

(c) Is it a fact that Rai Sahib Kishan Lal, the then Extra Assistant Commissioner, Merwara, was also a member of the said committee of enquiry?

(d) Is it a fact that after the completion of the work of the said committee of enquiry the said Rai Sahib Kishan Lal was appointed as Kamdar of the Rao Sahib of Masuda, a prominent Istimrardar of Ajmer-Merwara?

(e) Is it a fact that Diwan Bahadur Har Bilas Sarda was also a member of the said committee of enquiry?

(f) Are Government aware that the Istimrardars of Ajmer-Merwara have a well-established and consolidated organisation, whereas the tenants of the Istimrari area of Ajmer-Merwara have no such organisation?

(g) Is it a fact that while the proceedings of the said committee of enquiry were going on, ordinances were made applicable to several Istimrari areas of Ajmer-Merwara?

(h) Is it a fact that the tenants were not allowed to engage any lawyer except the two named by the Local Administration in connection with the proceedings of the said committee of enquiry?

(i) Is it a fact that the said committee of enquiry completed its work more than one year ago?

(j) Is it a fact that the said committee of enquiry has not yet published the results of its enquiry?

(k) If what are stated at parts (a) to (j) above are facts, what steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** (a) A committee was appointed to enquire into the question of the relationship between the Istimrardars and their tenants.

(b) Rai Sahib Mithan Lal was a member of the Committee. He is not, however, legal adviser to any particular Istimrardar, though he may, on occasion, be briefed by Istimrardars as by other clients.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) No, Sir.

(f) There is a recently formed organisation called the Istimrardars' Association.

(g) No, Sir.

(h) No lawyers were allowed to appear for either party in a professional capacity. Two local lawyers were examined as witnesses by reason of their knowledge of the subject.

(i) and (j). Yes.

(k) The question of how best to place the relations between Istimrardars and their tenants on a satisfactory basis is receiving the attention of Government.

**Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** May I know if the Committee appointed by Government has submitted its report?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** The Committee to which my Honourable friend has referred in the question submitted its report in 1933.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Has any action been taken on that report?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** No, Sir; no action has been taken on that report, because, on a consideration of it, both the Chief Commissioner and the Government of India came to the conclusion that it does not satisfactorily solve the problem.

#### ENQUIRY ABOUT THE CONDITION OF THE TENANTS OF THE ISTIMRARDARS OF AJMER-MERWARA.

1113. \***Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** Do Government propose to appoint a committee of enquiry with Members selected from the Legislative Assembly, to enquire into the condition and grievances of the tenants of the Istimrari area of Ajmer-Merwara and to suggest the ways and means of improving their condition?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer I have given to part (k) of question No. 1112 just now.

#### CESSES REALISED IN THE ISTIMRARI AREAS OF AJMER-MERWARA BY THE ISTIMRARDARS.

1114. \***Maulvi Syed Murtuza Sahib Bahadur:** (a) Will Government please enquire and state what the names and descriptions of the cesses realised from the tenants and other residents in the various Istimrari areas of Ajmer-Merwara by the Istimrardars are?

(b) Is it a fact that in the *Khalsa* areas in Ajmer-Merwara tenants and other residents are not required to pay any cesses? If it is not a fact, will Government please state what cesses the tenants and other residents of the said *Khalsa* areas are required to pay?

(c) Is it a fact that in the Istimrari areas of Ajmer-Merwara, the police, educational institutions, hospitals, and other institutions of public welfare are maintained by Government at Government expense?

(d) If the reply to the question in part (c) above be in the affirmative, will Government please state why the Istimrardars are allowed to realise cesses?

(e) What steps do Government propose to take in the matter?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** (a) Complete information in reply to this part of this question is not readily available. The matter is one of great complexity, and I have asked for certain further information. A reply will be laid on the table of the House in due course.

(b) The answer to the first part is in the negative. Tenants in the Khalsa areas are required to pay cesses like the Veterinary, Dispensary, Chowkidari and District Fund cesses.

(c) As in the case of the other residents of the district, the Istimrardars make no special contribution towards the cost of the regular police force of the district, but they pay their own *Chowkidars* or rural police. District Board cesses are paid by all Istimrardars into the District Board Fund and, from this fund, expenditure on schools, dispensaries and other institutions is met. In addition to these, special and voluntary contributions have been made by certain Istimrardars, namely for a school and hospital in Bhinai and for two dispensaries and schools in Masuda.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer to part (k) of question No. 1112.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Who manages these hospitals and schools for which cesses are paid by tenants through these Istimrardars?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** I presume they are managed by the District Board.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that in other areas of this country these cesses are paid directly by the tenants to the Government concerned and not through Istimrardars or any other intermediary?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** My Honourable friend is imparting information, but I am dealing with Ajmer-Merwara.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE RULERS OF INDIAN STATES.

1115. **\*Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if any negotiations are being carried on with the Rulers of Indian States? If so, what is the nature of the negotiations?

(b) Do these negotiations consist of allocation of customs revenue or any such financial commitments?

(c) Having regard to the large interests of British Indians involved in such negotiations, do Government propose to consult this Assembly or any non-official Indians or at least to appraise this House with the progress of the negotiations?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar:** (a) and (b). I have presumed that the Honourable Member's question relates to financial negotiations with States in connection with the Federation. On that assumption the answer is in the negative.

(c) Does not arise.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** Is it not a fact that the Government of India have come to some arrangement with the State of Baroda with regard to the customs revenue?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar:** Has the Honourable Member's question nothing to do with financial negotiations in connection with the Federation, but is an independent question?

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** Independent of the Federation.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar:** In giving the answer "No", I presumed that the Honourable Member's question related to financial negotiations with the States in connection with the Federation.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** At any rate I did not say so.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Perhaps I can clear up the position. There have been negotiations with Baroda in relation to their customs right, but they have no relation whatever with Federation.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** My question does not relate to the Federation at all.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has got the answer that negotiations have been going on with regard to their customs rates.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** May I know what is the nature of the negotiations going on?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** If the Honourable Member will put down a question, I will see that he gets as full an answer as it is possible to give.

#### RATES FOR THE SUPPLY OF MATERIALS TO PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS, RAILWAYS, ETC., BY THE INDIAN STORES DEPARTMENT.

1116. **\*Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state if the Indian Stores Department supply materials to Provincial Governments or local authorities, Railways or contractors of any of these authorities at the same rate at which the department purchases these materials? If not, does the department sell these materials at higher rates? If so, how are these rates fixed?

(b) Is it a fact that contractors are bound to take material from the Indian Stores Department, even though the rates charged by the department are considerably higher than those available in the open market?

(c) Is it a fact that contractors are asked to calculate for their tenders at the rates at which the department sell these materials to them?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) The Indian Stores Department does not hold any stocks, but arranges for the supply of stores to Provincial Governments, local bodies and Railways, on receipt of indents, for which the indenting authorities are required to pay the actual cost *plus* a fee of one per cent. for purchase and one per cent. for inspection (if the stores are also inspected) for the services of the Department. The

Indian Stores Department is not authorised to make purchases on behalf of contractors.

(b) and (c). The supply of materials to contractors is regulated by the terms of the contracts entered into by them with the authorities placing the contracts. As already explained, the Indian Stores Department does not sell any materials to contractors, nor is that Department concerned with the fixation of rates for materials issued to contractors from the stores of the departments concerned with the projects.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** Does not the Department charge local bodies higher rate of charges than those at which those materials can be supplied by the customers?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** If a local body asks the Indian Stores Department to make its purchases for it, all it is required to pay in addition to the actual cost is, as I have stated, the charge of one per cent. for purchase and one per cent. for inspection. If the local body gets its stores from somewhere else, I obviously cannot say what it is charged for them. I am only dealing with the Indian Stores Department.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** Is it true that sometimes these local bodies can get these goods cheaper directly themselves than through the Indian Stores Department?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** They are not bound to use the services of the Indian Stores Department. They are not compelled to purchase through the Indian Stores Department. They can get their stores wherever they like. If they use the services of the Indian Stores Department, it is obviously because they consider that a satisfactory way of making their purchases.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty:** Does the Stores Department require the railways to purchase only through them?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** The Stores Department cannot require any Department of Government to purchase only through them. That is a matter for Government, not for the Stores Department to decide.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** If any Department wants to purchase through the Stores Department, does the Stores Department issue tenders for them or give orders to some particular firms?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Obviously, if the Stores Department is asked to make a purchase, it must issue tenders.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF LABOUR THROUGH INTERMEDIARIES IN BURMA.

1417. **Prof. N. G. Ranga:** (a) Are Government aware that shipping agents in Burma permit their cooly maistries to employ, dismiss and pay labour engaged in loading and unloading work of ocean-going steamers?

(b) Has the Royal Commission on Labour said in its remarks on employment through intermediaries that there is no part of India where responsibility for labour is delegated to the extent prevailing in Burma and that so long as the worker is dependent for the reward of his labour on a subordinate agent of an employer, there is little security against abuse?

(c) Are Government aware that in the dock labour of Rangoon, most of the subordinate agents of employers, namely, cooly maistries, take compulsory wage contributions, make reductions in wages, under-employ men in gangs and dismiss any labourer who protests against these practices?

(d) Are Government aware that in shipping labour at Rangoon only 50 per cent. of the work is given to Indian labourers, that the maistry system tends to keep more men, a labourer hardly gets at present more than four days' work in the month, that the maistry takes two days' wages from every four days' work a labourer gets, and with the heavy reductions made in wages by the maistry, it is becoming very difficult for a labourer to subsist?

(e) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the resolution adopted at the Burma Provincial Labour Conference held in Rangoon on January 11th and 12th of this year and presided over by Mr. N. M. Joshi, M.L.A., protesting against the evils of the maistry system?

(f) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a book called "Contract Labour in Burma" by Mr. A. Narayana Rao, formerly a member of the Burma Legislative Council, in which the facsimile of a document written by a cooly maistry and attested by two witnesses showing his sources of income from compulsory contributions, under-employment of men and reductions in wages, is reproduced?

(g) Will Government be pleased to state whether they are prepared to call for a report from the Government of Burma on contract labour in docks with special reference to (i) compulsory contributions, (ii) reductions made in wages, (iii) under-employment of men, (iv) arrears in wages, and (v) the period of wage payment?

(h) Will Government please lay on the table a statement showing figures for the years 1932, 1933 and 1934, month by month, for the port of Rangoon in regard to:

(i) the loading and unloading work in ships given to Burman and Indian labourers;

(ii) the number of Burman and Indian labourers employed; and

(iii) the amount of wages paid to Burman and Indian workmen, respectively?

(i) Have the Government of Burma taken any action against the abuses in contract labour? If so, in what manner?

(j) Have the Government of Burma carried out any recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour? If so, in what respect?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** (a), (c) and (d). Welfare of Labour is primarily the concern of the Local Government and the Government of India have no information beyond that contained in the Report of the Royal Commission on Labour in India.

(b) Yes.

(e) Yes: the actual dates were January 12th and 13th.

(f) Yes.

(g) The matter is primarily the concern of the Local Government.

(h) The information is not available and Government are of opinion that the time and labour which would be spent on collecting it would not be justified by the results to be obtained.

(i) and (j). Yes. The Honourable Member is referred to the Third Report recently supplied to him on the action taken on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labour.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Are Government prepared to call for a report upon the social ameliorative steps taken by the Government of Burma in answer to parts (a) and (c)?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Blore:** I understand that, in regard to this matter, my Honourable colleague, the Industries Member, recently received a deputation when this question was placed before him, and I understand further that the matter is receiving the consideration of my Honourable colleague.

#### STATION MASTERS AND ASSISTANT STATION MASTERS FAILING IN NIGHT VISION TEST ON THE NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

1118. **\*Mr. H. M. Abdullah:** (a) Will Government please state how Station Masters and Assistant Station Masters, who fail in night-vision test, are dealt with on the North Western Railway?

(b) Is it a fact that one Shahabuddin, Assistant Station Master, New Delhi, who failed in night-vision test, was not provided in any other capacity, whereas one Raghbir Das, Station Master, Sampla, of the same grade, who also failed in night-vision test has been provided in a higher grade and if so, why?

(c) How do Government justify their action with their present policy of encouraging the recruitment of more Muslims on the North Western Railway?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** (a) The instructions are that staff who have failed in the eyesight test should be offered suitable employment as far as possible.

(b) Government have no information.

(c) Government cannot see that the case referred to in part (b) of the question has any bearing on the general policy of representation of Muslims in the railway services.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi:** Are Government aware that many promising young Muslims have been discharged on this very ground without being offered any other jobs?

**Mr. P. B. Rau:** If my Honourable friend has any specific instances to show that this is the general practice in any particular railway, I shall consider the matter.



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA DEPARTMENTS WITH STORES PURCHASING AGENCIES.

1119. \***Mr S. Satyamurti**: Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) what the Departments of the Government of India are which have got stores purchasing agencies, apart from the Indian Stores Department;
- (b) the reasons why they are so having them; and
- (c) whether there are any proposals for amalgamating them?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce**: (a) Regular stores purchasing agencies, besides the Indian Stores Department, exist under the following Departments and officers:

- (1) Army Department.
- (2) Railway Department.
- (3) Controller of Printing and Stationery in India.
- (4) Surveyor-General of India.
- (5) Director-General, Indian Medical Service.

(b) Separate purchasing agencies are needed to deal with stores which are excluded from the scope of the activities of the Indian Stores Department, such as food-stuffs, medical supplies, stationery articles and locomotives.

(c) Does not arise.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: May I know by whom these categories are excluded from the scope of activities of the Indian Stores Department?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce**: Because they are specialised articles, and the Departments concerned consider it preferable that their own expert officers should deal with them.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: Have Government considered the question, from the point of view of the tax-payer, as to whether purchasing these articles independent of the Indian Stores Department may not entail a larger cost?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce**: Yes; that aspect of the question has been considered and I may mention that in recent years the Railway Department has entrusted more and more work to the Indian Stores Department.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: May I know if there are any proposals for amalgamating or rather abolishing these, and instituting a central purchasing department for all Departments of the Government of India?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce**: There is no question of the abolition of these departments: as regards the one of which I have special knowledge—the Department of the Controller of Stationery and Printing—that Department does not employ any additional officers to deal with its purchases: that is done as part of the ordinary work of the office. That is the position there.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Why should the Army Department have a separate purchasing department?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I think we have discussed that question already at great length in answer to supplementary questions: it has been referred to only this morning.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** May I know the reasons why Government do not propose to amalgamate all these departments? Is it based on the consideration of cost?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) That is really discussing the policy.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** Is it not desirable, in the interests of economy and cheap purchase that all the requirements of the Government should be purchased through one department?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is again discussing policy.

#### INDIANISATION OF THE ARMY.

1120. **\*Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state their policy with regard to the Indianisation of the Army?

(b) In view of the recommendations of the Expert Committee after the Round Table Conference, has the Government policy with regard to the pace of the Indianisation changed?

(c) Are Government aware of the recommendations of the Skeen and Rawlinson Committees which contemplate the complete Indianisation of the Army within 30 years?

(d) Is the present pace of Indianisation in consonance with Skeen and Rawlinson Committees? If not, why not?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** In reply to the Honourable Member's question, I do not think there is anything I can add to the information I gave the House in reply to Mr. Satyamurti's Short Notice Question on the 5th March and in my speech on the motion to reduce the Army Department grant on the 12th March, 1935.

#### APPLICATIONS FOR SALT CONCESSIONS UNDER THE GANDHI-IRWIN PACT.

1121. **\*Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** (a) Will Government state in view of the Finance Member's reply to starred question No. 548 on the 26th February, 1935, who the local officer is to whom the applications for salt concessions under the Gandhi-Irwin Pact should be sent?

(b) What are the considerations which are taken into account to decide this matter?

(c) In case he makes an adverse order, who are the people to whom an appeal lies against that order?

(d) Is there a final appeal to the Government of India against the decision of the local officer?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** (a) to (d). In areas from which the concession has not been withdrawn, there is no need for any applications; but if any villagers are in doubt as to the extent of their privileges under the concession, their enquiries would readily be answered by the local officers of the Salt Department or the Revenue Department.

As regards the restoration of the concession in areas from which it has been withdrawn, I have already stated in this House that applications are to be dealt with by the local officers in consultation with the Local Government but I do not know what arrangements, the Government of Madras have actually made in the matter. The Government of India have no intention of circumscribing the discretion of the Madras Government in this matter, either as regards the arrangements for dealing with applications or as regards their decision upon them and, in these circumstances, the question of an appeal to the Government of India against a decision of the local authorities does not arise.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Is the Honourable Member aware of the fact that even in those districts, where this particular concession is extended, the local police are threatening the masses and preventing them from manufacturing salt?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** I am not aware of that, Sir. As I said, this is a matter which is left to the Local Government.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will he ascertain and see whether what I have just stated is a fact or not?

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What is the answer to clause (b)? What are the considerations which are taken into account?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** The considerations which the Local Government decide to take into consideration.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will he ascertain whether what I said is a fact or not?

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar:** What are those considerations?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** I cannot answer two supplementary questions at the same time.

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

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** Sir, I have been authorised by Mr. Chattopadhyaya to put the questions standing in his name.

**POSITION OF THE INDIAN MUSEUM REGARDING CERTAIN PARTICULARS AFTER THE REPEAL OF THE INDIAN MUSEUM ACTS, 1876 AND 1887.**

1122. **\*Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether section 17 of Act X of 1910, which repealed the Indian Museum Acts, XXII of 1876 and IV of 1887, also repealed the Preamble to Act XXII of 1876?

(b) If the answer to part (a) be in the affirmative, will Government please lay on the table the express and definite sections of Act X of 1910 regarding (i) provision for the cost of repair of the Museum buildings, (ii) provision for the payment of the salaries, allowances and pensions of the officers and servants of the Trustees of the Indian Museum, (iii) all other expenses of the Indian Museum; and (iv) the change in the status of the officers and servants of the Trustees of the Indian Museum consequent on the repeal of the Preamble?

(c) Is it a fact that that section of Act X of 1910 was repealed by Act X of 1914 (II Schedule)? If so, why and with what effect?

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

(b) The Act is available in the Library for the perusal of the Honourable Member, who will be in a position to form his own opinion as to the presence or otherwise therein of provisions of the nature which he has in mind. Government do not share the Honourable Member's view that the Act introduced any change in the status of the officers and servants of the trustees.

(c) Yes. The section was repealed in pursuance of the established practice whereby repealing provisions are themselves repealed, when a suitable opportunity presents itself, with a view to the removal from the Statute-book of provisions which have accomplished their effect. By virtue of section 6 of the General Clauses Act the repeal of a repealing provision does not operate to revive the enactment repealed by the earlier repealing provision or otherwise to affect the law in force immediately before the enactment of the second repealing provision.

**Dr. P. N. Banerjee:** When does the Honourable Member expect to repeal this Act?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** No occasion has arisen to repeal the present Act.

#### COST OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE INDIAN MUSEUM.

1123. **\*Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Is it a fact that the officers and servants of the Trustees of the Indian Museum ceased to be Government servants from 1910, and if so, why was it decided in 1916 that the charge on account of the cost of establishment of the Trustees of the Indian Museum falls on the Government of India and not on the Trustees of the Indian Museum [as admitted by Government in reply to starred question No. 474 (b), dated the 5th March, 1930]?

(b) Will Government please lay on the table a copy of (i) the exact section of any Statute by which the charge on account of the cost of establishment of a private body like the Trustees of the Indian Museum falls on the Government; (ii) the exact section of any Statute by which the officers and servants of a private body can be deemed to be public servants; and (iii) the section under which a private body like the Trustees of the Indian Museum are exempted from contributing anything towards the upkeep of their Institution?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** (a) It is not a fact that the officers and servants of the trustees ceased to be Government servants from 1910. They never were Government servants; nor is it the case that the charge on account of the cost of establishment of the trustees falls on the Government of India and not on the trustees. It falls on the trustees and is defrayed from the revenues of the trustees, which include an annual grant from Central revenues.

(b) In view of the answer to part (a), the remainder of the question does not arise.

†1124\* and 1125\*.

**REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO CERTAIN CANDIDATES TO APPEAR AT THE INDIAN AUDIT AND ACCOUNTS SERVICE EXAMINATION OF 1934.**

1126. **\*Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact:

(i) that about 85 per cent. of the candidates who applied for admission to the Indian Audit and Accounts Service Examination of 1934, were refused permission to sit for the examination; and

(ii) that the candidates were informed whether they had been selected or not, when there were barely 12 days left for the examination?

(b) If so, will Government please state the main considerations which weighed with them in selecting candidates for the examination?

(c) Are Government aware that this belated intimation was responsible for causing too much worry and wastage of energy in the case of those candidates who were not selected for the examination?

(d) Why did not the Public Service Commission issue an intimation to the candidates at least two months before the date of the examination? Is it a fact that the applications for admission to the examination had to be submitted by the candidates prior to 21st July, 1934? If so, why?

(e) Are Government prepared to consider whether candidates should not be informed at least two months before the examination, so far as future examinations are concerned with a view to avoid undue hardship?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** (a) to (d). I would invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply given to parts (a) to (f) of question No. 820 asked by Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar on the 18th of February, 1935.

(e) The circumstances of last year's examination were abnormal, and longer notice will, if possible, be given on future occasions. The Public Service Commission do not, however, consider that it will be practicable to give as much as two months' notice.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Will the Honourable Member consider the advisability of giving a longer notice than 12 days to intending candidates? There is serious inconvenience.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** That is the question which I have answered. Yes, the Public Service Commission will, if possible, give longer notice on future occasions. They don't think they can give two full months' notice asked in the question.

**GRADUATES BELONGING TO THE DEPRESSED AND MINORITY COMMUNITIES APPOINTED ON THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY.**

1127. **\*Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact:

- (i) that the graduates belonging to the depressed and minority communities who were appointed on the basis of 24 hours' notice on the East Indian Railway, were started on a pay of Rs. 60 per mensem;
- (ii) that almost all the graduates appointed on the result of the Appendix 'B' examination and of far superior educational attainments were started on the minimum pay of the grade, *vis.*, Rs. 82 per mensem; and
- (iii) that in 1981, in reply to certain representations on the subject, Mr. T. R. V. Sarma, the then Deputy Chief Accounts Officer, East Indian Railway stated that the lower pay in the case of Appendix 'B' passed graduates was due to their stability of service?

(b) Is it a fact that these graduates of the minority communities have also been confirmed and they have been allowed to retain the benefit of about double the starting pay as compared with Appendix 'B' passed graduates?

(c) Has it been decided that competing in a All-India competitive examination like the Appendix 'B' examination is a disqualification for the purpose of determining the eligibility for higher starting pay?

(d) Do Government propose to review the matter and refix the pay of the graduates appointed on the result of the Appendix 'B' examinations held in April, 1929 and October, 1929 by allowing the same starting pay as compared with graduates of the minority communities? If not, why not?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) (i). In the Railway Accounts Department it used to be the practice to grant at the discretion of the Chief Accounts Officer, higher initial pay than the minimum, according to educational qualifications, to all temporary clerks recruited as a purely temporary measure otherwise than through the competitive examination; such initial pay did not depend on the community to which the clerks belong.

(ii) The initial pay of clerks recruited through the Appendix B Examination is fixed at varying rates according to the marks obtained by each candidate.

(iii) Government have no information.

(b) Certain temporary clerks, who had originally been recruited on higher rates of initial pay and had survived the retrenchment campaign and been declared as fit for permanent retention in service after examination of their work and capabilities, have as a special case, been allowed to retain the higher initial pay originally granted to them.

(c) No; higher starting pay was granted in all cases in which it was due under the terms on which the examination was held.

(d) No; for the reasons explained in reply to part (c) of the question.

**STAFF OF THE EAST INDIAN RAILWAY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT BROUGHT UNDER NEW LEAVE RULES.**

1128. **\*Dr. P. N. Banerjee** (on behalf of Mr. Amarendra Nath Chattopadhyaya): (a) Is it a fact that the staff appointed in the East Indian Railway Accounts Department after the 1st September, 1928, but prior to the 1st April, 1930, were not given any warning at the time of their appointment that they would be brought under the new leave rules on their introduction, and that they have been compulsorily brought under the same rules?

(b) Is it also a fact:

(i) that even permanent employees appointed prior to the 1st April, 1930 and recruited on the result of the Appendix 'B' Examination as prescribed in the Financial Commissioner of Railways' memorandum No. 5565-F., dated the 31st July, 1929, have been compulsorily brought under the new State Railway Leave Rules, although the 'letter of appointment' issued to them by the Controller of Railway Accounts did not contain any such stipulation; and

(ii) that the employees appointed in the office of the Controller of Railway Accounts have been permitted to remain under the old set of leave rules in similar circumstances?

(c) Is it not a fact that in accordance with the provisions of letter No. 270/CRA-E/33, dated the 17th August, 1934 from the Director of Finance, Railway Board to the Controller of Railway Accounts, the employees mentioned in parts (a) and (b) above can remain under the old set of leave rules?

(d) If so, do Government propose to issue a letter elucidating the whole position and granting the concession to the employees cited above?

**Mr. P. R. Rau:** (a) and (b). Employees belonging to offices or organisations where the intention to apply the new leave rules to future recruits had been made known generally were brought on the new leave rules if they were appointed after the 1st September, 1928. They have not been allowed to take advantage of accidental omissions on the part of their official superiors to take formal declarations from them that they would be governed by the new leave rules. The Railway Board understand that on the East Indian Railway it was quite well-known to the staff that persons appointed after 1st September, 1928, would be governed by the

new leave rules; on the other hand the relevant orders of the Railway Board had not even been communicated to the Controller of Railway Accounts, the staff in whose office had, therefore, no similar warning.

(c) No.

(d) No.

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIAN MERCANTILE MARINE AND PARTICIPATION OF INDIAN SHIPPING IN THE COASTAL AND OVERSEAS TRADE OF INDIA.**

1129. **\*Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether in face of the provisions set forth in paragraph 353 of the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report as under:

“We think that separate provision should be made for the case of ships and shipping; and it should be enacted that ships registered in U. K. are not to be subjected by law in British India to any discrimination whatsoever, as regards the ships, officers or crew, or her passengers or cargo, to which ships registered in British India would not be subjected in U. K.”

(i) it will be possible for Government to develop national shipping by the method recognised in all maritime countries of the world and approved by the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee of reserving the coastal trade to national shipping, and

(ii) whether it will be possible for Government to enact a measure on the lines recommended by the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee, whereby the steamers plying in the coastal waters will have to employ at least 50 per cent. of their officers and engineers from among the cadets coming out of the Training Ship “Dufferin” and obtaining their certificates of competency?

(b) If the reply to part (a) (i) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state what effective steps they propose to take to develop Indian Mercantile Marine and to carry out their oft-repeated policy of arranging for an adequate participation of Indian shipping in the coastal and overseas trade of the country?

(c) If the answer to part (a) (ii) be in the negative, will Government be pleased to state if it is not a fact that the *ex*-cadets of the Training Ship “Dufferin”, who have obtained their certificates of competency, have not been employed by the British shipping companies plying on the coast in a number in consonance with the number of their steamers plying in the Indian coastal waters?

(d) If the reply to part (c) be in the affirmative, are Government aware that in the absence of the employment of such officers by the British shipping companies in such a number as may be in consonance with the number of the steamers plying in these waters, the *ex*-cadets of the Training Ship “Dufferin”, obtaining their certificates of competency, either as executive officers or marine engineers, are likely to remain without employment and the building up of an Indian sea personnel is likely to receive a serious set back?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** (a) The reply is, I think, in the negative.



(b) Reference is invited to the answers given on the 27th February, 1935, to question No. 632 by Mr. N. V. Gadgil and the supplementary questions thereto.

(c) and (d). All the *ex-Dufferin* cadets, who had obtained certificates of competency as second mates up to the end of last year, have been employed either by shipping companies or in the Bengal Pilot Service or by Port Trusts. In this connection the Government of India will take steps to impress on all shipping companies, whether British or Indian, engaged in the coastal trade, the importance of employing duly qualified Indian officers in adequate numbers.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Will the Honourable Member be good enough to read out the answers which were given previously?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** I do not know what my Honourable friend is referring to.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** The Honourable Member in his answer referred to the replies given by him to Mr. Gadgil's questions and to the supplementary questions. Have you got those answers there? If so, will you please read them out?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): They were answered on the other day.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** May I know if Government are aware of the fact that the Shipping Ministry in England has given several millions by way of subsidy for the development of shipping in England?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** I believe, Sir, that an announcement on those lines was made some time ago.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that several countries today have restricted their coastal trade to their own nationals?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** That also, I think, is correct.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that the shipping industry in India is in an infant and backward state as compared with the tremendous advance that England has made in this matter?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** Indian shipping is developing every day.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Yes, I hope so, but in spite of that, is it a fact that the development that has taken place so far does not entitle it to come within even a hundred miles of the progress that the shipping industry has made in England?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhoré:** That is perfectly true, but shipping in England began long before India made a start.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact in the circumstances that Indian shipping, except with the help and protection that may be extended to it by Government, will not be in a position to compete with British shipping?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** My Honourable friend is, I understand, a non-violent co-operator, no one would accuse him of being a violent co-operator, and I do not see why he should prefer militant methods when I think we can reach the same objective by other means to which I have already referred in this House.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** May I ask the Honourable Member what are those other steps which he has in mind and the Government have in mind, by which they will be able to protect and develop the Indian coastal shipping?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** Amicable settlement between the parties concerned in the coastal trade of India.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** That is to say, only if the British shipping companies agreed?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** So far as my own experience is concerned, I have not found it an impossible task to get the British shipping companies to agree to a reasonable arrangement.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** In view of the provision in the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, will it be possible for Government to exercise any pressure on British shipping companies if they do not agree to their suggestion for an amicable settlement?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** My Honourable friend is still thinking in terms of pressure. I am prepared to think in other terms as I have already said.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Does the Honourable Member depend and rely on their piety?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** No. I depend and rely upon their good sense.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** And pray for it, as the Honourable the Finance Member will pray for industrial development?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** My Honourable friend is at liberty to do so.

**Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Ohettiar:** May I know what they have achieved till now by amicable settlement in the way of preserving the coastal trade?

**Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim):** That does not arise. That is too general a question.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** May I draw attention to pages 236 and 574 of the Sea-Borne Trade of India where it is said that India exports rice to Ceylon and Ceylon exports rice to India . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** I do not see what it has got to do with shipping.

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** It is in connection with a certain wrong statement made by the Commerce Member.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** When did I make a wrong statement?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it in connection with this question?

**Dr. Ziauddin Ahmad:** No.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then the Chair does not think it can be allowed.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Will the Honourable the Commerce Member secure for Indian shipping by means of an amicable settlement a share in the coastal trade of Great Britain in the United Kingdom?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** There is nothing to prevent their trying to enter into that trade.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Will the Honourable the Commerce Member make an effort to secure by means of an amicable settlement a certain portion of that trade reserved for Indian shipping.

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** My Honourable friend is comparing things which are not alike. So far as the coastal trade of India is concerned, British shipping is already established here and has been established for a long number of years. Up to the present, so far as I know, no Indian shipping has taken any part in the British coastal trade.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Exactly because Indian shipping is not established in England and we expect reciprocity from England and to work wonders through amicable settlement, I was putting the question, which I repeat, will the Honourable the Commerce Member, therefore, try to secure a share in English coastal shipping for the Indian shipping which has not yet had any opportunity of making a start there?

**The Honourable Sir Joseph Bhore:** I have already given my reply, and that is, that the two cases are not on all fours.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** But, Oh, we are slaves and they are free!

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): No. 1180.

#### GARHWALI PRISONERS CONVICTED FOR PESHAWAR OCCURRENCES OF 1930 STILL IN JAIL.

1130. **\*Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) How many of the Garhwali prisoners convicted for Peshawar occurrences of 1930 are still in jail?

(b) When were they convicted?

(c) Were they tried by a civil or military tribunal?

(d) What was the sentence in each case?

(e) Do Government propose to release them?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** (a) Four.

(b) On the 6th June, 1930.

(c) By court martial.

(d) One was sentenced for life, one for 15 years and two for 10 years each.

(e) Not at present, but His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief reviews their sentences every year.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** What were these people convicted of?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Mutiny.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that they were convicted for failure to fire on an unarmed crowd at Peshawar?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** No.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** What was the exact nature of the mutiny?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Refusal to obey certain orders.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** What were the orders that they disobeyed?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I should require notice of that question. I cannot quote the exact orders, but they were in connection with the disturbances in Peshawar.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Have not the Garhwali battalions acted most gallantly in the various theatres of war during the Great War?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Yes, Sir.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Did some of the Garhwalis at least secure the Victoria Cross?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** I should require notice of that. Very possibly.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that Garhwal provides a large number of recruits for the army?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Yes.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Are they not entitled to sympathetic consideration—the case of these people?

**Mr. G. R. F. Tottenham:** Yes, the Garhwalis are entitled to it and they get it.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that some of the other Garhwali soldiers who had been convicted and sentenced for similar offences have been released before their term?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham:** There were altogether 17 soldiers who were convicted in this case and sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. Of those 17, 13 have already been released before their sentences had fully expired and there are four left. These four were the ringleaders in this case and they received the longest sentences. I think the Honourable Member will realise the gravity of their offence and the impossibility of releasing at this stage people who were sentenced to life terms of imprisonment or long periods of 15 years, when the incident only happened five years ago.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that these soldiers have already undergone five years' imprisonment for a technical offence?

**Mr. G. E. F. Tottenham:** It was not a technical offence. It was mutiny, which is a very serious offence.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Did they use their arms against anybody? What sort of mutiny did they commit?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks the Honourable Member has asked for notice of that question.

#### GLASS BANGLE INDUSTRY.

**1131. \*Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) Are Government aware that the glass bangle industry is being hard hit by the Japanese competition and that it stands in need of expert scientific advice?

(b) What are the measures which Government have already taken to give it expert advice?

(c) What further measures do Government propose to take to help the industry and give expert advice?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a), (b) and (c). The Government of India have received no recent representation from this industry and I am unable to confirm the Honourable Member's opinion that Japanese competition is particularly severe at the present time. The question of giving technical advice to the industry is one for the Local Government to consider.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that the import of bangles is increasing?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** No. My information is to the contrary.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** What is the present extent of the import?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** The figures I have shown that the imports of Japanese bangles for 1932-33 were to the value of Rs. 22 lakhs, for 1933-34, Rs. 18 lakhs. We have no information later than that.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Is it a fact that the amount has gone up during the last financial year?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I have given the figures for the last financial year.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** In 1934-85.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** That is the current financial year. Unfortunately I have not been able to get the figures for that year. They are not yet available.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Will the Honourable Member be able to look into the figures for the last calendar year then?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I have given the figures for the last financial year. We have not got further information for the current year, but I will make an effort to get it as soon as possible.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** I speak of the calendar year and not the financial year.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** No. Unfortunately the figures are for the financial year and not for the calendar year.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Really unfortunate in this case!

#### CONDITION OF WORKING IN THE MIXING PROCESS OF THE GLASS BANGLE INDUSTRY.

1132. **\*Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** (a) Are Government aware that the bangle mixing process of the industry entails constant hazards, *e.g.*, inhalation of poisons and lead poisons?

(b) Are Government aware that the conditions of work in those factories, *i.e.*, intense heat, smoke gases and glare, badly tell upon the health of the workers employed in the process?

(c) Are Government aware that the conditions of work can be improved if the employers are made to supply suitable appliances to the workers, *e.g.*, respirators and protection goggles, and if they pay proper attention to the ventilation of the rooms and proper arrangement of the furnaces?

(d) Are Government prepared to invite expert opinion to improve the condition of working in the bangle mixing process, and consider the question of enabling the employers to furnish the factories with a gas at Firozabad?

(e) Have Government taken any measures regarding parts (a), (b) and (c) above?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** (a) Government are aware that glass manufacture may entail certain hazards to the workers. I have no detailed information as to the extent of the hazards involved by the bangle mixing process.

(b) Government are aware that in 1931 the Government of the United Provinces regarded the labour conditions in the glass and bangle industry at Firozabad, to which I think the Honourable Member is referring, as unsatisfactory.

(c) and (d). Rules under section 38 (4) of the Factories Act, 1934, are about to be made with a view to the protection of workers employed on hazardous operations, and I shall be glad to consult Local Governments, and particularly the Government of the United Provinces, as to the need for special protection to the glass industry when their opinion is invited on the draft rules.

(e) I understand that the Government of the United Provinces have taken steps to ensure that those of the Firozabad factories which come under the Factories Act are properly regulated under that Act. For other factories the Municipal Board made certain bye-laws in 1931.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Will the workers concerned here also be consulted?

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Will the proposals of the Government be published in the draft stage before they are finally adopted?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I think so. I think, in all probability, these draft rules will be published.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I know what the Honourable Member said as regards factories which do not come under the Factories Act?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I said that for other factories, which do not come under the Act, the Municipal Board made certain bye-laws.

---

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The Chair understands the Leader of the House wishes to make a statement.

12 Noon.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** (Leader of the House): With your permission, I want to make a statement with respect to an answer which I gave the House yesterday. There was a question and there were some supplementary questions too, about re-printing the documents relating to the statements made by Ministers of Ruling Princes, and so on. I proceeded on the assumption that they were printed in newspapers, and the supplementary questions proceeded also on that footing. I have been informed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Joshi, that that is not the fact and that only portions have been printed in the newspapers and also some Members would very much like an authenticated reprint of the documents relating to this matter. I have no objection to undertake to print it as soon as possible, so that it may be available to the Honourable Members.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** May I know whether Government will distribute copies free to Members of the Legislature, instead of making it merely available?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar:** We shall supply it free to Honourable Members of this House, but not to the public.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi:** All right.

## STATEMENT *RE* TRIBUNAL FOR INDO-BURMA FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** (Finance Member): I am very grateful to you, Mr. President, for allowing me to make a statement in regard to the debate that we had two days ago. (*Some Honourable Members*: "We cannot hear you".) I think it is due to the House that in two respects I should supplement and in one respect correct the information I have to the House during the debate on the Indo-Burma Financial settlement. In the first place, I ought to have informed the House that the tribunal was actually constituted in the middle of December last and has been in session since about the 21st of that month. Secondly, when the debate took place, I was unaware that later information had been received in the Secretariat by telegram to the effect that the tribunal had actually signed their report. I am not yet in a position to say when the report will be published, but I can definitely say now that an opportunity of debating it will be afforded to this House before the Secretary of State submits his final conclusions upon it to Parliament. I must apologize to the House fully and sincerely for having misled it. I ask Honourable Members to believe that this was absolutely unintentional.

**Mr. B. Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Has the Honourable Member seen the article in the *Statesman*—Between the Devil and the Deep—and understood the implications?

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

**Mr. Bhulabhai J. Desai** (Bombay Northern Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): With reference to the statement which has just been made by the Honourable the Finance Member, he has only furnished one proof, which we would otherwise have been unable to find out, of the manner in which the description he gave of the bloated service to which he belongs is justified. This is the kind of efficiency shown by this service, with all the expenditure that is devoted to it from year to year. We began with three statements, each of them was wrong. On the 21st of February, we were told that this Committee or tribunal or whatever it was would take a long time, and hence it was not advisable or perhaps not feasible that Members of this House could be associated with it in any way. Then came the answer in reply to Mr. Satyamurti, that probably it will take three days. Then we came to the discussion when the three days became three weeks and today we are informed that the report had already been signed. It is a matter of sincere regret that matters of this kind should escape the attention of those who are in charge of the Government of India here, but also their own principals in their own country, whose business it is to carry on with efficiency, being paid for fully and sufficiently for the purpose.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Does the Honourable Member mean to say that this tribunal was appointed by the middle of December without the knowledge of the Government of India?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: No, Sir. I ought to have given that information to the House during the debate, and I neglected it.



**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Some time before the debate took place, the Honourable Member had opportunities of answering supplementary questions when there was not the slightest inkling given to the House that this tribunal had been appointed so long ago as the middle of December without the knowledge of anybody in India, except perhaps, as now stated by the Honourable Member, the Government of India themselves. Does the Honourable Member realise that the tribunal was appointed against the recommendation of the Round Table Conference? Now, we understand to our great surprise that this tribunal was appointed so long ago as the middle of December. We are now at the end of March, and we were kept in complete ignorance of the constitution of this tribunal or that it was even taking evidence. Does my Honourable friend realise the implications of the statement he has made just now?

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): May I say a few words on this? It seems to me that it is no use flogging a dead horse.

**An Honourable Member:** We want to see that the horse does not die like this hereafter.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** In spite of the further information which is contained in the statement, the position still remains this. The Government will contradict me if I am wrong. I still understand that the Government of India were not consulted before this tribunal was appointed. If they were consulted, they must have made some proposals or suggestions of their own. That is still not before us. It seems that the Government of India were not kept in touch by the Secretary of State as to whether this report was concluded or not. The only satisfaction—and I want to be quite fair—that we obtain from this statement is that it is now definitely stated that no decision will be taken by the Secretary of State for India without this House being given an opportunity of discussing the subject.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** That is so.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** That is a very very poor satisfaction indeed. I am sure, when we come to discuss this question, we shall be told that here is the recommendation of a responsible committee, . . .

**An Honourable Member:** It will be flogging a buried horse.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** . . . after due deliberation sitting from the middle of December till the end of March, considering various points and discussing them and finally arriving at this conclusion. Is that to be lightly treated? We shall be told that the Government of India were represented and the Government of Burma were represented. I am quite sure that the Honourable the Finance Member will agree with me that that is not the way to treat this House. That is not the way to treat this country, and that is not the way to dispose of such vital interest of Burma and India.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Does the Honourable Member realise the significance of the statement he has made just now? The significance is that the Committee was appointed behind the back of India. The Committee was appointed, not in consonance with the recommendation of the Round Table Conference, but in defiance of those recommendations to which the Secretary of State was a party. Does the Honourable Member realise the significance of the statement he has made?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Yes, Sir.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Has he got any defence for the statement? Who is responsible for this state of affairs? Is it the Government of India or the Secretary of State?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): If the Honourable Member wants any information, let the Finance Member say anything he wants to.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** I cannot give any more information than I have already given.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I should like to put one question specifically to the Honourable the Finance Member.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member says he cannot give any more information.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Let alone the past. The Honourable the Finance Member made a statement today that the Secretary of State will not submit his conclusions to Parliament, before this report is discussed by this House. I want to know whether that statement is made with the authority and with the knowledge of the Secretary of State, or only on his own responsibility.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** With the knowledge of the Secretary of State.

**An Honourable Member:** And authority?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** It comes to the same thing.

## MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT.

### WORKING OF THE NEW CONSTITUTION BY INDIANS DESPITE DISCLAIMERS.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): A notice for the adjournment of the House was given yesterday by Mr. Asaf Ali. The notice is to this effect,—that the Honourable Member proposes to ask for the leave of the House:

"to move an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance on the ground that:

(1) in spite of the adverse opinion of the Assembly, the Provincial Legislatures, and nearly all political organizations of the country, the Government have reached the misleading conclusion that 'despite disclaimers every body will come and work the Constitution', and

(2) inasmuch as the Government of India Bill is now before the British Parliament the communication of such an opinion by the Government of India to the Secretary of State will do incalculable harm and encourage defiance of Indian opinion."

The Chair would like the Honourable Member to satisfy it that this is a specific matter of recent occurrence and urgent, in the sense of the Standing Order.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali** (Delhi: General): Sir, I hope you will permit me to preface my remarks by a few observations.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair simply wants the Honourable Member to state his points.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali**: I shall state my point, Sir, but I simply want to make it perfectly clear at the outset that I do not seek to revive the discussion of any matter which has been debated in this House. Nothing is further from my object. I propose to eliminate as rigorously as possible any reference either to the framework or to the contents of the Government of India Bill which is now before the British Parliament. So far as the point of recent occurrence is concerned, Sir, I do not suppose for a moment that even the Government will question that—because I am basing this adjournment motion on the reply which the Honourable the Leader of the House gave to my question No. 1033 only the day before yesterday. In a way, we are indebted to him for revealing a part of the confidential communication which has taken place between the Government of India and the Secretary of State, but inasmuch as he has made a definite assertion that the Government of India have reached a conclusion with regard to the attitude of India towards the coming Reforms, I think the matter becomes one of urgent public importance.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Order, order. The difficulty the Chair is feeling is this—that the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report was debated on the 4th, 6th and 7th February. Then, on the 13th also, some statements were made as regards the conclusions reached by the Government of India.

**Mr. M. Asaf Ali**: This conclusion was never made known to us before but only the day before yesterday. It was only the day before yesterday that the Government of India definitely made it known to us and to the world that, in spite of all that had been said in this Legislature and in all the other Legislatures of the country and by all the responsible political organisations throughout the country, they had reached the decision that everybody—mark you, Sir, everybody—would come and work the Constitution. Now, this is nothing but the grossest misrepresentation of facts.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair simply wanted to know the Honourable Member's point. Sir Nripendra Sircar.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar** (Leader of the House): Sir, I really would not have pressed my objection but that we are all now pressed for time, and this motion is hopelessly out of order. My Honourable friend is not right in saying that only day before yesterday he came to know that the conclusion of the Government—whether that is right or wrong is not the question now—was that, in spite of these resolutions passed by the Provincial Councils and other resolutions, they were of the opinion that the constitution would be worked. I will read, Sir, from page 558 of the Legislative Assembly Debates of Thursday, the 7th February, 1935, and I shall read other portions also. I hope to be as brief as possible. Now, this is part of my speech. I would remind the Honourable House that, before this, at least two Members had drawn attention to the fact

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

that this Constitution had been rejected by the Liberal Federation and had been rejected by other bodies, and so on. That should be finally borne in mind. This is what I said:

"If you had the courage to say that, if this is passed, we are not going to work the Constitution, because it is not consistent with self-respect to come within 500 miles of a Constitution, which is so derogatory to us, insulting and so humiliating, then, surely, to be consistent, you should say—'we cannot work this Constitution'."

It may be asked why I am assuming that this Constitution is going to be worked by the people who want now to repel it because it is inconsistent with self-respect? My reason is that throughout these speeches, I have not heard even a suggestion made by anybody that they are not going to work the Constitution if the Bill passes through the Houses of Parliament. I don't hear any contradiction even now, and I ask Honourable Members to consider what is the object of passing a futile Resolution when we know that this really means nothing. These are blank shots which create noise. I daresay they raise some amount of smoke but they do not hit anybody. If it had been followed up by a Resolution stating that it is not consistent with our self-respect to work it, I would have understood that there was something concrete in it. But this is nothing \* \* \* \*

I again ask,—what is the good of this heroic language of rejection, inconsistent with our self-respect, and so on, when we know perfectly well that this Constitution is going to be worked?"

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What was the date of that?

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar**: The 7th of February last. And, Sir, every bit of this sort of reasoning may be wrong—we are not concerned with that.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): It is wrong. The reasoning is quite wrong. (Interruptions.)

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar**: Sir, in spite of what my friend says, I am sure, I am perfectly correct. The House was informed on the 7th February that that is the opinion of the Government of India, namely, that the Constitution is going to be worked.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): That is the Law Member's opinion—not that of the Government of India.

(Interruptions.)

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar**: I think, Sir, at least four of my Honourable friends are anxious to interrupt, and I do not want to deprive them of that pleasure.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member had better go on.

**The Honourable Sir Nripendra Sircar:** Now, Sir, on the 18th, certain supplementaries were put by my Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, and I am now going to read from page 740 of the Debates, dated the 18th. This is part of my answer to my Honourable friend:

"Since the presentation of the report of the Joint Select Committee they (*that is, the Government of India*) have informed the Secretary of State that, in their opinion the scheme presented in the Report provided a basis for a Bill which they believed would be workable. Before expressing that opinion, the Government of India did not consult persons belonging to political parties in India."

Now, Sir, I would draw your attention to the supplementaries:

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti:* May I know, in view of the answer to clause (a) of this question being 'No', whether the Government of India's attention has been drawn to the Secretary of State's statement and that of Mr. Stanley Baldwin in this morning's papers that they had been assured by Governments in India that the reforms would be worked? May I know if that answer is based on any formal information sent by the Government of India, or is it merely an impression produced on their minds?"

That is where the question stops. My answer was:

"The answer to the last portion is 'No', and I do not accept the first portion as correct, because I have got here a brief report of what Sir Samuel Hoare is reported to have said: This is what Sir Samuel Hoare said:

"Critics in India must not be taken to mean that Indians would obstruct the reforms. On the contrary, the Viceroy and all Governors had told him that India would work the reforms."

Mr. Satyamurti follows up by another supplementary:

"May I know if the Government of India never informed the Secretary of State that in their opinion there will be people found in this country to work the reforms?"

My answer was:

"I think that follows from the answer to the first part, but, if necessary, I again say, 'Yes'."

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti:* Then, may I know when the Government of India, according to the Law Member's reply, informally, as a result of correspondence, gave the impression to the authorities in England that the reforms would be workable, whether they were giving expression to their own opinion, or whether it was arrived at in consultation with any representative Indians, persons or parties?"

In realising the answers given to the next three questions I would ask the House and you, Sir, to remember that Mr. Satyamurti was proceeding on the assumption that the Secretary of State had been informed informally though not by means of a formal document that the constitution would be worked and his whole point is why was not public opinion consulted. The answer given was this:

"They had drawn their own inference from facts before them."

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti:* So, may I know that they did not consult any Indian belonging to any school of political thought before giving this opinion or impression to the Government in England?"

My reply was:

"I have answered once and I give the same answer, and that is, they did not consult."

"*Mr. S. Satyamurti:* May I know the reason why the Government chose not to consult any Indian, and yet informed the British Government that the reforms would be workable?"

[Sir Nripendra Sircar.]

I answered :

"Because the Government had hundreds of opinions as expressed in speeches, resolutions and writings."

"Mr. S. Satyamurti : May I know whether those speeches and writings were not available to the Government in England? May I know where the Government of India come in?"

I replied :

"That is a question which ought to be put to the Government in England."

Then, Sir, I would give you one more reference, because I do not wish to argue at any length. The point that everyone had rejected the proposed Constitution was brought out by several speakers, but I will give only one reference and that of Mr. Asaf Ali, because he is moving this motion for adjournment. On page 474, he said :

"Those who attended the Round Table Conference have one and all rejected it as a monstrosity, a constitutional monstrosity, which no one on earth would be prepared to nurse. Then, in so far as the question of the opinion in the country is concerned, was there any doubt in the minds of any one, including His Majesty's Government, that the whole of this country had condemned it right and left from the moment the proposal emerged in any form whatsoever?"

The next point that I wish to take is the question of urgency. My submission is that they are well aware that on the 5th and 13th we had definitely come to the conclusion that this constitution would be worked on all sides. I want also to draw your attention to the Legislative Rules. If you will kindly turn to page 85 you will find that rule 12 (iii) runs thus :

"The motion must not revive discussion on a matter which has been discussed in the same session."

The point is so obvious that my Honourable friend cannot say : "Oh, no, no, I am not going to refer to the Joint Parliamentary Committee". But whether he does it or not, if this question is debated I have to go over the same ground again.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) : The Chair has not the least doubt that this motion is out of order. The whole question was debated on the motion for the consideration of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's Report and the point of discussion was whether the recommendations of the Joint Parliamentary Committee were acceptable to Indian public opinion as represented in different sections of the House. That was the occasion on which opinions were expected to be expressed as to whether the Constitution proposed would be worked in India or not. Now, it would be open to the Government as well as to any Honourable Member of this House to draw any conclusion he could from the debate on the Joint Parliamentary Committee Report, whether the Constitution, such as is proposed, would be accepted or rather would be worked by different classes of politicians representing Indian public opinion. If the Government of India formed the conclusion that such a Constitution would be worked, that opinion might be right or wrong, but it was a conclusion which it was open to them to come to. The question was debated also in replies to questions put by several Honourable Members of this House. Therefore, the Chair does think that the motion is out of order.

## CONFIDENTIAL REPORT MADE ON MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): There is another notice of a motion for adjournment in the name of Mr. Fazlul Huq. The Honourable Member proposes to ask for leave to make a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House today for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance as follows:

"The situation created by the admission made by Government yesterday that Members of the Legislative Assembly are being confidentially reported upon to the Government of India, and that such reports are not open to inspection even by the Members affected."

Is there any objection to this motion?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik** (Home Member): Sir, a motion for the adjournment of the House has to satisfy three standards. It has to relate to a recent matter, a specific matter and a matter of urgent public importance. As regards the recentness of this matter, I find that it has always been the practice to ask Local Governments to supply us with a statement giving, for all newly elected candidates, a brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belonged. That has been the practice ever since this Assembly was started in the year 1921. There is nothing, therefore, recent about this. It is true that apparently the practice was unknown to Honourable Members. I may say it was unknown to me till a few days ago. But even assuming that its recentness is admitted, even assuming that it is quite a definite matter, does the House or do you, Sir, consider that one can lay one's hand on one's heart and say definitely that this is a matter of urgent public importance?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it done in the course of ordinary administration?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik**: Yes, Sir. I would urge that it is desirable in these matters to preserve a certain sense of proportion. We have had numerous motions for adjournment lately on matters which can be considered of urgent public importance, such as the position of Indians in Kenya, the Indo-Burman financial relations, the Karachi firing and other matters in which no doubt the public are deeply interested. But is the public really deeply interested in this particular matter? Would I not be equally in order or possibly even more in order in asking that this House should now adjourn in order that Members might have for once an opportunity of getting a little fresh air and exercise?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair wishes to know from the Honourable the Home Member whether this report was specially in respect of the Honourable Members of the Congress or the Nationalist Party?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik**: It refers to all newly elected Members of the Assembly, that is to say, Members who were not Members of the last Assembly.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it a report by the C. I. D.?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Orsk:** It is a report by the Local Governments.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Give copies of this report for our obituary notices!

**Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Maitra** (Presidency Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Will the Honourable the Home Member say if the President is reported on by the C. I. D.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq** (Bakargunj cum Faridpur: Muhammadian Rural): Sir, there is a Persian proverb . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair does not want any discussion. The Chair wants the Honourable Member's statement.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** I will only refer to that Persian proverb and come to the point. That Persian proverb says:

*"Ozre gunah badtar az gunah".*

It means that sometimes the excuse for a crime is worse than the crime itself. (Hear, hear.) If the Honourable the Home Member had only taken the trouble to read the wording of my motion, I do not think he would have given the answer which he has given to the House today. My point is that a situation has arisen which is a definite matter of urgent public importance. I emphasize the word 'situation'. I do not care what the Government of India or the Governments in India have been doing in the past.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member has only to state his point.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** I have got to satisfy you. Sir, that it is a definite matter.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not a question of argument. The Honourable Member will simply state his point.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** You will please permit me, Sir, to develop the argument in my own way.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is not to argue, but he has to state his points.

**Mr. A. K. Fuzlul Huq:** I am arguing to this extent that it is a definite matter of public importance which can be discussed in this House. The new situation is what I want to discuss. It may be that the Government has been doing it for a long time, but it is inconsequence of the answers given the day before yesterday. that I personally and many of us came to know that we are under an espionage whether by the police or by the Government I do not know. That has created a situation and I submit,



Sir, that the knowledge that we are being reported upon confidentially and that the reports are to be kept away from us interferes with the free exercise of our right as Members of this House. (Hear, hear.) (Applause.) I submit there are many Members who feel that their freedom is being interfered with in this way, that they are under the impression that a vote given against the Government would be recorded against them and that such a vote will ruin their future career. In this way this interferes with the free exercise of the rights of Members of this House. Therefore the situation that has arisen is after the statement has been made and that arose the day before yesterday and I could not have brought forward this motion earlier. I submit, therefore, that this is a definite matter and it is of public importance. As regards urgency my submission is that this situation affects our work in this House from moment to moment (Hear, hear) and it was not that it arose sometimes ago and then ceased to exist. Every moment of our life in this House is being affected by the situation that has been created (Laughter), and, therefore, it is of extreme urgency and it has to be discussed. I already submitted that it is a definite matter.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, it is admitted by the Honourable the Home Member that it is specific, that it is urgent, and that it is recent. The only point which he takes is whether it is of public importance urgent enough to be taken now. I submit, Sir, it is *prima facie* for you to say, but if afterwards you rule it in order, and if, in spite of the objection of the Honourable the Home Member, 25 Members stand up in support of it, it shows to the House that a section of the House wants the motion to be discussed. The only other matter that I want to submit is this. I am not on the merits, Sir, but you put a very pertinent question as to whether the C. I. D. report on the position and political antecedents of the Members. My Honourable friend, the Home Member, does not know. He says simply that the Local Government report . . . .

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik**: I beg the Honourable Member's pardon. I said, "No; the C. I. D. do not report". It is only the Local Governments that report. If the Honourable Member wants to quote me he must do so correctly and not incorrectly.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: My point is this. How do Local Governments get their report? How do they collect information? My Honourable friend does not know.

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik**: I do know. In fact, I have done it myself.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: That will be going into the merits of the question. I think it is unusual in any deliberative House of the world, where Parliaments with full powers or even Parliaments with limited powers like us sit, that one section of the House must have a confidential report about the other section of the House, and, at the same time, they refuse to show these reports to them. I consider this very unusual in any part of the world. I also consider that this is an urgent matter and of public importance to be discussed in the House.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** May I just point out that, so far as I understand, the position is this. The Honourable the Home Member stated that when a Member is elected to this House, the Local Governments are asked to send a brief biography of that gentleman, a short history . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Has the Honourable Member got the answer of the Home Member before him?

**The Honourable Sir Henry Craik:** I said "A brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belong".

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** If that is usual when each Member becomes a Member of this House for the first time, then it is a part of the administrative routine. It is nothing urgent. I contend that it is not important and that it will be a waste of time of the House to discuss this motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair thinks there is a good deal of misconception which has arisen on this. Apparently the Honourable Member, who gave notice of this motion, did not perhaps consider carefully the answer which was given by the Honourable the Home Member in reply to the question of Mr. Satyamurti. The answer is:

"As has been done on the occasion of previous general elections, the Government of India asked the Local Governments, and not C. I. D. officers, to supply them with a statement giving for all newly elected candidates a brief account of their position and political antecedents and showing the party to which they belong."

It is not espionage on any Honourable Member at all. The Chair does not see how an ordinary departmental matter like this could be the subject of a motion for adjournment. The Chair, therefore, rules the motion out of order.

### DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS—*contd.*

#### TRANSFER TO THE FUND FOR THE TRANSFER OF THE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE FROM PUSA TO DELHI—*contd.*

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The House will now resume discussion on Demands for Supplementary Grants.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai** (Secretary, Department of Education, Health and Lands): It is a dull transition from the subjects that we have been discussing just now to the question of transfer of Pusa, but I can assure my Honourable friends opposite that I shall curtail the agony as much as possible. Sir, I was stating yesterday why it was that the Agricultural Institute was located at Pusa in the first instance, and I think I explained that point satisfactorily. The next point that I would take up is in regard to the crop experiments and the work on crops which has been done at Pusa. My Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, quite rightly paid a tribute to the very good botanical work which has been done at Pusa in evolving a new strains of seeds. May I remind him of what I said in the House the other day in answer to a question, namely

that it is not the intention of Government to disturb the botanical work which is being done at Pusa. In other words the work of evolving new strains of seeds and crops will continue and the sub-station will be maintained. The botanical sub-station will be maintained at Pusa so that the work that is being done at present will not be interfered with by reason of the transfer. My Honourable friend also referred to the work which has been done on sugar-cane. May I remind him that the main work of the Imperial Institute of Agricultural Research on sugar-cane has been done at Coimbatore, that the policy of extending the scope of field experiments has been applied also to Bihar and Orissa and that as a result of grants made by the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research, the agricultural research work on sugar-cane is not being done now at Pusa, but at a separate farm in Mushari, Muzaffarpur district.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I say that I did not make any statement to that effect. I only read out the passage from the Encyclopedia Britannica.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** That is perfectly true. But my Honourable friend implied by that quotation that as a result of the transfer, this valuable work might cease, and I think I am perfectly justified in pointing out to the House that this valuable work will not cease but that it will be continued.

I now go on from this to the main change which has taken place since the Institute was established at Pusa. The scope of field work has extended all over India by reason of the realisation of the fact that the work of conducting enquiries on effect of soil and climate on crops must not be done in one central place but is to be done in regions peculiarly representative of special conditions.

The second point which one has to remember is that in 1904 there were no provincial departments of agriculture of any value or importance. Since then colleges have come into being in the different provinces; for example, the college at Lyallpur, the college at Cawnpore, the college at Coimbatore, etc., and these are doing research work themselves. Now, as a result of the emergence of these two classes of experimental work by the provinces, experimental work of very high importance, *vis.*, field work as also laboratory work, the question of contact between Pusa and the provinces has become much more of a live issue than it was when Pusa was the only institution carrying on agricultural research in India. And, on this point, I should like to quote to the House what I quoted before in Simla, namely, the opinion of the Royal Commissions on Agriculture. It said, in paragraph 40 at page 45:

"The evidence we received showed that the reverse (*i.e.*, reverse of contact between the provinces and Pusa) is unfortunately the case and that the thread of connection between Pusa and the provinces is becoming more and more attenuated."

That, Sir, is the position. It is not that the officials of the Government of India in Delhi want to be in nearer touch with the Institute, although that may have a certain importance from the point of view of supervision and control, but the important thing is that contact between Pusa by reason of its isolation and the research work which is being done in the provinces and which is being done in the universities does not exist; at least it does not exist to the extent that is desired. That, Sir,

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

is the position. My Honourable friend also said something about cultural contacts and he seemed to be of the opinion that Delhi really has no pretensions either to culture or to the provision of cultural contacts. I can pursue that point but it seems to me that it is not essentially germane to this discussion. In any case I would ask my Honourable friend to turn to a greater authority than myself on the cultural position and traditions of this place, to the Chief Whip of his party Mr. Asaf Ali, who will be able to give him ample enlightenment as to what part Delhi has played in the cultural development and evolution of India. Sir, he also said that if Pusa were transferred to Delhi the University of Delhi will be thrown in the shade. The University of Delhi, as everybody knows, is an extremely small and limited concern. I have yet to hear that any university is thrown in the shade by reason of the fact that its scientific activities are supplemented by the creation in its very neighbourhood of a first-class institution. I do not think that that is a point which really has much validity.

Now, Sir, I go on to another point of my Honourable friend's and that was the question of the adequacy of financial return as a result of the transfer. Sir, there are two kinds of savings; one is an immediate saving of expenditure, and the other and the more important kind of saving is the greater and the added benefit that you derive by reason of the change that you make. I informed the House last Session in Simla that it was, on a conservative estimate the opinion of experts, that if you do remove Pusa to a central location the value of the work which is being done there will be at least doubled. We spend on the maintenance of Pusa seven lakhs of rupees a year. I do not attach much importance to purely arithmetical calculations in a matter of this kind because the advantages of research are really imponderable. But at any rate if one has to proceed on that basis, I should say that seven times two is 14 lakhs; in other words, by spending seven lakhs we should be deriving a benefit which should be equivalent to seven lakhs extra. And I think on a simple calculation it will be clear that in 8½ years or four years the additional expenditure of moving Pusa from where it is to Delhi will be completely wiped out, and, after that, we will continue to derive this additional benefit.

Now, Sir, I do not think I have very much more to say in regard to the points raised by my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, but I will turn to one remark made by my Honourable friend, Maulana Shafi Daudi. He said that he had visited the site where the new Institute is to be built and he found it a desert and he thought that really it was a great wrong to this country that we should move the Institute from the fertile neighbourhood of Pusa to the desert neighbourhood of Delhi. Well, Sir, my Honourable friend is, I am sure, familiar with the history of canal irrigation in this country as also abroad. What was the position of Lyallpur, as my Honourable friend reminds me, before it was subjected to intensive irrigation and the application of the results of scientific research? What exactly was the position of the Soudan? They were deserts before; they have blossomed as the rose today. I think my Honourable friend ought to do us the justice of conceding, that when this place is treated as Pusa has been treated, there is no reason why it should not be as fertile and as suited for agricultural research as Pusa.

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi** (Tirhut Division: Muhammadan): The soil is rocky.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai**: I am coming to that later on.

Now my Honourable friend may not be satisfied with a purely *a priori* argument. He may say that this is just dialectics pure and simple and and there is nothing scientific behind this. My answer to my Honourable friend there is this. We have not come to this conclusion merely on the analogy of what irrigation and research have done for the Soudan or for Lyallpur. We took the very natural precaution of consulting every agricultural chemist of any consequence or importance in this country. We consulted Mr. Mackenzie Taylor who is the Irrigation Chemist to the Government of the Punjab; we consulted Rao Bahadur Viswanathan who is the Imperial Agricultural Chemist to the Government of India; we consulted Dr. Shaw who is the head of the Institute at Pusa and who, if the Institute is transferred to Delhi, will be here and who is an eminent botanist. They all said that the soil of the land, which we have chosen for this Institute, is in every way adequate for the work which this Institute is required to do. I do not think that it is necessary for me to continue that particular point further.

Now, Sir, I come to one last question. I am sorry that my Honourable friend, Mr. Aney, is not here. He wanted to know whether we had consulted the provincial Departments of Agriculture in this matter before we came to a decision. Sir, it so happened that,—I think it was in January, 1934,—soon after the earthquake, we held a meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Imperial Agricultural Research Council here. The Vice-Chairman of the Council definitely put this question to the Directors of Agriculture. The Director of Bihar and Orissa unfortunately was not present. Even if he had been present I do not think that provincial feelings being what they are he would have expressed his own opinion. But all the other heads of the Departments of Agriculture present were unanimously of the view that the neighbourhood of Delhi would be better from the point of view of co-ordination and contact in the field of research than Pusa. That was the opinion of the Directors of Agriculture. Then let me pursue the point. In August, 1934, there was a meeting of the Scientific Advisory Board, which includes representatives of the Departments of Agriculture, which includes representatives of universities, in fact of every one engaged in agricultural research. They made it clear, in the course of their discussion, that as a result of the transfer, they felt that we had made a step forward in the direction of the co-ordination of agricultural research, and, what is more, that we would be economising by this in different ways.

I will mention one instance of that. For example, the question of the investigation of certain pests of sugar-cane had been engaging the attention of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. They felt they could not proceed with the investigation which had been proposed to them because of the cost involved. The non-recurring cost was estimated at about a lakh and a half and the recurring cost was estimated at Rs. 44,000 a year. As a result of the change that we are proposing the non-recurring cost has fallen to about Rs. 30,000 and the recurring cost only to Rs. 19,000. This is to be spread over five years. It is open to Honourable Members to calculate for themselves what the saving on this one individual scheme is. I think that I have said all that I had to say, but I would only repeat . . . . .

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Before the Honourable Member resumes his seat, I would like him to answer one question for my information: I do not know whether my question is an intelligent one; but after the transfer of this Institute from Pusa to Delhi, what would be the position of the Institute in Pusa?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai**: After the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, the laboratory work which has, up to the present, been done in Pusa, laboratory work on entomology, mycology, agricultural chemistry and botany, will be done in the laboratories that are to be constructed in Delhi. The practical agricultural or experimental work on crops peculiar to that tract and to which that tract lends itself will continue to be done at Pusa because the botanical sub-station is to be maintained there . . . . .

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir**: One more question: what about the damage done by the earthquake? To what extent was that damage and to what extent does it make it necessary to reconstruct the buildings and what will be the cost of such reconstruction?

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi**: Before that question is answered, I say 36 lakhs or even double that amount is justifiable for such reconstruction.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai**: I cannot answer two questions simultaneously. My Honourable friend's question was what is the extent of the damage done at Pusa. The main work of the laboratory was done in the buildings known as the Phipps Laboratory: that laboratory has been completely destroyed. The position is that at the present moment practically no research work is being done at Pusa: it is in cold storage. Our engineers said that it would be two years before they could say definitely on what particular site of the area included in the Institute you could reconstruct at all, because they were not sure of the effects of subterranean subsidences that had taken place. At any rate there is this additional consideration for my Honourable friend's reflection, namely, that if you build here you can build immediately, but if you want to rebuild in Pusa you have to wait for another two years . . . .

**Maulvi Muhammad Shafi Daudi**: That fear has vanished now.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai**: Yes, but the work has also progressed. There is only one further point that I wish to submit for the consideration of this House. Last July, the matter was considered at very great length at two meetings of the Standing Finance Committee. With the exception of two Honourable Members from Bihar and Orissa—and I have no quarrel with them for that—the Committee was unanimously of the opinion that the Institute should be transferred. We had a two days' debate in the Legislative Assembly. There again our Supplementary Demand for expenditure, which we expected might reach up to Rs. 7 lakhs by the end of the year, was voted by the House without a division. I submit that since then no new fact, no new consideration has come to light. My Honourable friend's eloquence is undoubtedly a new factor: it moves the House; but I do beg the House not to be swayed by eloquence pure and simple but to reflect upon what has happened and then decide for itself whether in view of the fact that no new fact has come to light, it would be justified in reversing a considered and a careful decision.

**Some Honourable Members:** The question may now be put.

**Mr. G. Morgan** (Bengal: European): I only want to ask you, Sir, for your ruling about this vote on which there has been rather a mixed up debate. The motion moved by the Honourable the Finance Member is the transfer of a part of the revenue surplus to a fund on account of the Research Institute. The amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, is to reduce this amount of 86 lakhs to one rupee. What I want to know from you is: if one is to vote in favour of the amendment, does that mean the reversal of the decision of the Assembly for the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi? Because our view and our vote in the Assembly before was in favour of that transfer. Now this is a different question: this is the transfer from a surplus of revenue to meet that expenditure. We are not in favour of the transfer of the money from the surplus which the Honourable the Finance Member has got in the budget, and we would rather stick to the old arrangement by which it was charged against capital. But if the voting in favour of the amendment means that we are against the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, then we cannot vote in favour of the amendment. I should like your ruling as to what the actual meaning and result of the vote would be.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): So far as the Chair can understand the wording of the motion, the result will be that the transfer from surplus revenue will not take place and things will remain as they are. The question is . . . . .

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Have I no right of reply, Sir?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair did not know that the Honourable Member wanted to reply.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** May I point out that the point raised by Mr. Morgan is one of considerable importance in order to enable us to vote? I am also one of those who feel that expenditure of this sort should come from capital. That point was never really discussed in this debate. I am one of those who agree with the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi. If this vote means that Government are to have no money to carry on with during the next year in order to carry out the scheme of this transfer, then I would vote against the amendment. But if you hold that the passing of this amendment will have the effect of not allowing Government to use money out of capital I would change my mind. I would like an authoritative statement on this point from Government as to what their position is and what is the real consequence of this vote. I should like to hear the views of the Honourable the Finance Member.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg** (Finance Member): It seems to me that the matter is in inextricable confusion. Supposing this vote is rejected, the Government have got to make up their mind whether the motive of the House in rejecting it is because it disapproves of any further expenditure upon the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi or whether it merely objects to the method of paying for it out of the revenue surplus that is expected to accrue in the present year.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What is the Honourable Member's interpretation of the wording of the motion? As the motion is worded, what will be the effect so far as the Government are concerned?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: I cannot say: it is impossible to say that: the Honourable the Mover of the motion may be able to throw some light upon it; but as I heard his speech . . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member's demand for grant is in the same language. What is the Honourable Member's interpretation of his own demand?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: The motion for the grant is to meet it out of the revenue surplus. It is then open to the Government to decide, if it is rejected, whether it can come back to the House and ask for a capital grant or whether these proceedings should be taken to mean that the House is rejecting the motion on its merits. It is quite impossible to say what the Government will do until they have considered the matter in the light of the debate in all its bearings.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): At any rate, they cannot transfer the money from the surplus revenue?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: If this is rejected, it means that the House is unwilling that it should be paid for out of the surplus revenue.

**Mr. G. Morgan**: That is all.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir**: Is that all it means?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: That is certainly the meaning of it.

**Mr. F. E. James** (Madras: European): Before my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, speaks, may I have it clear from you, Sir, what the position is? I understood that when Mr. Morgan asked your advice on the matter you said that the effect of the success of the vote which is in the name of Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant would be that the Government would be precluded from taking this particular amount out of the surplus revenues which accrue this year. If that, therefore, is the only effect, then surely that is an authoritative interpretation of the meaning of this vote if it is carried.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: May I just elaborate the point, Sir, because it is quite clear that the Honourable the Mover  
 1 P. M. of the amendment objects very strongly to the transfer of the Institute from Pusa to Delhi, and he wishes that the whole work on the transfer should be put an end to. That was quite clear from his speech, and if the only question before the House is about the method of charge, then most of the discussion which has taken place is completely irrelevant.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant**: May I just say one word, Sir?



**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** I really think, Sir, that the Government do not realise their position. It is not a question of ruling at all. The words are perfectly clear, because the Honourable the Finance Member has moved the motion which stands in his name, and he has asked us to vote the grant, and it is specifically stated there that it will be from the surplus revenue. That is quite clear. There is no question of ruling at all from the Chair. The question is this. Do the Government stand by this, and do they want our vote on this? If we vote in favour of this grant, then it means the transfer of the fund from the surplus revenue. If you say that that is your intention, and it is quite clear to me, then the vote of the House can only be recorded on that point. It is not a question whether the House is in favour of the transfer of Pusa Institute to Delhi or not. If you want the vote of the House on that question, you must make your position clear.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** The only question I wish to submit to the House is whether it should be charged to capital or to surplus revenue. If the charge to surplus revenue is rejected, the position then is that there are no funds. The provision of funds for any further work upon Pusa by the House has not yet been approved. The question then will be whether the Government will bring forward a proposal to finance it out of capital, but all I say is that, in deciding whether they will bring forward such a proposal, the Government might or might not take into account the fact that the Honourable the Mover of the amendment made it quite clear that he wished the vote, as far as he was concerned, to be recorded on the project as a whole.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** That is not Mr. Jinnah's point.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** I think the House could very well give me an opportunity to explain what I mean by my motion. So far as I am concerned, I have not concealed my opinion on the merits of the question of transfer. But, so far as the present motion before the House is concerned, it certainly can be restricted to one point, namely, whether payment for this purpose should be made out of the surplus revenue or not. It does not prevent the Government from coming to the House again with a proposal for supplies out of capital. It will be open to the House then to discuss the question from the viewpoint whether or not they are prepared to find the money out of capital for the transfer of the Institute, and it is not impossible that I may myself change my mind (Hear, hear), for it is one of the factors which does weigh with me. Therefore, I hold, Sir, that the present issue is restricted exclusively to the point whether funds should or should not be provided out of the surplus. And the main reason why I have made this motion is this.—I want to have the surplus revenue for the relief of taxation. I think it is a breach of the ordinary canons of finance that any surplus revenue, which is not unoften kept back intentionally by Members in charge of Finance, is dealt with by them at the end of the year as they choose. I make it quite clear that my motion will not debar the Government from bringing forward another motion before this House to ascertain its opinion on the merits of the question. What I will think of it later on, it is left for me to decide, but one of the reasons, which certainly weighs with me and weighs with me to a very considerable extent, is this, that I am opposed to the

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

transfer from the surplus revenue for purposes of this Institute. So, Sir, I will not argue the other points. I have got much to say, and I had intended to say a good deal, but, on this occasion. I restrict my motion to this, that no transfer shall be made from surplus revenue for this purpose or for any other purpose, and, therefore, I would request my friends to concentrate on this point.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** May I make the position clear, Sir? If the object of the Honourable the Mover of the amendment is to intercept this non-recurring and practically accrued surplus for the purposes of reduction of taxation in the next financial year, I should like to make it quite clear that that is quite illegitimate, and the Government have no intention of proposing any such thing. But the effect of this motion, if it is passed by the House, will be simply this, that instead of using the accrued surplus, *pro tanto* it will go automatically to the reduction or avoidance of debt, and, therefore, will reduce the capital debt. Then the House will next vote precisely similar sums over the next two or three years which will increase the debt to the original figure. I submit that if that is the sole purpose, then the House will be stultifying itself.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** The House knows that it has 86 lakhs at its disposal. Undoubtedly, our Finance Bill is passed, adopted and modified every year in accordance with the exigencies of the financial situation . . . . .

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** It will automatically on the 31st of March go to the avoidance of debt.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** I want to know for our guidance one thing. Do I understand my friend, Mr. Pant, to say that he is putting it on the ground that the transfer from the surplus revenue should not take place?

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Yes, Sir: that is the main ground.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** And no other ground?

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** No other ground.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** It has nothing to do with the question whether the Pusa Institute should be transferred to Delhi or not?

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** No.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** Then, Sir, it is not a question of a cut. If I hold that Pusa Institute ought to be transferred to Delhi, then I would be entitled to vote against the cut, and when the grant is put to the vote again, I shall refuse that grant on the ground that I refuse to be a party to its transfer from the surplus revenue. Therefore, Sir, I would ask you to put the cut motion first, which is, whether the Pusa Institute should be transferred to Delhi or not. If the House is of the opinion that it should be transferred. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is exactly what the Chair was going to do.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** I am much obliged to you, Sir.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The position appears to be quite clear. The Chair need not repeat what it said as to the effect of this motion. It only means that there shall be no transfer from the surplus revenue for this purpose. What action Government will take afterwards, the Chair is not concerned with at present. The question is:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 36,00,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi' be reduced to one rupee."

The motion was negatived.

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

"That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 36,00,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Transfer of the Agricultural Research Institute from Pusa to Delhi'."

The Assembly divided:

#### AYES—52.

Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.  
 Abdullah, Mr. H. M.  
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.  
 Allah Bakhsh Khan Tiwana, Khan Bahadur Nawab Malik.  
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama.  
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.  
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.  
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.  
 Bhole, The Honourable Sir Joseph.  
 Buss, Mr. L. C.  
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.  
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.  
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
 Drake, Mr. D. H. C.  
 Fazli-Haq Piracha, Khan Sahib Shaikh.  
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya Ananda.  
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.  
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.  
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.  
 Hockenbuhl, Mr. F. W.  
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
 James, Mr. F. E.  
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur Sardar Sir.  
 Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.  
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur Chaudhri.

Lalchand Navalrai, Mr.  
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.  
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.  
 Mehr Shah, Nawab Sahibzada Sir Sayad Muhammad.  
 Metcalfe, Mr. H. A. F.  
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.  
 Monteath, Mr. J.  
 Mukerjee, Mr. N. R.  
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya Charan.  
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.  
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank Owen, Mr. L.  
 Parma Nand, Bhai.  
 Rajah, Raja Sir Vasudeva.  
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. O.  
 Rau, Mr. P. R.  
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.  
 Scott, Mr. W. L.  
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain Sardar.  
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.  
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir Nripendra.  
 Sloan, Mr. T.  
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.  
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

## NOES—72.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.  
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.  
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.  
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.  
 Ba Si, U  
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.  
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.  
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.  
 Baqui, Mr. M. A.  
 Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.  
 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.  
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.  
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.  
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.  
 Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed.  
 Essak Sait, Mr. H. A. Sathar H.  
 Fakir Chand, Mr.  
 Fuzlul Huq, Mr. A. K.  
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.  
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.  
 Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.  
 Giri, Mr. V. V.  
 Govind Das, Seth.  
 Gupta, Mr. Ghansham Singh.  
 Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.  
 Hosamani, Mr. S. K.  
 Jedhe, Mr. K. M.  
 Jehangir, Sir Cowasji.  
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.  
 Jogendra Singh, Sirdar.  
 Khan Sahib, Dr.  
 Khare, Dr. N. B.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.  
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.  
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.  
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.  
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi  
 Syed.  
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.  
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.  
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.  
 Raghunir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.  
 Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.  
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.  
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.  
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.  
 Sant Singh, Sardar.  
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.  
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
 Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.  
 Sham Lal, Mr.  
 Shaikat Ali, Maulana.  
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.  
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib  
 Nawab.  
 Singh, Mr. Deep Narayan.  
 Singh, Mr. Ram Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Anugrah Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Satya Narayan.  
 Sinha, Mr. Shri Krishna.  
 Sinha, Raja Bahadur Harihar Prasad  
 Narayan.  
 Som, Mr. Suryya Kumar.  
 Sri Prakasa, Mr.  
 Thein Maung, Dr.  
 Thein Maung, U  
 Umar Aly Shah, Mr.  
 Varma, Mr. B. B.  
 Vissanji, Mr. Mathuradas.

The motion was negatived.

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

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

# IMPERIAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH DEPARTMENT.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs 5,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department'."

There are two motions in the name of Professor Ranga. Both of them are token cuts and are out of order. There is another in the name of Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta. That is also a token cut, and out of order. Pandit Nilakantha Das has another motion. That is also out of order.

**Mr. Ghanshiam Singh Gupta** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I only want certain information. May I know if anything substantial has been done at the Research Institute for rice? Everybody knows that rice is the principal food-crop of India. Out of a total net crop of 229 million acres, 80 million of acres are sowed with rice. Now, if I am not wrong, my information is that, except for a small experiment on the isolation of paddy, nothing has been done. May I know if something substantial has been done for rice?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** Sir, my Honourable friend is labouring under some confusion. He is talking about the Imperial Institute of Research. This is not a demand for the Agricultural Research Institute but for the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research. However, I will give my Honourable friend the information that I have in my possession. The Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has already sanctioned expenditure to the limit of Rs. 11 lakhs for provincial research in Bihar, Burma and other Provinces on this question of rice and paddy.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga** (Guntur *cum* Nellore: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I wish to make some suggestions. I find that only two Members of this House are represented on the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department. This is a Department in the progress of which this House has been evincing a very great deal of interest from the very beginning, and, as such, I suggest that the number of Members of this House on this Imperial Council ought to be increased at least to six.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** Sir, as you are aware, I am always anxious to give all the information I can to Honourable Members opposite. But I do feel that this is raising a question of policy as to what the constitution of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research should be.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** In that case, I wish to oppose this demand.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das** (Orissa Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I wish to point out that this is practically a "new grant". At any rate, Rs. 5 lakhs of this demand for agricultural research is so. This money is being given year after year in this way by means of a supplementary grant. In 1932-33, for want of money, this grant was not given in the Budget. It was retrenched, so to say. But, towards the end of the year, it was given as a supplementary grant. The same thing was done in 1933-34, and, in the current year, the same thing is being done. Of course, nobody would think of stopping a grant of five lakhs for agricultural research. My idea is that more should be spent on it. But I should like to suggest one thing. New crops are being investigated in the research. Old crops are being more useful by selection of varieties. Rice crop, I mean, paddy, is the staple crop in most parts of this country. The whole of Coastal, Eastern and Himalayan India is paddy-growing. But many parts of this paddy-growing areas are affected by floods, as, for example, North Bengal and the

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

East Coast tracts, especially Orissa. Vast tracts of land in these regions are flooded year after year, especially the lands on the East Coast. Now, I have noticed that lands are flooded especially when the plants are young, and if floods come at that time, then, in that year, there is no paddy. So, if some rice crop could be found out or selected by means of research which could stand the flood water even when the plants are young, then it would prove to be of a great benefit in those flooded parts of the country. So, I should like to suggest that some part of this research money should be allotted for the investigation of the problem of the paddy crop in the flooded areas.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** Sir, the money that we are asking for now has, in all probability, already been allocated to schemes that have been submitted by the Advisory Council and approved by the Governing Body, but I can assure my Honourable friend that the suggestion which he has made as regards the investigation of possibilities of the paddy crop in permanently-flooded areas will be brought to the notice of the Advisory Board.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I really want to raise two questions—concerning the financial procedure as apart from the merits of the question. Sir, it has become almost a practice with the Treasury Benches, because they have been allowed to do just what they like, to do like this. Look at this—it is a note in the book of proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, Vol. XIV, No. 9, at page 882, Sir, you will find there this opinion of the Government:

“The annual research grant of five lakhs of the Council under Demand No. 60 was suspended for the year 1932-33 on account of financial stringency, but subsequently on the recommendation of the Committee, the Legislative Assembly voted a supplementary grant of 5 lakhs during that year”—that is 1932-33.

The same procedure was adopted in 1933-34. Again in 1934-35, a supplementary demand of 5 lakhs was asked for and granted. Now, I really want to know from the Finance Member, if he has followed me, whether it is right that, for three successive years, the same supplementary demand for the same service should be made. Can it be said to be a new service which was not contemplated? And, if it was suspended three years ago, I suggest that the Honourable the Finance Member or his Department should have examined the question of its need, the last time, when the Budget was introduced.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Are you objecting to the grant of the five lakhs on the ground that it is unnecessary because they have been able to do without it for one or two years and that they can do without it for ever?

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** On the other hand, I want this Council to get the five lakhs, if they can find the money. I am pointing out this it is not right to bring, in year after year, for three years, a supplementary demand for five lakhs, for the same purpose.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it exactly the same sum?

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Yes, and for the same service. The proposal is that the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research may be provided with a supplemental grant of 5 lakhs for research.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The amount asked for is Rs. 5,38,000.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** That is a separate grant. It is mentioned in the Standing Finance Committee proceedings Vol. XIV, No. 10, dated the 2nd March, with regard to the earthquake grant. For these three years continuously, the exact sum of 5 lakhs has been asked as a supplemental grant for the same subject.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): That is not the demand under discussion now?

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** We are now asked to vote Rs. 5,38,000 for two items. Five lakhs are required under this head, and Rs. 38,000 are required for the reclamation of land in a place called Mushari in Bihar and Orissa. You will find the details in Vol. XIV, No. 10, dated the 2nd March, 1935. The details are given on page 466:

	Rs.
" Reclamation of land . . . . .	10,000
Installation of new tube wells . . . . .	3,000
Construction of temporary residential quarters for the entire staff . . . . .	20,000 "

That is a separate item. But the point I am raising for the consideration of the Finance Member is that this department has been coming up with a supplemental demand of five lakhs for the same service year after year. That, I submit, is a financial irregularity. They must satisfy his department in time, and the department should say whether they can spare the money or not. The other is an entirely new service. I will refer you to page 456 where it is said:

"Owing to the urgency of the matter and in order to reduce the dislocation of the research work to the minimum, the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research has already authorised expenditure on items (i) and (ii) in anticipation of the approval of the Standing Finance Committee."

I want to know where exactly we are. Who is the sanctioning authority for expenditure beyond the budget sanction? Where does the Council come in? I am simply asking for information. The note simply says that the Imperial Council sanctions the amount. I want to know what is the financial procedure which sanctions extra expenditure in anticipation. Those are the two points on which I should like to have information.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** As regards the bringing forward of a supplementary grant at the end of each year, I understand that what was in my predecessor's mind was that the budget balance was very precarious during the last three years and although he had great benevolence towards the work of the Imperial Council of Research he was not quite certain whether he could find five lakhs out of the budget. So he waited till it became clear that he could spare five lakhs and then he brought a supplementary

[Sir James Grigg.]

grant: I am quite ready to consider ~~and~~ I think there is a good deal in what the Honourable Member says—that it is rather concealing a material fact, although I do not think it is a very vital fact, from the Assembly if the expenditure is not definitely submitted to it at the beginning of the year. I quite agree with that. His principle in the matter is unexceptionable. I am afraid that the same course has been taken this year but I will certainly consider whether a more orthodox procedure cannot be accepted in the future years. His other point was: Who is the body which is responsible for anticipating the approval of this House? That cannot be done by the Imperial Council of Research on its own: it must have the approval of the Finance Department.

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

“That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 5,33,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of ‘Imperial Council of Agricultural Research Department’.”

The motion was adopted.

#### SCHEME FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING IN INDIA.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** Sir, I beg to move:

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 57,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of ‘Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India’.”

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

“That a supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 57,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of ‘Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India’.”

There are motions standing in the names of Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena, Prof. Ranga, Pandit Nilakantha Das, and Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant all of which apparently raise questions of principle by motions of cuts. They are out of order.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena** (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I propose to move my motion.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already ruled that out of order.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** May I submit a few words about this demand because it is a new service and new appointments are going to be made. I think the House should get an opportunity to express its views on this subject.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can raise those questions, not by means of a token cut, but he can speak on the substantive motion.



**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** Sir, I had given notice of this motion with two objects in view. Firstly, I wanted to draw the attention of the House to the high salaries of the officers that are provided under this scheme. Secondly, I wanted to warn the House against raising any false hopes from the scheme so far as improving the lot of the unfortunate agriculturist is concerned. But, before I proceed further, with your permission, I want to say a few words to remove the wrong impression that has gone abroad that there is some dissatisfaction amongst us, the back benchers, for not getting more frequent opportunities of speaking because, much of the time of the House is taken up by our friends who sit on the front benches. I think I am voicing the views of friends here when I say that this is not so. Sir, so far as I am concerned, I am not ashamed of having to play the roll of a dummy and allowing my hand to be played by those who are sitting on the front benches.

**Mr. Ahmed Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer** (Bombay Central Division: Muhammadan Rural): But you are an interrupter.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena:** You can interrupt me all right. I know, Sir, that my Honourable friends, who occupy the front benches, are experienced hands at the game that we are playing here and I have full confidence in their sagacity, judgment and resourcefulness. Moreover, our experience has shown that it is our discipline, more than our speeches, which has proved embarrassing to the benches on the opposite. But still there are occasions when even we, back benchers, have to speak, either with a view to giving expression to some local grievance or to putting certain first-hand information in the possession of the House or again with a view to indulging in a little more plain-speaking.

Sir, now coming to this demand which has been moved by the Honourable the Finance Member, we find that in the note on supplementary estimates on page 25, we find details of pay of officers. Central marketing officer, Rs. 2,500 rising by Rs. 125 to Rs. 2,750. Senior marketing officers Rs. 900 rising up to Rs. 1,200 and then Marketing officers Rs. 600 rising up to Rs. 900 and Assistant Marketing officers rising from Rs. 200 to Rs. 500. Now, Sir, you are aware, that there is a Marketing Board in England and, if we compare the salaries of the officers there, we find firstly the Minister of Agriculture is getting only £1,700 a year. The pay was formerly £2,000 and now owing to retrenchment the pay is reduced to £1,700. On the other hand here in India the Central marketing officer is going to get Rs. 2,500 rising to Rs. 2,750 a month which is much more than the pay drawn by the Minister there. Then, if we see the civil estimates for 1934, we find on page 94, that there are investigation officers and their salary is only £400 rising to £500 per year which would come to less than Rs. 500 or Rs. 600 a month. Well, Sir, here these Senior Marketing officers are going to be paid Rs. 900 rising to Rs. 1,200 per month. Again, we have got Assistant Marketing officers and in England they are given only £200 rising to £400. I now confine my remarks only to the salaries of officials engaged in similar work. I am not going to raise the general question of salaries in India and in other countries. We find that an authority in economics, on whom the Honourable the Finance Member relied, that is Lionel Robins, the Assistant Professor of Economics in London School of Economics, is not drawing more than £800 a year and I should like to be corrected if I am wrong.

[Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena.]

That means that Lionel Robins, whom the Honourable the Finance Member claims to be one of the greatest economists of the day or at least by whom he swears, does not get even that much salary which is proposed to be paid to these Marketing officers here. If we refer to the book "Wisdom and Waste", written by Mr. Darling, who is supposed to be an expert, so far as the rural problems are concerned, he writes on page 336 that:

"it is the peasants' financial interests that require special protection and in regard to these, three propositions may be laid down, firstly that the Government should be carried on as economically as possible."

That is the first condition that Mr. Darling has laid down. Then there are other conditions, but in regard to this first condition he says further on:

"If, therefore, it, i.e., *democratic government* is to be introduced into a poor country like India it is the bounden duty of all concerned to reduce the cost wherever possible and the comparatively few who are fortunate enough to hold all the public posts whether high or low should be content with the market wage for their services and in return to give full measure of their service. The idea of service for the common good is as much an Indian as an English ideal."

My submission is that the salaries that are being offered to these officers are not the market wage as suggested by Mr. Darling. Then, we must bear in mind that this scheme is being inaugurated and these officials are being appointed with a view to serve the rural interests and to ameliorate the lot of the unfortunate agriculturists and certainly it does not become this department that so highly paid officers should be appointed in it. In India it is a well-known fact that high salaries have a history behind them. We know that the officials who came from England were given higher salary, not because they compared, in any way, unfavourably with those given to them in England, but because they wanted that the officers who come to India should not be exposed to the temptation of bribery and corruption. So, in a way, these high salaries were fixed by way of a consolidated bribery. In other words, for not taking bribery direct from the people, the officers were given bribery in the shape of high salaries. These circumstances do not exist today. Moreover, the difficulties and the experiences which persons coming from England had to suffer do not exist any more. My submission is that a time has come when there should be a general revision in salaries, and, at least in the case of new appointments, we must see, as the custodians of the interests of the poor, that these high salaries are not allowed so far as these new appointments are concerned. The other day, the Honourable Sir James Grigg said that we, the Congressmen, want that this poor country should be made rich over-night or even in a year and that that was not possible. I submit that no one but a congenital idiot could have made that suggestion or understood it as such. What we have been protesting against is the process of impoverishment that commenced about 150 years ago in India and is still continuing. That process must be stopped and the principal factor in that process is the high salaries. We know what Mr. Burke said 150 years ago holds good even today. He said that one rupee that goes out of India is lost to India for ever. The large amount of money that is going out of India, in the shape of salaries and

pensions and other remittances, is a complete loss to India. But we are painfully aware that we cannot touch their salaries. It is not within our power. We know that their salaries were not only enhanced but additional allowances were given on the recommendation of the Lee Commission, against the decisions and views of the Legislatures both Central and Provincial. I had given notice of a token cut, but, as I cannot move it under your ruling, Sir—I would ask the House to reject this demand *in toto*, unless the salaries of these officials are fixed according to the market wage of these incumbents who are going to be appointed. So far as we, the Members of the Congress, are concerned, you know, Sir, that there is a resolution of the Congress laying down that no public servant should be allowed, except specialist, more than one thousand rupees a month. If Honourable Members on the other side have any real regard, any genuine regard for improving the lot of the agriculturists, they should come forward with proposals, so far as salaries are concerned, which are commensurate with the poverty and with the income of the people who have to contribute money towards these salaries.

Then, Sir, coming to the other point as to whether this scheme is going to prove beneficial to agricultural interests, I do not want to go into it in detail. I would only say that the scheme may be very good but how long will it take to materialise? How much money will be needed to finance it. It is no use having a motor without motive power and without a battery. We know marketing boards have been working in other countries like America and England. These marketing boards and marketing schemes require large sums of money to finance the crops. They have large sums of money to advance by way of loans to the agriculturists in need. It will serve no useful purpose to set up this machinery, to have these persons to investigate, to survey, and to plan, without knowing what is needed. What is the trouble with the agriculturist today? We find that his income has been considerably reduced.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member cannot go into those general considerations. He should confine his remarks to the item before the House.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena**: I was submitting that the expenditure on this scheme is not going to help the agriculturist very much. It is just like that Persian proverb which means:

"Till the specific is received from Mesopotamia, the person who has been bitten by snake will die."

So the whole point is this, that the agricultural situation requires a radical treatment here and now; it does not admit of waiting. At the most, these schemes will be palliatives; they will not be the remedy that the situation requires. We know it for a fact, that so far as foreign markets are concerned, Indian agricultural products cannot compete there. Even in India itself we have to impose import duties on wheat and rice in order that they may not come and compete with us in these markets. So, it is no use appointing commission agents or marketing officers; we cannot make others purchase what they can get cheaper from other countries. Ultimately we shall have to fall back on the markets in India, and in India, we know that the sale is poor because the purchasing capacity of the people has been considerably diminished. How is that capacity to

[Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena.]

be restored,—that is the problem; and, I think it is up to all sections of the House to apply their minds to find out a remedy which will solve this one problem. And I raise this discussion simply to draw the attention of the House to the difficulties of the agriculturists and to tell them that the remedy which has been approved by the conference, which met some time ago in 1934, is not going to solve the problem. With these few words, I oppose the demand.

**Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Ohetty** (Madras: Indian Commerce): Sir, I propose to make a few observations on this demand. The details of the scheme presented to us in respect of this demand are no doubt very imposing; most of them are such as it would be impossible for any person representing the Indian peasant to object to. But the point is that most of these duties could be done and should be done by the existing departments of the respective provinces. It is a pity that, whenever we want certain improvements to be made in any particular line of the Government's administration, we are very often met with a strong denial, and, when that is not the case, we are met with a costly establishment. Unfortunately this proposal containing the appointment of marketing officers on high salaries and a senior marketing officer and assistant marketing officers on proportionately high salaries seems to me an unnecessary burden. If only there was a will on the part of the provincial Governments and also of the Central Government to keep up the respective departments of the provinces, they could have certainly done all that is intended to be done under the scheme. However, I do not wish to grudge the grant of this amount only on that ground, but I would, in this connection, warn Government against the inevitability of these marketing officers being entirely out of touch with the conditions in this country.

It would appear that in the view of Government any person who is appointed by Government is competent to do any work on the face of this earth. He may be a lawyer but he can easily be made to do the work of a tradesman, in the view of Government. It is with that view that whenever there is an appointment vacant or a fresh appointment is created, the only officer who in the view of Government is competent enough to do that work, however technical it may be, however important it may be, and however special it may be, is the I. C. S. officer. In many places where Industries Departments were created under the provincial Governments, all the provincial Councils demanded that this department should be manned by persons who are competent to know anything about the industries and they should be at the head of this department. We are always told that it would be wrong and difficult to choose one industrialist as against another, and so the best way of keeping impartiality is to put a person who is thoroughly ignorant of either one industry or the other. I daresay, the same kind of policy is going to be adopted even in respect of this senior marketing officer; and I know in respect of other minor appointments the provincial Governments are given the power of appointment.

What usually happens in the provincial Governments is this. Either a deputy tahsildar or, this subject being in charge of the ministry, some unemployed and unemployable favourites of the Ministers will be pitchforked into these places. They do not know absolutely anything, either the trade conditions or marketing conditions or the agricultural conditions

that exist in the country. They would begin to learn from the day of the appointment and by the time they have picked up a few things the offices might expire or the ministry may come to an end and the new ministry will want new favourites. That is going to be the position. I am afraid it is going to be a costly burden on the agriculturists and an unnecessary interference with the general trend of trade and commerce in this country. I am glad, however, that despite the very strong opinion of the Finance Member against any planned economy, there is a suggestion that one of the duties which this marketing establishment will be asked to do is to plan the production on the basis of quality and demand. That is really no doubt a very desirable move, but the whole question is whether in the determination of these things, whether in coming to decisions as to what crop and to what extent that crop will survive in particular areas, we will have the co-operation of the local traders and cultivators primarily or whether they are going to be merely guided by the figures that may be contained in the blue-book; and moreover, whether those decisions will have the force of law in the matter of being observed by the cultivators. I do not yet see that there is on the part of Government any inclination to make it compulsorily observable by the cultivators. But without it it will be a hopeless task; without compulsion to be enforced subsequently it will be impossible for any plan to proceed successfully. I do not know if Government's view is that after the collection of information Government propose to take legislative power to enforce the programme of cultivation, the extent of cultivation of the zone of the crops that they want this country to produce. I would suggest that instead of these appointments being left to the Provincial Governments, the Central Government itself must directly collect statistics: the subject of marketing is so closely connected with the central subject of commerce that the administration of this whole thing should be in the hands of the Central Government; otherwise, it would only mean adding one more section to the agricultural section of each province: they will be sending up their comments without reference to the conditions existing elsewhere in the country; and it will be necessary for the Central Government to collaborate all those needs, seemingly conflicting and seemingly irreconcilable. It would be merely a redundant task to collect information from Provincial Governments on the one hand and for the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research or some other central establishment again to consider how far they are capable of reconciliation with each other. I would like that in this matter both the cultivators and those who are engaged in commerce in this country should be consulted without having too much of bureaucratic opinion, and information collected by marketing officers, who may be appointed either by the Central Government or by the Provincial Governments.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Sir, I find, as my friend, Mr. Saksena, has already said, that the marketing officer is to be paid a salary which is very much more than what is paid to the Minister in England in charge of the Board of Trade and also the expert who is engaged to advise him, and I find also that one of the officers who are already appointed in this direction is somehow or other related to one of the ex-Members of the Executive Council.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will not allow that sort of reflections to be made.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Anyhow, to propose to pay such an enormous salary to the marketing officer and also such enormous salaries to his assistants at the very outset is nothing short of trying to rob the peasants who are supposed to be helped by this new Department of Marketing.

Then, this Department or this particular officer with his assistants is expected to collect information regarding producers and consumers both in India and abroad. It is something like putting the cart before the horse. How can they get information about the prospects for agricultural produce of India in other countries when the Government of India does not have any of their Trade Commissioners in most of the countries in the world? The other day, when I put a question to the Honourable the Commerce Member, whether he proposed to appoint any more Trade Commissioners either in the United States of America or Japan or any other country, he said that there was no such provision in this year's budget, and, therefore, he did not see any chance of appointing any more Trade Commissioners. Without having any Trade Commissioners in any of those countries, it would be impossible for this marketing officer and his assistants to get the necessary information about the conditions prevailing in other countries.

I come next to the point that is mentioned in the items that are going to be laid stress upon, that are going to be taken up by this particular marketing officer,—the appointment of special committees for staple crops. I do not know how many committees they propose to appoint, but they state here that they would like to have committees for the most important staple products in this country. If these committees are to be appointed, who are going to be represented on them? Are these committees going to be constituted in the same manner in which these other committees under the aegis of the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research have been constituted or are they to be constituted in such a manner that the agriculturists, who really are to be benefited by the activities of these marketing officers and their subordinates, are going to be represented on these committees? I do not know what the Government propose to do in this particular connection.

Then, who is to appoint these committees? The marketing officer himself or the Imperial Council of Agricultural Research? If it is the Council which is to appoint these committees, then what is the sanction behind the Council? Anyhow, in the last two or three years, the Imperial Council has not come on any special occasion for any grant, but, instead of that, it has only come here for—its needs and affairs have been placed before us in the form of—a supplementary grant for the last three occasions, and, therefore, this House has not had any occasion at all to discuss the policy underlying the work of this Imperial Council or the manner in which it has been appointing these several committees. There are a number of committees, as many as 16 committees, and on none of these committees are the peasants represented at all. We are now to have some more committees appointed and these are expected to help the marketing officer, and if the peasants are not going to be represented on these committees as well as on other committees, I do not know really how this marketing officer can be expected to do his job satisfactorily.

The next question is of marketing surveys. These surveys when completed will set out in detail the present system of marketing the commodities concerned not only in each province separately but in respect of inter-provincial, inter-state and foreign trade, so as to provide an all-India picture of existing conditions and a common basis for future purposes. But I find that we do not at present have any useful information at all, any relevant information at all, about the inter-state as well as the inter-provincial trade that is going on in this country. This information has not been collected: they made a sort of abortive attempt to collect information about the rail-borne trade in this country, and, after that, they stopped publishing these reports in 1922: and took it up two or three years ago; but if you look into those figures, you will find that there is no general review or attempt to explain the facts that are presented in the report nor is there any account of the total amount of different agricultural commodities that are being carried by rail in this country. Apart from that there is the river-borne trade and here is the coastal trade, and the trade between different towns. Even if we have, with the help of this marketing officer and his assistants, some sort of survey about these conditions for one particular year, it will not be enough. We must have annual reports published about the inter-state and inter-provincial trade that is being carried on in agricultural commodities. But are these people competent to carry out this task? Are these the people really who can be expected to do this work? They themselves admit, they are not enough, they want some more assistance, and it is for that purpose that they expect and hope that the Provincial Governments will appoint their own Provincial Marketing officers; and in order to enable the Provincial Governments to appoint their own marketing officers, they propose to make certain grants to the Provincial Governments, and, in that connection, my friend, Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty, has already pointed out that the Provincial Governments are just as capable of appointing people in whom they are interested as the Central Government itself has behaved in this connection. If such officers are going to be appointed, more because of favouritism on the part of Ministers than because of their real ability, then, I say, this is going to be a farce rather than a real constructive proposal.

Then, Sir, are these provincial marketing officers going to be given a free hand in making their inquiries, in carrying on their work, and are the Provincial Governments going to be given free hand in running the whole of this department, or are they going to be subject to the direct control of the central office? I cannot very well agree with my friend, Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty, when he said that all these provincial officers should be appointed by the Central Government and should be controlled by the Central Government and directed by the Central Government. But, at the same time, I do agree with him in this essential principle that the Provincial Governments ought not to be given complete autonomy as to the manner in which they are to conduct these economic surveys and these marketing arrangements and to establish other facilities for the peasants. I found the same thing had happened in connection with the handloom weaving industry. It is the Government of India which raises the money and which distributes it to the provinces, but the Government of India allow these Provincial Governments to have their own way in regard to spending that money. Sir, I do not like that the same

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

thing should happen in regard to this matter. If the Government of India is to make any grants at all for the maintenance of these Provincial Marketing officers, then certainly the Government of India should insist upon a uniform policy being followed all over India, and they should also see that these Marketing officers carry on their work in a manner which will be satisfactory both to this House as well as to the Government of India.

Next, Sir, I come to the question of publication work, and the order in which these officers should carry on their work. Last comes the most important thing. It is said that a marketing officer is going to be appointed by the Government of India. As has been observed by my friend, Mr. Satyamurti, already, the Government has come to this House with a supplementary demand,—in fact it is not a supplementary demand, really it is a new demand,—and yet, the Government has already appointed a marketing officer, in fact they have not only appointed a marketing officer, but they have appointed several assistant marketing officers, clerks and so on, it is a *fait accompli*. The next thing is the appointment of provincial marketing officers. I do not know if in any of the provinces, marketing officers have been appointed so far. I have a vague idea that in Madras they have already appointed a marketing officer, but whether that appointment has been made with or without the subsidy from the Government of India, I do not know.

Then the third thing is the question of the inauguration of marketing surveys. We are going to have a number of surveys, I do want all those surveys, but at the same time, my point is, how is it that the Government of India have taken such a long time to create this service? The only reason that I can assign for it is that the Government of India really did not wish to create these surveys at all, because the Honourable the Finance Member has already said that he has absolutely no faith in statistics, he has no use for surveys, and the Government have not had any need for statistics at all about the marketing position in this country.

And, now, they propose to have all these too-highly paid officers for marketing service. But what will they do? They will work on grade standards, just the one aspect of the work on which Great Britain and Ireland have been laying much stress. In Great Britain much useful work has been done in this matter. They have stated here that National Mark Schemes are now in operation for beef, strawberries, apples, cucumbers, canned fruits, vegetables, cider . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it necessary to read out the whole list of vegetables?

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Now, Sir, all this work has been carried on in England, and now our marketing officers come forward and say that they are going to carry on the same kind of work here in India, but only in regard to three or four commodities. and lastly comes this their programme of work in their scheme. If this is the kind of work, which the newly appointed officers are going to do, then the sooner we abolish this service the better. On the other hand, if the Government of India gives us an assurance that they mean business, that they will provide for us an annual review of trade conditions for agricultural commodities



in this country as well as in other countries, and, if they will assure us that they will appoint part-time correspondents in different countries with a view to supply us periodically with information about marketing facilities and conditions prevailing in other countries in regard to Indian agricultural commodities, then we can reconsider the position in respect of this particular grant and see if we cannot help the Government in passing this particular demand.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** Sir, this is practically a new service, and in creating a new service I should like to make it clear that we should, in the first place, look to the question of Indianisation both in regard to pay as well as personnel—spirit as well as form. It is a fact that we have been paying very heavily to all our services, but I am not going into the matter now, but I may tell my friends at once that in a service like this which is being created for the first time, it should be Indianised not only in personnel but in spirit. The pay and conditions of service should be adapted to the conditions of living in this country. That is Indianisation in spirit. Now, Sir, it is proposed to create this service according to the recommendations made by a Commission like the Agricultural Commission, endorsed by the Banking Committee some six or seven years ago, and Government had enough time to send at least one man, if not more, to foreign countries for necessary training as a marketing officer or expert. Instead of that, Government say now that they have secured the services of one marketing expert, and I presume his services have been secured from England. It may not be very palatable to some, but I say that so long as we look to England for our experts or for the control of all our services, especially new services, we shall never be able to build up our nation. I have no objection to your recruiting experts from foreign countries—even from England, if there is a real national need for it. But, if you want a real expert, our selection should not be confined to England alone, we must pick out from any country the best man available, and we may pay him for a particular period of time, but one of the conditions of his service should be that he should train our youngmen. I presume this marketing officer's services have been secured on a contract basis for a particular period, and so I would suggest that after the period of his contract is over, Government should give us an assurance that his contract will not be renewed and that an Indian will be appointed in his place.

As to the spirit of Indianisation, it will not be possible to carry out the spirit if the outlook does not change in regard to new services. First of all, look to the pay of the Central marketing officers and that of the provincial marketing officers,—we find a good deal of difference. They begin with Rs. 200 in Provinces whereas these marketing officers in the Centre begin with Rs. 600, for provincial marketing officers, it is said, will be of the grade of assistant marketing officers.

Then, again, as has been remarked by some of our friends, this service, in course of time, may prove a heavy burden on the taxpayer. I may mention here something by way of an analogy as to what happened to co-operative research in Bihar and Orissa. When co-operative credit societies had not even been fully established, when people had not even understood the utility of these societies, a proposal was made that all those

[Pandit Nilakantha Das.]

poor societies of the Province should contribute something towards the construction of a big house in a central place to accommodate one or two experts to be indented for from abroad so that they might study and advise how best the co-operative movement could be promoted and developed in this country. I now find that the entire co-operative movement there is in a moribund condition. Many co-operative societies are in process of liquidation and banks too.

There is again, in this new programme, another thin end of the wedge for fresh taxation. I find that many committees like the Oilseeds Committee are going to be established, and in this connection it is intended that there will be levied a cess in each case to meet the expenditure for the committees. In the case of the Oilseeds Committee it is already under investigation to levy a cess to meet the expenditure of this Committee. Similarly, in the case of other Committees also, a cess is contemplated and the Oilseeds Committee is actually considering detailed proposals for the same. Of course, if under this marketing department there was some storehouse or sales depot, and some articles were to be sold through this department and some commission was charged for the sale etc., that might be a separate proposition, but, if there is going to be a cess which would act like a land cess, like our road cess, then it will be a fresh taxation and I would appeal to the Honourable Member that he should not meet the expenditure on the Committees by levying a cess on the produce of the soil, for our agriculturists are being taxed already very much and Government might well afford to give some money for their relief.

Last of all, there is an item in which I am somewhat personally interested—rather, my constituency is directly interested. Aids are given to ten provinces. I should like to suggest that this is going to be done for three years, and, as in the meantime, new provinces are coming into being, I earnestly appeal to the Honourable Member to treat the new provinces, especially the province of Orissa, as a separate entity, for I have no desire now to describe the condition of Orissa—its miseries, mainly due to long neglect, and exploitation in neglect. This is a province where there are no industries and our agriculture is in a very bad state on account of floods which are generally followed by famines. So, it should be considered as a separate entity and some special provision should be made for the province of Orissa so far as the marketing organisation is concerned.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** Mr. President, I think that my intervention at this stage might help to shorten the debate, because the points which, in my opinion, could be raised on the demand have already been raised and raised in elaborate form. There are four main questions, as I see it, that have been raised. The first is, is it worth while to undertake the work which is to be entrusted to the marketing officers and their associates? My Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, was doubtful, in fact, he thought that it would be money wasted. On the other hand, my Honourable friend, Mr. Sami Vencatachalam Chetty, was not so sceptical; on the contrary, if I heard him correctly, he said that nobody representing agricultural interests could minimise the importance of the objects for which this investigation was to be undertaken. I submit that the task of persuading my Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, in regard to this

matter had better be left to Mr. Sami Vencatachelam Chetty. He will be able to do it much more persuasively and much more effectively than I, because I do not happen, fortunately or unfortunately, to be a member of that political organisation.

The second point which was raised was regarding the level of salaries. It was stated that we had pitched the rates of pay too high, not merely for the principal Agricultural Officer, but for the other members of the hierarchy. I would like to deal first with the principal Agricultural Officer. There seems to be an impression that this appointment has only recently been made. No. It was made last year; it was made after reference to the Standing Finance Committee; it was made after an advertisement issued by the High Commissioner for India in England who invited applications from suitable candidates. And we chose the best officer in the circumstances, because it was felt that, in view of the highly specialised work of marketing organisation and investigation, it was desirable that we should have somebody with practical experience of this kind of work. But the point to bear in mind is that the appointment was made only for a period of three years and it was made with the definite object that this officer would train up officers in India to take his place and to continue the work which might be initiated as a result of the organisation that might be started. That is all I need say on the subject of the principal marketing officer. And I would like to take this opportunity of repudiating the suggestion that this appointment was made in any spirit of nepotism, because, as I have already stated, it has been made as the result of advertisement and on the recommendation of the High Commissioner for India who happens to be not only an Indian, but was in the past a very distinguished and a very respected Member both of the Government and of this House. Now, we go on to the other members of the hierarchy and the staff of the marketing officer. My Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, and I think very rightly, said: you should fix the rates of pay having regard to the market value of the people that you get. Now, in so far as the staff of the Central Marketing Office is concerned, that has been recruited, not by the Governor General in Council, but by the Public Service Commission. That, I hope, will dispose of any suggestion that there has been any nepotism or any other backdoor influence at work. The Public Service Commission advertised, they scrutinised the applications—I think more than 300 applications were received,—they interviewed the candidates, and then they chose the best people they could. I come to the point of salaries. As you would have observed . . .

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** May I know if there were applications from other countries than England and India?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** I am not at the present moment talking about the principal marketing officer. I am talking about the other members of the hierarchy, the marketing officers, the assistant marketing officers and the senior marketing officers, who have been recruited by the Public Service Commission in this country. My Honourable friend is, and he said so, a staunch friend of Indianisation. He will agree that in regard to appointments which could be made in this country and about which we were confident that there is a suitable field in this country, there would have been no justification for inviting applications from abroad. That was the reason why the Public Service Commission were asked to confine their

[Mr. G. S. Bajpai.]

attention to the field of recruitment in this country. Now, to come back to the salaries, I think my Honourable friend, Mr. Mohanlal Saksena, enunciated a very excellent principle, namely, that the salary shall be related to the market value of the people whom you get. Let me now give you the salary of the first principal marketing officer. This gentleman was in receipt of a salary of Rs. 700 per mensem in Mysore. He is being asked to take up an appointment which is not a permanent one but a temporary one, because the appointment is only for a period of five years. I think my Honourable friend will agree that in the circumstances we had to offer him a slightly higher salary than the salary which he was getting in Mysore, otherwise it would not be worth while practically jeopardising a permanent appointment in Mysore for the purpose of doing temporary work. I submit that in the circumstances our fixing his initial salary at Rs. 900 per mensem is by no means an act of extravagance. Similarly, in the case of the second marketing officer, also from Mysore. He was already in receipt of a salary of Rs. 1,000 per mensem. I may state that if we had fixed his salary at a rigid figure of Rs. 900 or 950, we should have had to go without this officer. I can go on multiplying instances, because I have got the names of all the officers selected by the Public Service Commission, but, I hope, in the light of the explanation I have given, my Honourable friend will agree that the decision of Government was a decision calculated to meet the requirements of economy as well as the requirements of efficiency, because it is no use, in fact, it is uneconomical to go and appoint people cheap and people inefficient. That disposes of the second question, namely, the scale of salaries.

Now, I come to the question of functions. My Honourable friend, Prof. Ranga, said that while he was in favour of leaving a great deal of latitude to the Provincial Governments, he felt that this investigation shall be co-ordinated, so that there shall be some systematic method both of **investigation and of presentation of the facts**. That exactly is the principle upon which this whole plan has been worked out. Our staff of principal marketing officers, senior and junior, has been recruited on this assumption that, inasmuch as the principal crops with which they may be dealing are grown in more than one province, inasmuch as the commodities of which the marketing they may be investigating interest more than one province, the particular plan of investigation must be laid down by the Central Government; the particular lines of investigation must be supervised by the Central Government but the actual investigation must be done locally by such a staff as the Local Government may appoint. That, Sir, is the principle on which we have acted. We have provided money for the central staff with the approval of the Standing Finance Committee, and, after furnishing to them every information that was likely to be needed. So far as the provinces are concerned, the only thing that we could do was to ask the Standing Finance Committee and this House to agree to a lump grant being given. The maximum of that is 2 lakhs. It will not be consistent either with the spirit of the Constitution, nor I submit would it be generous to the provinces to assume that a sum of two lakhs distributed over nine or ten Governors' provinces cannot be judiciously spent by the Ministers in the provinces and the Governor—by the Ministers who, I am sure, are responsive in these matters to public opinion and to the opinion of leaders of parties as they sit in the Provincial Legislatures.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** What about the recommendation of Committees?

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member is interfering too much.

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** The fourth or last point which I want to deal with is the subject of commercial intelligence. My Honourable friend Prof. Ranga, was responsible for raising that also. He said what on earth is the good of all these investigations. We do not want merely to collect statistics in India. We want to know what the outlet for our products abroad is. You will really have a picture of these requirements only when there is a proper commercial intelligence organisation abroad. Now, my Honourable friend will agree that the staple products which are to be investigated by these officers and committees are primary products, that is agricultural products. Now, what is the position in regard to that. We have a Trade Commissioner in Hamburg, we have a Trade Commissioner in Milan. We have a Trade Commissioner in London and also a Deputy Trade Commissioner. In other words, with the possible exception of the United States of America—and the Honourable the Commerce Member announced the other day that the question of appointing a Trade Commissioner there is under consideration—every principal consuming country of our primary products has already a Trade Commissioner. I submit, it cannot, in the circumstances, be contended that we are undertaking something which would be lopsided. That is all, Sir, I need say in regard to the various points that have been raised.

**Pandit Nilakantha Das:** What about a grant to Orissa?

**Mr. G. S. Bajpai:** My friend has asked me about Orissa. At the present moment, my friend is perfectly aware that Orissa is part of the province of Bihar and Orissa. We can, for purposes of this distribution, recognise only the province of Bihar and Orissa. When Orissa becomes a separate province, the question will be reconsidered.

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Scheme for the Improvement of Agricultural Marketing in India'."

The motion was adopted.

#### INDUSTRIES.

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Industries'."

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Industries'."

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Sir, this is the first time . . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Does the Honourable Member want to oppose this motion?

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Yes. This is the first time that this demand for money for the handloom industry is brought before this Assembly. The policy underlying this grant of money has not been discussed before in this Assembly.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): This is not a new service, and the Chair cannot allow any question of policy to be debated.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** I find that this money is to be distributed between the different provinces in the manner which is accepted and proposed by the Industrial Conference held once a year in Simla. I find that according to the figures supplied to this House by the Honourable Member for Industries, only very small sums are to be granted to each one of the provinces. I find that, in 1934-35, it is proposed to distribute one lakh and 76 thousand between all these provinces in this country for the improvement of handloom weaving industry and in 1935-36 only 4 lakhs 74 thousand is proposed to be distributed but if you look at the proceedings of the Industrial Conference held in Simla on the 9th, 10th and 11th July 1934, we find the proposals placed before that conference by various Local Governments and according to the estimates that they have made for their schemes of improving the handloom weaving industry that as much as 12 lakhs of rupees per annum will be needed if all those schemes are to be properly financed at all but it was thought since the Government of India was having only about 5 lakhs of rupees or a little more, it would not be possible for them to accept all their schemes and therefore a compromise was arrived at and a particular scheme was adopted according to which this money was to be distributed between all these different provinces. The principle according to which this money is to be distributed is stated as follows:

"It was agreed that the distribution of half the grant in proportion to the consumption of yarn and half in proportion to the expenditure incurred should hold for the first year only and that the matter should be reconsidered at the next Conference in the light of experience, and it was also agreed that 15 per cent of the grant should be retained for contingencies and grants to Minor Administrations and especially to increase the grants of those provinces which for special reasons received unfavourable allotments under the agreed basis of allocation."

But I find no provision made for establishing a Central Emporium for hand-woven goods either at Delhi or at any other centrally-situated place in India, and I find also that several provinces, especially the United Provinces and the Central Provinces Governments were suggesting the establishment of such a Central Emporium, if necessary, to be under the direct supervision and control of the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour. Sir, this Central Emporium will serve a very useful purpose in that people from different parts of the world and India who will be thronging to Delhi can resort to it. And it is for that reason that it is proposed to shift the Pusa Institute to Delhi. It is, however, for a very much more sensible and plausible reason that I suggest that such a Central Emporium should be established in Delhi and money should be provided for it, but no provision at all has been made.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Honourable Member can make his suggestions without repeating himself.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** Secondly, Sir, according to the proposals placed before the Government of India and accepted by the Government of India, it is learnt that the various provinces are to appoint their provincial marketing officers and they are to have their provincial committees also. In Bombay they are to have industrial committees in different districts and so on, and they are to establish these marketing societies in various parts of their province. Yet no mention is made about the manner in which these weavers should be taken into the consultation and confidence of these Provincial Governments on the allocation, distribution and expenditure of these sums proposed to be granted by the Government of India. It is only one province and one Government and that is the United Provinces Government which has come forward with this proposal that it will supplement the money that will be granted to it by the Government of India with its own funds and thus finance this marketing programme, but other provinces have not come forward with any such programme at all, and I do not know what the Government of India propose to do in order to see that the money which they are granting will be properly utilised and will not be a sort of drop of water in a world of desert but, on the other hand, will be a useful source of inspiration and progress. Then, Sir, I suggested the other day to the Honourable the Member for Industries and Labour that the handloom weavers should really, if they are to be benefited, taken into the confidence of and ought to be given representation on, all the committees to be established in all these provinces, but he gave me the answer that he was not prepared to make any such suggestion to the Provincial Governments, that he was not prepared to interfere with the manner in which the Provincial Governments propose to spend these sums that are granted by the Government of India, and that he will not even see the advisability of making or even placing that suggestion before them. Unless the handloom weavers who are sought to be benefited are to be given a higher constitutional place on all the institutions that are to be established in all these provinces with the money that is to be granted by the Government of India, I cannot feel sure that the handloom weavers will be benefited at all.

And, then, there is the question of the salaries. I find from the proposals placed here that the Madras Government propose to pay as much as Rs. 700 for its marketing officer, while the Punjab Government propose to pay only Rs. 250 for its officer. Now I would like that there should be some sort of uniformity in the salaries to be paid to the various marketing officers out of the funds to be granted by the Government of India, and that is why I again maintain that the Government of India should try to put its foot down and then say to these Provincial Governments that if they are to get any money from the Government of India, they should certainly try to abide by the decisions of the Government of India; and in coming to its own decision, the Government of India should develop a uniform policy about the manner in which this money should be spent in the way of grants to handloom societies, in the way of the supply of capital at a low rate of interest to the handloom weavers, the co-operative societies, the industrial societies, the sales societies, and also by way of salaries to the officers to be appointed to carry on the marketing of handloom goods.

Next, Sir, I want to suggest that the Government of India should try to persuade the Provincial Governments to pay more attention to the marketing of handloom-woven goods and in that way improve the get-up and

[Prof. N. G. Ranga.]

efficiency of the clothes used by handloom weavers and they should also pay attention to the collection of facts in regard to the number of handlooms there are in different provinces, the number of handloom weavers employed in that particular industry, and also the standard of living that is possible for those workers. And I want the Government of India also to investigate the possibility of establishing Trade Boards in order to improve the conditions of the handloom weavers who are employed by an increasing number of employers. It is usually believed that the handloom weaving industry, being a cottage one, is full of only independent weavers, who are not at all employed by anybody, but it is a wrong belief, Sir. I find, as a result of an extensive inquiry carried on in the Madras Presidency in various districts, that more than 75 per cent of the handloom weavers are employed today as wage-earners either in groups of five or groups of ten or twenty by various employers belonging to either their own caste or some other caste or even race and are thus being exploited by these employers, and these weavers should be protected from the ravages of these employers, and that ought to be undertaken also if there are funds available for that. Lastly, Sir, I find that these five lakhs will not be enough at all. The Government of India should certainly try—if they do wish to help these handloom weavers at all—to convince the millowners and persuade them to agree to an increase in this direction to the extent of at least five lakhs raised per annum so that these handloom weavers may really be helped . . .

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Where are the millowners going to get the money from?

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** They even tried to oppose it here on the floor of this House when the additional income from the tariff was being granted.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** What authority have you for that?

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** That is my memory.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Oh, memory!

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** I am speaking subject to correction. I say, when this money is being distributed by the Government of India they should have a sufficient amount of control over the manner in which it is being spent by the Provincial Governments, and I do not want the Honourable Member for Industries and Labour to come here and say: "I cannot make any suggestions to the Provincial Governments. I cannot control their activities, I cannot have anything to do with it at all—I will simply make over the money that the Assembly grants to the Government of India to the provinces to be distributed, and then I simply wash my hands of all this."

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce** (Member for Industries and Labour): Sir, my Honourable friend, Professor Ranga, stated at the outset of his speech, that this question had not been discussed before in this Assembly. I think, Sir, that is hardly correct. The grant we are discussing is the outcome of a statement made by the Honourable the Commerce Member



last year in the course of a discussion on the Indian Tariff (Textile Protection) Amendment Bill. It was then that he told the House that the Government of India had—

“Decided that they would invite Local Governments and Local Administrations to place before them suitable schemes for developing co-operative buying and selling on behalf of the handloom weaver, and, generally, for the better organization and improvement of the industry. They propose to make grants-in-aid of such schemes as may appear suitable to them, the grants-in-aid per annum not to exceed, in the aggregate, an amount equal to the amount of the proceeds of an import duty of a quarter anna per pound on yarns up to fifties imported into the country, and to last so long as the protective measures in this Bill are in force. We calculate that we shall have something like Rs. 3½ lakhs per annum to distribute for this purpose.”

The position is that the House had ample opportunities, during the discussion on the Bill, to discuss the principle of the grant.

4 P. M.

My recollection on the subject is not very clear, but, so far as I know, no objection was raised. In fact, the proposal was generally welcomed, as it was felt that as the Government were doing so much for the cotton mill industry, they ought to do a little for the handloom industry. My Honourable friend's next contention is that the amount is too small. There I have considerable sympathy with his point of view. But one has to cut one's coat according to one's cloth. If we find that this expenditure is really producing a useful effect, I should have no hesitation in going to my Honourable colleague on my right and asking him whether he cannot give us a little more money.

**Prof. N. G. Ranga:** He has got 35 lakhs now.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair would ask the Honourable Member not to go on interrupting. He must exercise some self-restraint.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Now, Sir, I come to my Honourable friend's main contention with which I find myself in complete disagreement. He wishes us to keep the very strictest control over the expenditure of this amount by Local Governments. He wants us to put Local Governments on a Procrustean bed and to have absolute uniformity throughout the whole of India, whatever the differences may be between the local conditions of the different provinces. He wants us to give the marketing officer in Madras Rs. 250 or Rs. 300 or whatever the figure he mentioned because the Punjab Government happen to have fixed that salary for their marketing officer irrespective entirely of the amount of work the marketing officer or the officer in charge of these schemes in Madras has to do and irrespective entirely of the number of handlooms in that province and of the consumption of yarn. I decline to be a party to any proposal of that kind. I cannot understand the distrust of Local Governments which prevails in some sections of this House. The Madras Government administers a budget of about 16 crores. We are giving them about Rs. 60,000 for 1935-36 to spend on the handloom industry, and, forsooth, we are to tell them that they can only spend the money in one way and one way alone. Sir, it is really too much to expect us to tie the Local Governments down this way especially when we are on the eve of Provincial Autonomy when they will be entirely independent in matters of this kind. It is absurd that we should expect them to come to us for our approval if they want to make changes in their schemes and if they

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

want to spend another Rs. 100 here or another Rs. 100 there. I think that we have done our duty to this House in the way of seeing that the money which is voted by it is properly spent when we have asked the Local Governments to submit schemes to us for general approval. The schemes they submitted were carefully examined by the sub-committee of the Industries Conference and it criticised them in various ways. I should like to express my appreciation of the way in which the Local Governments gave effect to the points which were made in the course of the discussion at the Industries Conference last year. We are proposing that the schemes should be reviewed annually at the Industries Conferences not merely to provide us with information on the progress made but also with a view to enable all the provinces to exchange ideas and experiences. I feel, Sir, that in these ways we have provided sufficient guarantee that the money we are giving the Provinces should not be wasted. I do not think there is any other point in my Honourable friend Professor Ranga's speech which calls for comment except that I am a little doubtful whether the idea of a Central Emporium is worth following up. India is a vast country with 350 million people and I should have thought that Provincial Emporiums were all that is required. I cannot see myself what useful purpose would be served by having a Central Emporium in addition. I should like to express my agreement with him in regard to the last point he raised, which is that special attention should be paid to marketing. That, after all, is the most important part of the various schemes which have been submitted to us. He also said that special attention ought to be paid to the finish. There I am in entire agreement with him. If you want to sell your goods, they must be finished properly and he is perfectly right in urging that special attention should be paid to the finish of the articles produced. I would only once more say in conclusion that I feel that Local Governments may be trusted in this matter, that the administration of the grant must be left to them and that it must be for them to decide whose advice they should take in regard to the expenditure. They are far better judges of local conditions than we are and any undue interference on our part beyond the limits that I have mentioned would be both unnecessary and uncalled for.

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 1,69,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Industries'."

The motion was adopted.

#### TRANSFER TO THE FUND FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CIVIL AVIATION.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: Sir, I beg to move:

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation'."

Perhaps I may be allowed to make a few preliminary remarks of explanation. Except in one particular, this grant is on all fours with the grant for the transfer of the Pusa Institute to Delhi. The scheme was approved by the Standing Finance Committee of the last Assembly, but it was not approved in principle by the Assembly itself. It was proposed to meet the expenditure out of capital, and it is now proposed to utilise the revenue surplus for that purpose. The principle behind that change from capital to a revenue surplus is that whatever may be said about the return on the money spent, it will not yield an immediate and correspondingly measurable return to the exchequer, so that it is not a remunerative scheme of the kind which it is normally justifiable to charge to capital. That is why, when money became available, we decided to meet the expenditure out of a revenue surplus. And perhaps as a certain amount of misapprehension exists about what it is and what it is not legitimate to spend revenue and accrued revenue surplus on, I may say that even if the money from the surplus which it was proposed to spend on this subject is released by a restoration of the former decision to charge it to capital, it is not available for the reduction of taxes in the forthcoming year. On the 31st March, it will automatically go to debt reduction and avoidance. In other words, it will go towards reducing the capital debt. Therefore, if we decide now to increase the capital debt by precisely the same amount, the net effect on Government finances will be nil. But it certainly is not legitimate to bring forward an accrued surplus from year I to assist the revenue of year II and to utilise the money for the reduction of taxes which involves a recurring reduction of the resources of the Government. With these few words of explanation, I move the motion standing in my name.

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation'."

The first motion is in the name of Pandit Nilakantha Das that the demand be omitted. That, being a direct negative, is out of order.

**Mr. Mohan Lal Saksena**: I do not move my amendment\*

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: Sir, I must apologise to you for again rising to a point of order. But I may assure you, Sir, that I do so only after the most careful consideration that I am capable of. I submit to you, with some confidence, Sir, that this supplementary demand is not covered by our Rules. My submission to you is this. It is admitted, Mr. President, that it does not come under Rule 50(1)(i) of the Indian Legislative Rules, because the amount voted in the Budget is not found to be insufficient for the purpose of the current year. Rule 50(1)(i) says:

"An estimate shall be presented to the Assembly for a supplementary or additional grant when :

(i) the amount voted in the Budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year.

(ii) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Assembly is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the Budget for that year."

\*"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation' be reduced to one rupee."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

I lay some emphasis on the words 'not contemplated in the Budget for that year'. If you will kindly turn to the big Volume which has been circulated to us along with the Demands for Grants for this year, you will find at page 393, Demand No. 68, Aviation and the sub-heads under which this grant will be accounted for on behalf of the Department of Industries and Labour (Civil Aviation). Therefore, I believe there was last year, I speak subject to correction, this Demand No. 68 including Aviation and Civil Aviation, and it was a service contemplated in the budget for the year 1984-85. This Civil Aviation was a specific service, for which the House was asked to vote money, and the House voted money for this very specific purpose. I should like to know, Mr. President, what is the new service for the expenditure upon which this money is wanted, which was not contemplated in the budget for that year. As far as I can see, this demand comes under neither sub-rule (i) nor sub-rule (ii).

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): What about Rule 49.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: It is not admittedly an excess grant, because it has not been spent.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, what does the Honourable Member say is the nature of the demand?

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: It is more than I can say. The Honourable the Finance Member says that it is a supplementary demand. I say it is not covered by any Rule I know of. You will concede at once that, so long as the demand cannot come under Rule 49 or Rule 50, no demand can come before the House.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): It is a technical question. The House can, if it so chooses, reject the demand.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: On that matter, I submit one thing. When these demands are asked for, we are given a big Volume stating the specific items of expenditure. It is not as if this House votes block grants for Civil Aviation. This House votes for a grant to be spent in the manner specified in the Volume given to us. So far as this is concerned, you will notice only a reference at the bottom and it says:

"This is in accordance with the proposal explained in paragraphs 23 and 33 of the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member."

If you will kindly turn to the speech of the Honourable the Finance Member, you will find in paragraph 28 there is nothing mentioned specifically about this. In paragraph 33, the Honourable the Finance Member simply says:

"After these special grants have been made there should remain a balance of Rs. 2.04 lakhs. A large part of this sum I propose to put aside for two schemes which it was provisionally decided to finance from capital. These are the civil aviation programme, which is expected to cost Rs. 93 lakhs, and the transfer of the Pusa Institute to Delhi which will cost about Rs. 36 lakhs. I was not myself very happy about the decision to charge to capital these two schemes, which are certainly not in any strict sense of the word remunerative. And now that we have an accrued revenue surplus it seems to me sound policy to use part of it for these purposes and to avoid the creation of what might have become an awkward precedent."

My point on the merits is this. We are asked to vote away 98 lakhs without a single datum, as to how it is to be spent. I submit this is a very vital point. We are asked to vote away 93 lakhs block grant. Nobody tells us details about this.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Then, this cannot be brought up as a supplementary grant.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti**: My substantial point is that there are no details forthcoming as to how this money will be spent, and so this demand cannot be taken up.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir**: May I say a few words as to what the position is. It is as follows: This matter was discussed by the Standing Finance Committee before whom a note was placed. The Finance Committee was the Committee of 1934. They considered the whole question and approved of this expenditure of 92 lakhs odd from capital. The suggestion of the Government originally was that money should come out of capital and that was in the note. The note was considered by the Finance Committee, but it was never placed before the House (Hear, hear), nor was there any Resolution before this House such as in the case of Pusa. It evidently turns out now that the Honourable the Finance Member did not think that this expenditure should be financed from capital and he wanted it to be financed from revenue. He got a windfall from the surplus of the last two years and he wanted to use that surplus for this purpose. Finding no other way of bringing it before the House the Honourable the Finance Member struck upon the brilliant idea of a supplementary demand. It ought to have been shown under capital expenditure in the next year's budget. That is how it ought to have appeared before the House and then it would have been open for discussion on its merits. As a matter of fact, my Honourable friends have not got the report of the Standing Finance Committee of that year, because they were not Members of this House. I suggest it might be distributed to all the Members.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg**: I understand it has been distributed.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir**: It was distributed to us before, to us old Members.

**Mr. K. Sanjiva Row** (Government of India: Nominated Official): It was distributed to all the Members here along with the budget papers.

**Sardar Sant Singh** (West Punjab: Sikh): I have also got it. It is dated 27th August, Proceedings of the Finance Committee, Vol. XIV, No. 4.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir**: Then, I apologise, if that is so. I was given to understand that my Honourable friends did not get it. Then, the scheme is now before the House. I withdraw the statement that it is not before the House. My Honourable friend, Mr. Satyamurti, was then wrong in saying that he did not know the whole question. He ought to have seen the papers distributed to him. He made a mistake. We all sometimes make mistakes. But, however, the point of order raised remains

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

that this demand ought to have been included in the budget and that also out of capital expenditure. The Honourable the Finance Member desiring to provide this money out of revenue, but not being able to afford to pay out of the revenue of the current year, has taken advantage of the surplus of the last two years and has further taken advantage of the medium of supplementary demands to bring it before this House. I contend that this is capital expenditure as originally suggested by Government themselves and that the Finance Member ought to find ways and means of granting this money to the department through capital. I agree that there is a great deal in the point of order raised.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** The only thing, Sir, that I need say is that if this is an illegitimate use of a supplementary demand, it is precisely the same procedure as was adopted in the utilisation of the surplus of last year for special expenditure on the Bihar earthquake. It is a special programme of expenditure outside the ordinary annual programme of civil aviation and it is a special programme to overtake arrears of development.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): With regard to the Bihar earthquake, was any point of order raised at the time?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** I understand not.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Sir, may I point out to the Finance Member that the Bihar earthquake took Government by surprise? It was a sudden call upon their resources, and it, therefore, falls within the two rules read out by my Honourable friend about supplementary demands. This was not a sudden call upon Government.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** There is nothing here about a sudden call. The language is, "a need arises not contemplated in the budget of that year". The need in this case is to overtake the arrears of development of civil aviation.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Yes, but it was contemplated.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** No, it was not. The provision made was for the bare minimum which we thought could be financed within the budget of that year.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** The whole demand was placed before the Finance Committee and sanctioned by the Finance Committee. It was contemplated; the Bihar earthquake took Government by surprise.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** It was not contemplated in the budget; it was contemplated at a later stage.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): Is it a new service?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** It is a new service which was approved by the last Standing Finance Committee, but was not submitted for the vote of the Assembly.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): But civil aviation is not a new service?

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** The special programme to overtake the arrears of development is a new service.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Sir, in the proceedings of the meeting of the Standing Finance Committee held on 27th August, 1934, the question was if the proposal was in respect of a new service, and the answer is, "No." It is in vol. XIV, No. 4, page 138.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** The question of new service does not arise in connection with capital charges. "New service" has a special technical significance in relation to the budget and to the charges to be defrayed out of revenue.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The point of order raised is that this supplementary demand about the transfer of the fund for the development of civil aviation is not in order and is not covered by rule 50. It is clearly not covered by clause (i) of sub-rule (1), and it is also contended that clause (ii) of sub-rule (1) does not apply because it is not a new service. This question, the Chair admits, is not free from difficulty as to what will be considered a "new service" so far as financial provisions are concerned. Aviation itself is not a new service because provision has been made in the last budget. But what is suggested is that it is a new service so far as the programme as sought to be financed by this scheme is concerned. And also a precedent has been cited in the case of the grant that was made for relief of suffering caused by the Bihar earthquake. This is a technical question, but one of importance. On the materials that are available at present, the Chair is not prepared to rule that the demand is out of order, but it does not want this to be taken as a precedent for guidance in future.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Sir, I move:

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum of Rs. 22,57,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation' be reduced to one rupee."

[At this stage, Mr. President (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim) vacated the Chair which was then occupied by Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta).]

Sir, though you have been pleased to hold that, in the special circumstances of the case, you are not prepared to hold that the demand is not out of order, the fact remains that the demand does not fully answer the conditions that are provided in the rule governing supplementary demands and is certainly not in consonance with the spirit of it. This is a factor which must weigh with the House in determining their attitude towards the demand. Sir, we have to see what will be the consequence of our approval of this proposal. The financial year for which these supplementary demands are being presented is almost at its close. Within a few days it will have come to an end. Admittedly no part of this money has been spent so far. So far as one can foresee:

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I am sorry to have to disabuse my Honourable friend, but some of this money has been spent.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Under whose orders?

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** How much?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, explained the position in that respect this morning. He explained that the Finance Department can authorise money in anticipation of a supplementary demand.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** How much has been spent?

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** That, I am sorry, Sir, I cannot say, but it is not a very great amount.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Well, then, I have no objection if a rupee has been spent out of it; I am prepared to concede that a rupee has been spent. That does not affect the position so long as we are not told what is the amount that has been actually spent. It is no answer to say that at least a part has been spent. I know that there is a provision of about 16 lakhs for civil aviation in the budget for the next year and one for about 12 or 13 lakhs in the budget for the current year. So, it is just possible that money may have been spent out of the provision that had been made in the budget for the current year; and, if anything has been spent in excess of that amount, then the proper course for Government would be to bring a supplementary demand for that excess amount and not to press for such a huge amount with a view to covering that small expenditure. Here the proposal is for the transfer of a sum of about a crore to a fund. So long as no transfer has been made to that fund, it is inconceivable that any money could have been spent out of a fund to which nothing has yet been transferred. So I cannot possibly conceive how anything could have been spent out of the funds that we are now being asked to transfer to the contemplated or proposed fund which has not yet come into existence. I should very much like to know from the Honourable the Finance Member how he would justify such expenditure out of a fund which has not yet come into existence, whether it would be a regular expenditure, and whether it would be in accordance with the elementary rules of financial disbursement or adjustment or expenditure. But it is not merely a technical question: the question is of greater importance than that. When we are asked to transfer money to a fund, it is open to the Government to spend it in one year—it is open to the Government to spend it in 10 years. If any supplementary demands are brought before the House, they must be strictly restricted to the sums that are needed for immediate and urgent expenses; for any transfer of funds to a consolidated account which will remain in operation for an indefinite length of time would be highly objectionable, as the Government can always in this manner ask the House to transfer sums to a fund with a view to securing a blank cheque and a full licence to spend it away in any manner they choose, at any time they choose, for any purpose they choose . . . .

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** May I ask the Honourable Member whether he himself did not, on an earlier occasion in this House, propose that all revenue surpluses be carried automatically to a special fund for the development of rural areas?



**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** I did. There, I did not leave it open to the Government to spend away the money for any purpose they chose. On the contrary, I made it clear that the main reason why I made that proposal was to prevent Government from keeping money up their sleeve at the time of framing the budget and then springing upon us demands like these with a view to obtaining arbitrary latitude for wasting away sums which they often managed to secure as surplus revenues through these devious and dubious means and contrivances. That was my argument then, and that argument stands today. The rule by which surpluses are automatically transferable to a particular fund is certainly distinguishable from a proposal for transferring money to a fund and leaving it there to be used by the Government in any manner they chose. What would be the effect of my proposal? The result would be this: that no appropriation could be made out of that fund without sanction to the various schemes being accorded by the House itself. It would be a consolidated fund and various schemes would require sanction before it could be drawn upon. But here we are asked to sanction this amount and leave it at the disposal of the Honourable the Finance Member to be spent by him at his sweet will. That is not only opposed to all principles, but on merits too it is highly detrimental to the proper regulation of expenditure as it would practically divest the House of whatever control it possesses over the expenditure of public money. The Honourable the Finance Member told us that this provision is different from that made for the transfer of the Pusa Institute only in one respect. He said that it stood exactly on a par with that in all other respects and in so far as it can be distinguished from that I think it will induce the House to throw it out still more than in the former case: for he said that while in the case of the transfer from Pusa to Delhi the House had accepted the principle of transfer, so far as this particular demand is concerned, the House had never considered it: it has not in any way examined the policy underlying it, and it has not yet committed itself to the policy underlying or governing it. So, when the House felt that it was necessary and proper that the expenditure should not be met out of surplus revenue for the transfer of the agricultural institute from Pusa to Delhi, in spite of the fact that the House stood committed to the principle of transfer, I think we stand on much stronger ground in urging upon the House the necessity, the wisdom, the advisability, the justice and the propriety of opposing such expenditure out of surplus revenue for a purpose of which even the principle has not yet been independently approved or accepted by the House. On the financial ground alone, therefore, this demand should be thrown out; and if there is occasion for any expenditure it should be met out of some other sources with which we will deal when the occasion arises.

As to the statement made by the Honourable the Finance Member that the money would not be available for the relief of taxation, as it would be automatically transferred to the debt redemption fund, I am not aware of the rule on which he bases that statement; and I would very much like to know the exact rule which lays down that every pie that is left in hand at the end of the year will be automatically transferred to the debt redemption fund or will be devoted to the redemption of debts. Is it the contention of the Honourable the Finance Member that on the 1st of April or rather at 12 o'clock on the night of the 31st March, the Government of India have not a shell left in their balances in any bank or treasury or currency office? That they can have not a shell at the end of the year

[Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant.]

as, whatever they then possess automatically goes over to the redemption of debt? That seems to me a preposterous position, and I cannot possibly accept it. Undoubtedly the House is asked to make provision year by year for the reduction of debt, and in the budget which we have just passed—or rather which has been passed in spite of us to be more precise—there is a provision of 50 crores for the redemption of debt in the next financial year. Is it open to the Government to apply a larger amount to the redemption of debt than they have provided for? Would it be consistent with the provision that has been made by the House by its vote? Then, this vote is sheer mockery and has no meaning. I submit it is not open to the Finance Department to apply more than Rs. 50 crores to the redemption of debt in the coming financial year; and it has to be applied out of the sums to be raised in the manner indicated and provided in the budget itself. So, the argument that it will automatically go over to the redemption of debt is, I submit, fallacious and wrong.

But assuming for a moment it might be so, it would not affect the substance, it would not affect the real financial position as it is. We would still have reduced the debt liability by a further sum of 92 lakhs and so we would be free to add to our debts in the course of the next financial year to the extent of 92 lakhs; and assuming, as I said, that it is not open to the Government to apply more than 50 crores to the redemption of debt without a vote of this House, we would still save 92 lakhs out of that provision of 50 crores, without in any way making the debt position worse than what it would otherwise be on the 31st March, 1936. I submit that it would be certainly a relevant argument to be taken into account by this House when we reach the Finance Bill: I would be entitled to argue that we have in our hand a sum of 92 lakhs which had been set apart for the purpose of civil aviation and which had not been voted or granted by the House for that purpose. Whether this will or will not be granted out of capital account, I am not concerned with at present. It is enough for me that it should not be granted out of surplus revenue, and I hope it will help us in reducing the price of postcards, the rates of income-tax, and, if possible, some other taxes. So far as the Members of the European Group are concerned, they have a mandate, I believe, from their constituency not to submit to any expenditure out of surpluses until and unless the surcharges have been removed. So their duty is clear enough. They have, out of regard for the mandate of their constituency, to join hands with us in throwing out this proposal for spending this money out of surplus revenue.

**Mr. F. E. James:** May I ask my friend,—I do not wish to interrupt him in his speech,—but may I ask him on what authority he states that we have the mandate from our constituencies in the terms which he has described.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Well Sir, if they have not that mandate in those terms, my friend can let me know in what terms they have that mandate.

**Mr. F. E. James:** I will.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** And I will stand corrected to that extent, but the readiness with which they supported our objection to the transfer of Pusa on the ground that the amount provided for that purpose should not be voted out of surplus revenue further confirmed the impression I had about their mandate. If they acted contrary to their mandate, I have no quarrel, only I want them to do likewise in this case, and I hope they will act according to the precedent which their Group has set.

I submit, Sir, that the allotment for the transfer of the Agricultural Institute from Pusa to Delhi was less objectionable than this proposal for spending no less an amount than 92 lakhs out of surplus revenue on aviation. The surplus revenue, Sir, is the result of the sacrifices of the poorest of the poor in this country; it has been paid by the agriculturist at a time when he is getting less than a rupee for the stuff for which he used to receive Rs. 2 two or three years ago. The Finance Member said that we cannot make a country rich by calling a penny a turpence, but I may tell him that we can make a country poor by calling the worth of a penny a half penny, and that is what he and his Government have been doing, and that is how they have managed to secure this surplus revenue. There is no justification for making any alteration in Government's original proposals for meeting expenditure out of capital account. The surplus should be devoted to the relief of the taxpayer. In every country today, from one end of the world to the other, wherever there are surpluses, they are devoted to the relief of the taxpayer, because he had to pay very heavy taxes during the economic crisis. In fact, the burden of the taxes, even if the amount were constant, would be twice as heavy and burdensome as it was two or three years ago. In these circumstances, Sir, I press my motion that this amount be reduced to Re. 1 on the ground mainly that it is not payable out of surplus revenues for the year.

**Mr. Deputy President (Mr. Akhil Chandra Datta):** Amendment moved :

"That the demand for a supplementary grant of a sum of Rs. 92,57,000 in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation' be reduced to one rupee."

**Sardar Sant Singh:** Sir, I rise to support the motion of my friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant. Sir, civil aviation has been in existence since the year 1920. During the past 15 years, the development of aviation has been very rapid in all parts of the world, but in India we find that we are still in an infant stage. Sir, aviation has great potentialities in the various departments of human life, and I know too that, at this particular time, France, Italy, Germany and England herself are affected with aerial malaria and they are strengthening their aerial arm for the defence of their country. At the same time, it is somewhat significant that we find the Government of India too want to spend a huge sum of money for the development of civil aviation and this coincidence is remarkable in the extreme. However the fact is there that we are asked to vote a huge sum of money for the purpose of further development of civil aviation in India. The question was considered in the Standing Finance Committee, and the considerations urged in justification of the scheme proposed are given at page 186 of the proceedings. There two reasons are given. The first is that the inadequacy of the sums placed at the disposal of the civil aviation ~~directorates~~ in recent years has resulted in hand to mouth uneconomical expenditure. Further on, in part (b), it is stated that apart from the

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

considerations that further expenditure is being forced upon the Government of India by humanitarian considerations and by their international commitments, there is good reason to believe that the expenditure now proposed will be remunerative, though not so directly as in the case of Railway or Irrigation projects. The principal points to be marked in the so-called justification for incurring this huge expenditure are that this expenditure has not been undertaken by the Government of India because they feel that the money is required to be spent but because it has been forced upon them,—by whom it is not clear. It is stated that it has been forced upon them by humanitarian considerations and by their international commitments. What the two expressions mean it is not very easy to guess. If they mean, as I will show later on, that it is desired to benefit the foreign companies by providing more facilities for them, that is not a consideration to which this House will be a party. Again, at page 157, we are given a very illuminating essay on the benefits of aviation which are likely to accrue to India if India utilises the opportunity of capturing some of the markets by which aviation promises to bring a good return to this country. But one thing which is conspicuous by its absence in this whole description is what is the policy the Government of India have been pursuing in the past in developing civil aviation in this country, I mean, in India alone.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** That question comes very curiously from an old Member of this House. I could have understood if it had been raised by one of the new Members. My Honourable friend was a Member of the last Assembly, and the whole question of the Government of India's policy in regard to civil aviation was debated at length in that Assembly on the 29th September, 1933.

**Sardar Sant Singh:** I am coming to that point later. I am putting two issues clearly before the House, so that I may examine them carefully in the course of my speech. The first issue is, what is the policy to which the Government of India is committed to develop civil aviation in this country, and the second is, what is the policy that the Government propose to follow in future. This policy is printed in Appendices 1 and 2 in the volume of the proceedings in my hand. Similarly, I may point out that in the year 1927 when a similar motion for a supplementary grant to civil aviation was made before this House, a certain policy was enunciated by the Government before this House. Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra, in his long speech, declared in very forcible language one important point, and that was,—I should like to state it in his own words:

“The fact of the matter is that if we do not ourselves adopt a steady line of development of our internal air transport, however cautious and slow it may be, there is a distinct danger of our internal air routes being exploited by, and falling into the hands of, foreign capitalists.”

This was one line of argument adopted by him. Then, again, later on, he said:

“The Government of India consider that ‘India should obtain her proper share of the business of aerial transportation at this stage in order to ensure that she shall have an effective voice in the conditions on which contracts are given for services touching her shores and that opportunities are afforded for the investment of Indian capital and for the training and employment of Indian pilots and personnel.’”

This was the policy adopted in the year 1927. Again, the then Member for Industries and Labour went on to examine what methods the Government proposed to give effect to this policy. He said:

"I should like also to state that the reports which I have so far studied make it clear that a school for the teaching of the science and art of civil aviation in all its details is not a practical proposition. So far as I can make out the conclusion which has been arrived at in some of the more important countries of the world on the basis of recent experience is that the training of the personnel required in connection with the air transport services can be best managed through subsidised companies; and this is precisely what the Government of India propose to do at present."

Then, he went on to discuss how training was to be given to the aerial engineers, artisans and mechanics for the purpose of employment in this department, and he declared in no unmistakable terms:

"Should, however, this become impossible and Government has to take over the establishment and management of the internal air services, Government will also have to make direct arrangement for the final training of Indian youths at aerodromes and air works."

Then, he held out a promise to the House:

"It is our intention to foster the training of Indians as pilots, etc., and as soon as we get our Director of Civil Aviation, one of his functions will be to prepare a paper showing the steps taken in the other principal countries of the world in regard to training in the various subjects connected with civil aviation, and the action to be taken in India in that direction."

Let us, after eight years, examine what steps have been taken in this direction by the Government of India. Two points, which were later made clear by Sir Basil Blackett were, one, that the Government of India would encourage the promotion of a company with rupee capital and a majority of Indian directors on its board, and secondly, they would see that Indians were trained in this branch of science. Government have circulated this memorandum and we find what steps have been taken since 1927 towards the fulfilment of this promise. The first question I will ask of the Honourable Member in charge would be as regards the promotion or encouraging the promotion of a company with rupee capital and a majority of Indian directors on its board—whether it was done at all during the last eight years, and, if so, what subsidy was paid by the Government. The second would be, how many Indians have been trained during these eight years to take over charge of this department. At page 160 of this book, details are given of the training imparted to Indians during these eight years, and I find that Indian aerodrome officers have been trained to the number of six, and aircraft inspectors two. Four have been disqualified during the course of the training, one, on account of disobedience of orders, another, on account of ill health, the third, for not making satisfactory progress in flying, and in the case of the fourth, scholarship terminated from 30th June 1930 on his being declared medically unfit. This is the total which has been trained during these years. Besides this, seven more persons have been trained not for the purpose of employment in the Government of India department but for commercial purposes, as it is stated. I do not want to prolong my speech on this point but I certainly want information on this point. Is this sufficient progress during the last eight years? If we were to compare the training imparted to the nationals of other countries in other countries, will it compare in any way with the training imparted in India? It is now stated that certain staff is to be

[Sardar Sant Singh.]

recruited and that staff is to be recruited for the purpose of employment in the civil aviation department. Another departure is made in this respect and that was that when originally civil aviation staff was recruited, they were recruited on a contract basis of five years' contract and the object was that after the termination of that period the department automatically goes to the Indians who would have been trained during this period but now we find that the same staff is being made permanent. This is a very great departure from the principle which was accepted in the first instance. Now, it is stated on page 143 that, for the future of civil aviation in India, it is essential that the very best material should be recruited. Nobody can take objection to this, but, further on the Government state that the field of recruitment for the present is restricted to the United Kingdom. Why, Sir, do you think that India has not been able to furnish and is not likely to furnish the suitable material for being trained in this branch of service. Why in the last 15 years steps were not taken to qualify persons for this department? It has been our experience that the Government always fall back to the United Kingdom for recruitment of experts in all technical subjects. Why it is so, and why it should be so? It is a thing which no Indian should voluntarily or willingly tolerate. It is an insult to our self-respect. With a population of 350 millions, we are told that India cannot furnish the material for manning such departments. I will say that the real reason behind this is not that the material is not available in India, but because there is no will to obtain that material. So long as the Government are not prepared to really effect improvement in the technical service in India by training and then recruiting Indians to these jobs, they cannot expect us to be a party to give any more money, so that it may go to the pockets of aliens from this country. Sir, there is no doubt that aviation is an important subject and the world will see more of it in the future, but we are not willing to have any more even the benefits of scientific improvements so long as the Government are not willing to make it possible for the youth of this country to be employed in these departments. In foreign countries, whenever new enterprises are undertaken, they open up new avenues to the youths of such countries, but, in India, the conditions are just the reverse. The new openings offer fresh fields for further exploitation of India by alien nationals and alien capital. Therefore, it is our painful duty in such matters to oppose Government, even in the matter of the improvements coming in the world of science in other countries. Therefore, I will oppose this motion until and unless suitable arrangements are made for training Indians in this branch of service.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney** (Nominated Non-Official): I intervene in this debate for one or two reasons. I listened very attentively to the speech of the Mover and that of the last speaker, but as I listened to the reasons adduced by Mr. Sant Singh, which were nothing else but a mirror of the reasons of the Mover, Pandit Pant, I was reminded of a story of a dear old lady who had a beautiful female dog which she had carefully looked after in every way. One morning, she came down and to her surprise, she found five or six puppies around this dog who was proudly and cozily looking up at her mistress. The lady naturally was very surprised and shocked at what she saw and sternly addressed the dog, saying: "Fluffiken's darling: I see you have again allowed your heart to get the better of your head". When I heard my friend, Mr. Sant Singh, adducing his reasons as to why he opposed this demand, I felt sure, he

had allowed his heart to get the better of his head. I have no doubt that neither the Mover nor Mr. Sant Singh will deny that we should do our utmost to improve India's position so far as her air services are concerned. Whether we get the money from the surplus or from the general revenues does not concern me so much. You may, as did the Mover, talk of the poorest of the poor as being affected if we pass this demand, but you should have included the richest of the rich who also pay their taxes. There is no doubt that if we reject this demand and it is used in remission of taxes, any benefit, even to the poorest of the poor, would be very very small indeed. What do we find? Here we have Government trying their utmost to satisfy the needs of India and the demands of this House to improve our nation building services. Here is a matter—aviation—in which India is lamentably and disgracefully lagging. There are many other smaller countries who spend eight to ten times the amount that India spends on her civil aviation. Indeed, at present, we are merely playing at aviation. This must be stopped.

**An Honourable Member:** What is their income?

**Sardar Sant Singh:** That is the real point. You are missing that.

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** Sir, I did not interrupt Sardar Sant Singh when he spoke. Would he mind keeping quiet now? But I see he has a point. I am glad. I hope it has a sharp point. My advice to him is to sit on his point, and, when he does, I hope he will appreciate the truth of the saying "Thrice blessed is he who sitteth on a point for he shall rise again". And when he does rise with his point, of course, in him, this House will be able to see his point, already felt by him and which we cannot see now.

Sir, what has been the expenditure in the past in regard to civil aviation in India. In 1930-31, it was 16½ lakhs; in 1931-32, 16½ lakhs; in 1932-33, 9 lakhs; in 1933-34, it was about 12 lakhs.

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

And what has been the income derived from this expenditure? In 1932-33, the income from this expenditure of nine lakhs was two lakhs and, in 1933-34, from an expenditure of 11 lakhs, it has been three lakhs. None can deny that money which has brought this income is not a revenue producing investment. Moreover, India is peculiarly well situated from a geographical point of view, and if civil aviation were developed to the extent that the needs of the country demand, any investment on civil aviation will be money well spent; for it will add to our national revenues. Remember, India lies on the best route between Europe and North Africa on the one hand, and China, Japan, Java, Malaya and Phillipines, Indo-China, Australia and New Zealand on the other but the traffic to the southern countries of this group could be diverted along the sea-plane route *via* Colombo and traffic to the northern countries along a land route north of the Himalayas which is already engaging the attention of the Russians and the Germans.

Sir, we in this House are continually crying out that our country lags behind all others in the British Empire, because we have not got self-government and because we have not got responsibility in the Centre and the control of our own affairs. But when Government ask for nearly a

[Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney.]

crore of rupees for such a laudable purpose, you refuse it and you want to starve one of its vital nation-building services. Sir, when money is asked for this, you say: "I shall refuse it and reduce it to one rupee". Surely Sir, with the Opposition, their hearts have got the better of their heads. (Hear, hear.)

**Sardar Sant Singh:** That is not a nation-building service?

**Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry Gidney:** It certainly is. Apart from that, with this money, which I believe will be spent, judiciously, and as the cadre of Indians today undergoing training shows that Indianisation is absolutely the order of the day in this department, how can this House—when the Government are anxious to improve civil aviation in India and to develop it in uniformity with and parallel to other countries—refuse this demand and vote its reduction to one rupee? Let me refer to another way in which revenue *will* be obtained by the expenditure of this demand. We know that India is now getting bi-weekly services, that the Dutch Service flying between Karachi and Rangoon are planning to use Fokker Fxxxvi machines of a more modern type, which consumes 110 gallons of petrol an hour as compared with 75 gallons today; this will mean "revenue" to this country: and, surely, it must be only the purblind man and the prejudiced politician who will say that this money that is going to be used is without any corresponding revenue brought in. I submit that this money will be used with every prospect and every promise of there being, beyond doubt, a good return, and it is foolish to reject this demand and to seek to reduce the demand to one rupee! I quite agree with my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, that the time has come when India should manufacture her own aeroplanes. I go further and say that I think it has been the studied policy of the British Government for obvious reasons to exclude this country from being properly trained in these highly technical services, but that time has gone, and I think England is now just as alive to the necessity of India building her own aeroplanes and supplies as India is, and this demand for improving our civil aviation is a beginning of this policy. Regarding Indianisation: You have only to look at the cadre of officers who are in the Civil Aviation Department to see that every one is an Indian, except just a few of the heads who are administering the department. I have before me a list of aerodrome officers, assistant aircraft inspectors, pilots, instructors, etc., and every name I see is that of an Indian. Sir, when Government are desirous of improving India's civil aviation and keeping in step with other countries, when Government show their anxiety to help us to develop our own aircraft in this country, when the Government of India show their concern in their desire to help us to build up or rather to improve a nation-building department, I think it is very unwise indeed to seek to reject or reduce the demand—I would go further and say that we should spend more money on civil aviation. Sir, when I was a member of the Indian Military Academy Committee and we were discussing the subject of the India's Military Air Force, I insisted that we should start the whole thing in India and not depend for our training on England or Egypt. And here is a scheme that in my opinion will be the nucleus of our future air force and I personally know other schemes, e.g., aeronautical academy, etc., will follow and will provide India with everything aerial she wants. Sir,



this is a very necessary and a very desirable beginning, and I do think that it will be to the interest of this country if this House realises that the money that is being asked of this House is meant for a useful purpose intended entirely for the benefit of India. I repeat, it is meant entirely for the benefit of India, and I, therefore, support the demand and oppose the motion before the House. (Applause.)

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** Sir, in the realm of finance, as in the realm of morals, one error leads inevitably to another. (Laughter.) Sir, I would point out to this House that a financial acrobatic feat has been performed. It is not alone a supplementary grant, but a new category of demands has been created. I do not want, Sir, your ruling on this point. If Honourable Members will kindly look at the bulky volume. . . .

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair has already given its ruling.

**Mr. S. Satyamurti:** I am going on another point now, Sir. Your ruling did not cover the creation of a new department. Your ruling, Sir, certainly cannot be questioned on the floor of this House, but I am now bringing to the attention of the House the fact that among the original Demands for Grants there is another new Demand No. 63-A. It used to be "Demand No. 63", "Demand No. 64", but who the financial and constitutional genius of the Government of India is who suggested to them that, under a supplementary demand, you can create a new demand beats my head. Rule 44, at page 96 of the Legislative Assembly Manual, says that:

"A separate demand shall ordinarily be made in respect of the grant proposed for each Department of the Government, provided that the Finance Member may in his discretion include in one demand grants proposed for two or more Departments, or make a demand in respect of expenditure which cannot readily be classified under particular Departments."

It seems there is a demand already—the demand for civil aviation, that is Demand No. 63. Now this Demand 63-A is for civil aviation again. I am not raising a point of order; I am merely pointing out to the House that an opportunity is being used to create a new category of departments altogether, called Demand No. 63-A, which is not in the detailed estimates and demands for grants presented to this House; and I submit that it is not covered by the Rule, which says:

"Or make a demand in respect of expenditure which cannot readily be classified under particular Departments."

This can readily be classified under the head "Civil Aviation". Therefore, Sir, I object to this outrage on financial propriety and ask the House to vote for its rejection on that among other grounds. Then, Sir, we are told—my Honourable friend, the Baronet from Bombay, referred to it—and I apologise to you, Sir, and to this House for not having read this note early enough, but having read it, Mr. President, I want to draw the attention of the House to two or three important points. The first point is this. At page 136 of this Volume XIV, No. 4, of the proceedings of the Standing Finance Committee, we are told very seriously this:

"The Government of India have been forced to the conclusion that the development of ground organisation should be accelerated, and in view of the difficulty that funds are not yet available from revenue in sufficient amounts, have obtained the agreement of the Secretary of State to provide funds for the purpose from capital."

[Mr. S. Satyamurti.]

This was on the 27th August, 1934, when the Chairman of the Standing Finance Committee was the present occupant of the office of the Finance Member of the Government of India. Therefore, this statement was made to the Standing Finance Committee on his responsibility that they had got the sanction of the Secretary of State for this purpose. The matter does not stop there. In paragraph (b) Honourable Members will find the following statement of the Government of India:

"(b) Apart from the considerations that further expenditure is being forced upon the Government of India by humanitarian considerations and by their international commitments, there is good reason to believe that the expenditure now proposed will be remunerative, though not so directly as in the case of railway or irrigation projects."

Details are given later on as to how, according to the Government, this will be remunerative and various estimates are given, and we are assured that they will be remunerative. Coming now to the Honourable the Finance Member's speech, he says:

"I was not myself very happy about the decision to charge to capital those two schemes which are certainly not in any strict sense of the word remunerative."

I quite agree. He has used the words—"not in any strict sense of the word", and, therefore, protected himself from a formal contradiction of the previous system. At the same time, it seems to me that a change in the personnel of the financial officers of the Government of India or a change in his own opinion ought not to commit the Government, or at all events this House, to change an accepted financial principle, and say that this expenditure, which was originally agreed to be financed from capital, ought now to be charged to the revenue surplus.

Then, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the House to another matter. At page 137 (roughly about the middle of the page) they will find that the first category contains projects which are now urgently required on existing air routes. They amount roughly to 53 lakhs and a half. It is proposed to put these works into execution at once. The second category contains works which, though not actually required at present, may become very urgently required, if certain developments now strongly indicated should occur. The cost of this amounts to about 39 lakhs. Various schemes set out in the Schedule have not in all cases been worked in detail, and some of them may have to be modified or amplified before they are finally sanctioned, but, as has already been stated, the Schedule shows a total expenditure of 53½ lakhs which is proposed to incur at once, and a further possible expenditure of about 39 lakhs which may be required urgently within the next three years. Now, Sir, I want Honourable Members to notice this fact that even with regard to this 53½ lakhs there are schemes which are not completely worked out and which will have to be revised, modified or amplified. With regard to the 39 lakhs, it is only for a further possible expenditure during the next three years. I put it to you, Sir, and to this Honourable House, whether it is right that the machinery of a supplementary demand, which is intended for an unforeseen expenditure in the year, should be allowed to be utilised for the purpose of financing schemes, some of which are still not final, and a good portion of which are still in the realm of possibility. I do put it to the House that it will be certainly violating all elementary canons of financial propriety and budget control, if the House is asked to vote 92½ lakhs for these contingent expenses.

The last point I want to make is as regards the threat, for I cannot conceive of it in any other manner, which the Honourable the Finance

Member gave, that unless we earmark this 3½ crores of surplus somehow or other and sanction it by our votes before the end of the year, it will automatically go towards the reduction of the debt. I join with my friend, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in asking the Honourable the Finance Member to state what is the financial authority or rule or practice, which requires that automatically all the surplus should go to the reduction or avoidance of debt. I am ignorant on the matter, and I shall be obliged for enlightenment. But, Sir, I do feel that this House as representing the taxpayers many of whom are the poorest in this country, should be loath to allow money to be spent on projects which may otherwise be very desirable, but which we have to consider in relation to the other demands on our purse. These demands are the absolute need for relief of the taxpayer, the absolute need for lowering the postage rates, the absolute need for exempting the lower incomes from income-tax. All these are matters on which most sections of the House feel strongly. It seems to me, therefore, that the House will be ill-advised in following the advice of Colonel Sir Henry Gidney who seemed to think that a vote for my friend's motion will mean that this House is against civil aviation. That is not the case. It is a case of asserting its financial control. Indeed, your ruling, Sir, was so carefully and guardedly worded, if I may say so respectfully, that this House, I think, would be upholding its prestige and its control over the Finance Department and on the manner of spending this money, if we vote for this motion and refuse to give them this money. I want to warn the House that, apart from the question of utilising the surplus for this purpose, and apart from the fact that most of these schemes are in the realm of future, they are not complete schemes, they are not detailed schemes, they are not even approved schemes,—apart from all this, I think this House ought to tell the Finance Department that they cannot go on trifling with the finances of this country, and bring forward a demand for 92½ lakhs with unbaked details, and without telling the House how this money is to be spent and creating a new demand called No. 68-A. I, therefore, beg this House most respectfully to vote for this motion.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that a very important subject like this should have been presented to this Honourable House in the way it has been. Here is the question of the future of civil aviation in this country. There are proposals for an expenditure of no less than 92 lakhs of rupees, and the first time it comes before this House for consideration is by a supplementary demand. Surely, this House has a right to demand from Government greater facilities for considering and discussing schemes of this importance which involve an expenditure of nearly a crore of rupees and to protest at these having been brought up by means of a supplementary demand. We were hoping that these supplementary demands would have been dealt with by this House within a day or so but I am not at all surprised that we have taken the time that we are taking since these demands involve wide principles and involve a scheme which is concerned with the future policy of civil aviation in this country. Therefore, Sir, I greatly regret that this important question should have been brought before this House in the manner it has. Secondly, I regret that there should be a discussion as to how this scheme should be financed, namely, whether it should be financed from capital or from revenue. There can be no doubt that originally Government intended that this scheme should be financed from capital, but my Honourable friend, the Finance Mem-

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

ber, said that he had some doubts whether this scheme was remunerative enough to justify him in sanctioning capital expenditure. Well, Sir, my Honourable friend may have his doubts and as the watch-dog of our purse he has justification perhaps in thinking that the scheme, as placed before the House, does not justify expenditure from capital. On the whole it rather relieves me to think that the Finance Member of the Government of India should be so strict. It is his business to be strict and I do complement him on that strictness. But, Sir, let us see where he gets this money from that he proposes to hand over to his Honourable colleague on his left. It is the surplus money from the budgets of the last two or three years and that surplus accrued from the taxation which we paid.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** It is one year's surplus.

**Sir Cowasji Jehangir:** All right it represents one year's surplus. Having got that surplus and instead of using it for purposes that would meet with the approval of this side of the House, he quietly hands it over to his Honourable colleague and says: "Take this crore. I had my doubts about raising a loan for this purpose, but here I have got this amount. Take it, and we will put it before the Assembly in a supplementary demand." ("Hear, hear" from Congress Party Benches.) I think that has prejudiced the case. It has prejudiced the Government case because of the method they have adopted. It has diverted the attention of this House from the merits of the case.

The proper method of dealing with such important matters is by way of a Resolution. Get the House to adopt your scheme and then ask the House to make financial provision. Instead of that, as I have already explained, another method has been adopted and therefore I will repeat that I honestly feel that the merits of the case are not being properly considered due to the faulty method in which the case has been presented by the Government. Sir, this morning we expressed our opinion fairly definitely as to how this surplus ought not to be used. (Hear, hear.) There has been considerable criticism already all over the country about how this surplus is proposed to be utilised by the Honourable the Finance Member. I have great sympathy with that criticism. Sir, do not let us mix up the issues. Fortunately or unfortunately a very important scheme is placed before us for our consideration at this most awkward time during this Session. Is this scheme a good one? Does it deserve encouragement? That is the first issue. Having decided that issue, the second issue is, should we allow this money to be handed over to the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce's department for this scheme? Now, on the first issue, I am inclined to think that the scheme is a good one on its merits. We want civil aviation in this country. We want to encourage civil aviation as far as it possibly lies in our power. We desire to vote all adequate sums of money for the encouragement of civil aviation. That is the broad principle. Secondly, if the scheme is remunerative,—I am not going into the comparative merits of remunerative schemes,—if it can be called remunerative by Government, if that is the word used in the report, "remunerative", then I contend that the money should come from capital. (Hear, hear.) If now the Honourable the Finance Member will conclusively prove that the scheme is not remunerative, that the report that was placed before the Standing Finance Committee was not quite accurate, that the sanction of the Finance Com-

mittee was obtained to this scheme on facts and figures which are not quite correct, he will have to stand corrected on behalf of the Government. But so long as this report is before this House, which report goes to show that the schemes are expected to be remunerative, in the same breath the Government cannot come and ask us to sanction money for this scheme out of revenue and not out of capital. Now, Sir, the two issues I have placed before the House, I have answered to the best of my ability.

The next point that was raised by the Honourable the Finance Member was that if we did not agree to this scheme, the money would go to the reduction of debt, and that we would not be able to make any use of it. He said that there was a rule by which at the end of this month all money automatically would go for the redemption of debt. I am not going to contest the position he has taken up in theory, but in practice I respectfully beg to point out to him that he is not quite right. Suppose that it does go for the redemption of debt and suppose after the end of this month, we come to the conclusion that more money ought to be spent for some useful purpose or that further relief should be given to the taxpayer, we will have a justification for demanding from the Honourable the Finance Member that he should budget for a deficit budget, because we have merely through an accident enabled him to reduce the debt. (Hear, hear.) Having reduced the debt today on the one hand, we can demand on the other that he draw upon loans to a greater extent than he intended to do. Therefore, in practice, Mr. President, I do not think very much of his argument. (Hear, hear.) He may carry this surplus to debt redemption, but we can also, on our side, if we have the strength of voting power, nullify the ultimate result. He has finally the power of certification. We can insist upon his having a deficit budget to the extent of the money that we allow him to carry to debt redemption, but he has the final power of certification. That is the constitutional position. I do not think he will contend that I am wrong. This has happened all through the Finance Member's desiring suddenly to finance these schemes out of revenue. We disagree with him. We think they ought to be financed out of capital and if insisting upon our point of view being carried out results in a deficit budget, it is a deficit budget not really in practice but merely in theory. Therefore, Sir, I would respectfully suggest that this House do what it did this morning (Hear, hear) and approve of this scheme, but refuse it to be allowed to be financed out of revenue. I am not going to tell the Honourable the Finance Member how I am going to vote or what I am going to do in immediate future with regard to his other proposals. I am not going to say that I will insist upon the reduction of the salt tax, I am not going to say whether I am going to insist upon a further reduction in our income-tax surcharge, nor am I going to suggest just now what should be done with regard to the postal budget. We will consider these questions on their merits, keeping in mind, that we have reduced the debt of this country to the extent of about 38 lakhs this morning and I trust about 98 lakhs this afternoon. (Hear, hear.) Keeping those two points in view, we shall deal with the budget in the future, but I do not commit myself personally as my Honourable friends have done with regard to one side of the budget or the other. I would again very respectfully suggest that we carry out this morning's programme and not condemn a good scheme merely because it happens to be placed in an unfortunate manner before this House. While following the very good principle, Mr. President, that schemes which are remunerative or that involve large expenditure on permanent measures such as building research institutes

[Sir Cowasji Jehangir.]

should be financed from capital, I am sure that the Honourable the Finance Member will watch our interests to see that the departments do not carry this too far and ask him for monies from loans which ought to be met out of revenues. A laxity on our part might lead in the future to moneys being spent out of loans which justifiably ought to be credited to revenue. I have known that happen before, and I feel sure that this side of the House will be alive to that danger just as the Honourable the Finance Member is sure to be on his side of the House.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** Sir, it is, to say the least, very unfortunate from my point of view that this debate should have taken the turn it has. It seems quite evident that a very large section of the House is not willing to consider the proposal before it on its merits but wishes to side-track it on a technicality. Now, Sir, I am not a financial expert and I do not propose to make any contribution to the discussion regarding the canons of financial propriety, except to point out that in the memorandum we submitted to the Standing Finance Committee we said that we (that is, the Government of India):

"Have been forced to the conclusion that the development of ground organisation should be accelerated and in view of the difficulty that funds are not yet available from revenue in sufficient amounts, have obtained the agreement of the Secretary of State to provide funds for the purpose from capital."

It is, therefore, evident that our feeling at the outset was that this money ought to be provided from revenue and we are now reverting to the position which we felt we ought to have taken up in the first instance but which we were not able to take up owing to financial conditions. My Honourable friend, Sir Cowasji Jehangir, also read out a passage which he considered proved the point that this expenditure should be debited to capital. "There is good reason to believe that the expenditure now proposed will be remunerative". But, Sir, as has happened once or twice before in this House, he did not go on to complete the sentence. The sentence goes on:

"though not so directly as in the case of railway or irrigation projects."

and the memorandum proceeded to point out that a good deal of the return would be indirect. In the circumstances, Sir, it is not necessary for me to enter at length into the merits of this case. I am very sorry not to have an opportunity of doing so for I should have liked to attempt to convince the House,—I might not have been successful,—of the merits of the proposals placed before it. I should have liked to point out to my Honourable friend, Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, that this was a case of economic planning and that we were endeavouring to think ahead within our resources. I should also have endeavoured to point out the prospect that schemes like this, new activities like this, new careers that those activities open, hold out of doing a little,—they cannot do much at present but they have great potentialities—to help to solve the problem of unemployment. Now, Sir, I am debarred from doing that by the fact that the House, I gather, is not prepared to deal with this proposal except on the narrow point of financial propriety; and therefore I shall confine myself to making a few comments on the speech of my Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh. I cannot allow that to pass without a challenge for a more unfair presentation of a case I have seldom listened to in this House. My Honourable friend dug up certain debates of 1927

and 1928. I can assure him that as far as civil aviation is concerned, 1927 and 1928 are as dead as the dodo. I would ask him, what about the discussions of 1933 in the Simla Session of the Assembly? I do not remember whether he was present or not.

**Mr. F. E. James:** He was; I can never forget Sardar Sant Singh.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I am sorry I have not got Mr. James's memory, but if he was present in the Simla Session of the Assembly, why has he not referred to the discussions then? Why does he ask us now what we have done to create an Indian company with rupee capital? Sir, I explained at great length on that occasion to the House that that was exactly what we had done. I explained the rather complicated arrangement for the transit of mails across India. I explained the relationship between the Indian Trans-Continental Airways, a company with rupee capital and with a majority of Indian directors in which the Government of India have invested, I think, Rs. 24 lakhs—I explained the relationship between that company and Indian National Airways, another Indian company with rupee capital and with a majority of Indian directors, on the one hand, and with Imperial Airways on the other. My Honourable friend has taken absolutely no notice of that most important development which took place only the year before last. He has not referred to the fact that there is another important company operating services in India which is a purely Indian company and, I imagine, with entirely Indian capital; and that is Messrs. Tata's service from Karachi to Madras, which we hope shortly to see extended to Colombo. I would ask whether that is not more than a sufficient fulfilment of the promise made in this House in 1927 and 1928 which my Honourable friend quoted. And then, Sir, he referred to the training of Indians and asked what we were doing in that direction. There, again, I think the figures show that we have done and are doing our best. My Honourable friend seems to demand that Indians without training or with a modicum of training should be at once put at the head of affairs. I cannot think that this House will support that demand. Let us take the "Dufferin" cadets for example. They are excellent material, and I should like to add my tribute to the many which have been paid to the excellence of the "Dufferin" cadets; but nobody in his senses would demand that those cadets only a year or two after they leave the "Dufferin" should be placed in charge of a battleship or a big merchant ship. And that is exactly the position here. We are training Indians up to be able to pilot the big air liners but you cannot put them in charge of those air liners at once. The toll of air accidents every week shows the extent to which experience is necessary before you can do that. I think it is worth telling the House that we have spent nearly half a lakh on the training of Indians in England to fill various posts in connection with air transport. We have subsidised Flying Clubs in this country at considerable expense and they have trained something like 450 pilots from amongst whom the big companies, Indian Trans-Continental Airways, Tata's and Indian National Airways, select their personnel. Indian Trans-Continental Airways are employing 60 Indians in the higher posts now. They have two probationary first officers, two licensed engineers, 30 other skilled engineers and 26 unskilled engineers. Tata's have four Indian pilots, one Indian engineer and eight Indian mechanics. Indian National Airways have two Indian pilots, 24 Indian ground engineers, fitters, etc., and one Indian Aerodrome Officer. This

[Sir Frank Noyce.]

question of Indianisation has occupied the attention of my department very closely, and it will continue to do so. We have made agreements with the operating companies that they should do their best to help us in training Indian personnel and in employing them. I submit, Sir, that my Honourable friend's charge against the department on this account is absolutely without foundation.

As I have said, I could have wished for a better opportunity of trying to convince the House of the merits of this scheme, and of trying to show the extent to which we are endeavouring to conform to our requirements and obligations. My Honourable friend, Sardar Sant Singh, was at a loss to know what the humanitarian and international considerations were. The point there is that, under the International Air Convention, a country has a right to give or refuse permission to the operation of air services across its territorial limits. We have that right to give or refuse to foreign air services permission to cross our territorial limits; but most countries in the world, at any rate all the prominent civilised countries—and I maintain that India is a prominent civilised country, a contention against which, I am sure, there will be no argument—have given permission and we have followed their example. It was in accordance with the terms of the Air Convention that we have given the Dutch and French services permission to operate across India. . . .

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah:** Would the Honourable Member tell me why the Government did not, by way of a Resolution, put the matter before this House instead of coming up with a supplementary demand? I would like to know what the difficulty was.

**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** That is a question which, I think, my Honourable friend, the Finance Member, has already answered. (Laughter.) The House may not be satisfied with his reply, but, at any rate, he has replied, and I may point out in this connection that the last important debate we had on this subject was on a supplementary demand: the one in Simla was on a supplementary demand. A different line was taken on that occasion from the line that has been taken today. But to refer to what I was saying, the point is that under our international obligations we have to keep up at least a minimum standard in the matter of aerodromes and other arrangements, and it is in order to make up for the loss of ground during the last nine or ten years that we are asking for this 93 lakhs.

I think that is all that I can say, and I can only express my deep regret that my arguments will not in all probability prove very effective.

**Some Honourable Members:** The question may now be put.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** Sir, the Honourable Sir Frank Noyce seems to have renounced himself to the helplessness of the situation. In the circumstances, it is not necessary for me to deal with the merits of the proposals that find place in the report of the Finance Committee. He tried, however, to controvert some of the statements made by Sardar Sant Singh. It is unfortunately my duty to state before the House some facts as I know them. He said the Trans-Continental Airways satisfied the conditions that had been imposed for the flotation of an Indian company with rupee capital. In name, it does; in reality and in spirit, it does not. In fact, in the Trans-Continental Airways, 51 per cent. of the capital is held by the Imperial Airways, London, so that. . . .



**The Honourable Sir Frank Noyce:** I did not deny that for a moment: I did not say there was a majority of Indian capital invested: I said that it was an Indian company with a majority of Indian directors. The other two companies have a majority of Indian capital and I explained—again I wish my Honourable friend opposite had read the previous discussions on the subject—I explained very carefully in the course of the discussions in Simla in 1933 the reason why Imperial Airways held 51 per cent. of the capital of Indian Trans-Continental Airways, and the advantages to India which accrued from the arrangement as a whole.

**Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant:** On the whole, to me it is not in any way a position of profit, of self-respect or of advantage to this country that the majority of the capital in the company should be held by foreigners, with the right certainly of returning a majority of directors. It does not matter whether they are Europeans or Indians. The fact that has to be considered is who is the controlling authority, who nominates and who appoints these directors; and under the constitution of the Trans-Continental Airways, four out of the seven directors are to be appointed by the Imperial Airways, London, so that the majority of directors will always be nominated by foreigners and the control of the company will always vest in the hands of foreigners. That is obviously not a position over which we can congratulate ourselves or for which we can thank those who seem to be perfectly satisfied with the constitution of that company. I will not say anything about the Indian National Airways nor will I refer to the circumstances in which this company was formed and the manner in which it was constituted. It was floated by a gentleman who had been responsible for the Clive Engineering Company, which went into liquidation with a loss of Indian capital to the extent of over Rs. 20 lakhs. The Government have given a monopoly to this company and they have undertaken that no other company will have any subsidy or will be allowed to carry the mails in the branch lines so long as this company is there. There are various other features, but, at this late hour in the day, I will not refer to them. In these companies to which reference has been made by the Honourable the Industries Member, the Europeans are receiving double the pay of Indians for the same services, for performing identically the same work; and the majority of workers in higher grades, by far the majority consists of non-Indians. I would like to know whether there is any single Indian under training in this company at present. There are many questions relevant and highly useful which would have thrown considerable light on this department and its activities; but I refrain from addressing myself to them at this late hour in the day. As even the Government Member in charge has accepted the inevitable position, I think it is unnecessary for me to say more in this connection. I hope that my motion will be accepted unanimously by all the non-official Members in this House. I beg leave, Sir, to withdraw my motion, and request Honourable Members to throw out the original motion.

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

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

"That a supplementary sum, not exceeding Rs. 92,57,000, be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1935, in respect of 'Transfer to the Fund for the Development of Civil Aviation'."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—7.

Abdoola Haroon, Seth Haji.  
 Abdul Aziz, Khan Bahadur Mian.  
 Abdul Matin Chaudhury, Mr.  
 Ahmad Nawaz Khan, Major Nawab.  
 Allah Bakhsb Khan Tiwana, Khan  
 Bahadur Nawab Malik.  
 Ayyar, Rao Bahadur A. A.  
 Venkatarama.  
 Bajpai, Mr. G. S.  
 Bewoor, Mr. G. V.  
 Bhagchand Soni, Rai Bahadur Seth.  
 Buss, Mr. L. O.  
 Chatarji, Mr. J. M.  
 Craik, The Honourable Sir Henry.  
 Dalal, Dr. R. D.  
 DeSouza, Dr. F. X.  
 Drake, Mr. D. H. O.  
 Ebrahim Haroon Jaffer, Mr. Ahmed.  
 Gajapatiraj, Maharaj Kumar Vijaya  
 Ananda.  
 Ghiasuddin, Mr. M.  
 Ghulam Bhik Nairang, Syed.  
 Gidney, Lieut.-Colonel Sir Henry.  
 Graham, Sir Lancelot.  
 Grigg, The Honourable Sir James.  
 Hidayatallah, Sir Ghulam Hussain.  
 Hockenhull, Mr. F. W.  
 Hudson, Sir Leslie.  
 James, Mr. F. E.  
 Jawahar Singh, Sardar Bahadur  
 Sardar Sir.  
 Jinnab, Mr. M. A.  
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.

Kirpalani, Mr. Hiranand Khushiram.  
 Lal Chand, Captain Rao Bahadur  
 Chaudhri.  
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.  
 Moulali, Mr. H. A. F.  
 Milligan, Mr. J. A.  
 Mody, Mr. H. P.  
 Monteath, Mr. J.  
 Morgan, Mr. G.  
 Muhammad Nauman, Mr.  
 Mukerje, Mr. N. R.  
 Mukherjee, Rai Bahadur Sir Satya  
 Charan.  
 Nayar, Mr. C. Govindan.  
 Noyce, The Honourable Sir Frank.  
 Owen, Mr. L.  
 Rajah, Rao Bahadur M. O.  
 Rau, Mr. P. R.  
 Row, Mr. K. Sanjiva.  
 Sarma, Mr. R. S.  
 Scott, Mr. J. Ramsay.  
 Scott, Mr. W. L.  
 Sher Muhammad Khan, Captain  
 Sardar.  
 Siddique Ali Khan, Khan Sahib  
 Nawab.  
 Singh, Mr. Pradyumna Prashad.  
 Sircar, The Honourable Sir  
 Nripendra.  
 Sloan, Mr. T.  
 Swithinbank, Mr. B. W.  
 Tottenham, Mr. G. R. F.

NOES—57.

Aaron, Mr. Samuel.  
 Aney, Mr. M. S.  
 Asaf Ali, Mr. M.  
 Ayyangar, Mr. M. Ananthasayanam.  
 Azhar Ali, Mr. Muhammad.  
 Bajoria, Babu Baijnath.  
 Banerjee, Dr. P. N.  
 Baqui, Mr. M. A.  
 Bardaloi, Srijut N. C.  
 Bhagavan Das, Dr.  
 Chhattoadhyaya, Mr. Amarendra  
 Nath.  
 Chettiar, Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam.  
 Chetty, Mr. Sami Vencatachelam.  
 Das, Mr. B.  
 Das, Mr. Basanta Kumar.  
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.  
 Datta, Mr. Akhil Chandra.  
 Desai, Mr. Bhulabhai J.  
 Deshmukh, Dr. G. V.  
 Fakir Chand, Mr.  
 Gadgil, Mr. N. V.  
 Giri, Mr. V. V.  
 Govind Das, Seth.  
 Gupta, Mr. Ghanashyam Singh.  
 Hosmani, Mr. S. K.  
 Jodhe, Mr. K. M.  
 Jhangir, Sir Cowasji.  
 Jogendra Singh, Sardar.  
 Khare, Dr. N. B.

Lahiri Chaudhury, Mr. D. K.  
 Maitra, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta.  
 Mangal Singh, Sardar.  
 Mudaliar, Mr. C. N. Muthuranga.  
 Muhammad Ahmad Kazmi, Qazi.  
 Murtaza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi  
 Syed.  
 Nageswara Rao, Mr. K.  
 Paliwal, Pandit Sri Krishna Dutta.  
 Pant, Pandit Govind Ballabh.  
 Raghubir Narayan Singh, Choudhri.  
 Rajan, Dr. T. S. S.  
 Raju, Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami.  
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.  
 Saksena, Mr. Mohan Lal.  
 Sant Singh, Sardar.  
 Satyamurti, Mr. S.  
 Shafi Daudi, Maulvi Muhammad.  
 Sham Lal, Mr.  
 Sheodass Daga, Seth.  
 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, U.  
 Varma, Mr. B. B.  
 Ziauddin Ahmad, Dr.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The "Ayes" are 57, and the "Noes" are 57. I vote for the "Ayes".

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir James Grigg:** I understand that all Parties in the House are prepared, with your permission, to take a division without speeches on the next motion relating to Broadcasting, where precisely similar considerations arise. I have consulted the Leaders of Opposition Parties.

**Mr. President** (The Honourable Sir Abdur Rahim): The Chair will only say this, that it hopes Honourable Members will see that these motions for supplementary demands are concluded on the next official day.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 29th March, 1935.