

29 April 1921

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

VOLUME II

SECOND SESSION

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1921



SIMLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1921

CONTENTS

	Page
THURSDAY, 1ST SEPTEMBER, 1921	1—6
Caths.	
President's Speech.	
SATURDAY, 3RD SEPTEMBER, 1921	7—17
Inauguration of the Second Session of the Council of State and Legislative Assembly.	
MONDAY, 5TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	19—155
Statements laid on the Table.	
Questions and Answers.	
Procedure in regard to Question and Answer.	
Motion for Adjustment to consider Moplah Outbreaks.	
Arrangement of business of the Assembly.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Addressed of Welcome to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Welcome to H. E. Lord Reading.	
Demand for Supplementary Grant.	
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Bill.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Emigration Bill.	
The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill.	
The Carriers (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Post Office (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Marine (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Works of Defence (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian War Relief Trust Bill.	
The Moplah Outbreaks.	
TUESDAY, 10TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	157—243
Oath.	
Questions and Answers.	
Message from the Council of State.	
Point of Procedure.	
The Exclusion from Inheritance Bill.	
The adoption (Registration) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Repeal of Workmen's Breach of Contract Act.	
Postponement of the Discussion on Mr. Samarth's Resolution.	
Procedure for taking Divisions.	
Legislative Business.	

	PAGE
THURSDAY, 15TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	215-379
Questions and Answers.	
Statement of Government Business.	
The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
The Negotiable Instruments (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Post Office (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Marine (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Works of Defence (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Lac Cess Bill.	
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill.	
The Press Law Repeal and Amendment Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Distinctions between Indians and Non-Indians and the Removal of their Mode of Trial.	
MONDAY, 19TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	381-483
Oaths.	
Questions and Answers.	
Allotted Days for Voting on Supplementary Grants.	
Statement of Government Business.	
Election of Deputy President.	
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill.	
The Carriers (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Lac Cess Bill.	
The Indian Income-tax Bill.	
The Indian Contract (Amendment) Bill.	
Message from the Council of State.	
TUESDAY, 20TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	485-638
Death of Raja Sivanandan Prasad Singh	
Questions and Answers.	
Motion for adjournment.	
Bills passed by the Council of State.	
The Transfer of Property (Amendment) Bill.	
The Adoption (Registration) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Purity of Administration in the various Depart- ments of the Government of India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions.	
Precedence of Notices of Bills and Resolutions.	
WEDNESDAY, 21ST SEPTEMBER, 1921	637a-671
Oath.	
Questions and Answers.	
Election of Deputy President.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Reconstitution of the Provinces of India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Transfer of Judicial Administration of the North- West Frontier Province.	

THURSDAY, 22ND SEPTEMBER, 1921	673-903 -
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Notice of Questions.	
Distribution of Blue Books	
Election of the Deputy President.	
Demands for Supplementary Grants.	
FRIDAY, 23RD SEPTEMBER, 1921	909-975
The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Bill.	
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Income-tax Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Purchase of Stores by the High Commissioner for India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> . the Construction of the Sukkur Barrage.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indian Autonomy.	
Programme of Government Business for the Rest of the Session.	
Use of the Chamber Precincts for a Non-Parliamentary Purpose.	
MONDAY, 26TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	977-1064
Statement laid on the Table.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Message from His Excellency the Viceroy.	
Programme of Government Business for the Rest of the Session.	
The Indian Factory (Amendment) Bill.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Exclusion from Inheritance Bill.	
The Press Law Repeal and Amendment Bill.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Cattle Trespass (Amendment) Bill.	
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill.	
The Musalman Waqfs Registration Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Limitation of Hours of Work in the Fishing Industry.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Establishment of National Seamen's Code.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Unemployment Insurance for Seamen.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Minimum Age for Admission of Children to Employment at Sea.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Unemployment Indemnity Case of Loss or Foundering of a Ship.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Facilities for finding Employment for Seamen.	
Message from the Council of State.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Enhancement of Pensions of Civil Pensioners.	
Last Day of the Session.	

TUESDAY, 27TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	1065—1139
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Invalidation of Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Anti-Drink Movement in India.	
Messages from the Council of State.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Equalizing the Number of Indians and Europeans in certain Posts.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Amendment of Indian Evidence Act.	
WEDNESDAY, 28TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	1141—1218
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Election of the Deputy President.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Medical Diplomas of Indian Universities.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Permanent Capital of India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Reserve Railway Compartments for Different Communities.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Postal System in India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Reserved Railway Compartments for different Communities.	
THURSDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	1219—1299
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
The Indian Income tax Bill.	
The Maintenance Orders Enforcement Bill.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indian Autonomy.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Recruitment for All-India Services.	
FRIDAY, 30TH SEPTEMBER, 1921	1291—1331
Statements laid on the Table.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Point of Order.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Recruitment for All-India Services.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Railway Committee's Report.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Contribution to the Governor General in Council by the Government of Bengal.	
Provisional Date of re-assembling.	
INDEX	1—150

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 29th September, 1921.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Half Past Ten of the Clock. The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

LOCAL ALLOWANCE TO CLERKS OF GENERAL POST OFFICE, SIMLA.

644. **Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) Is it not a fact that the Postmaster-General, Punjab, has passed order, fixing a universal scale of Rs. 20 per mensem as local allowance to all clerks of General Post Office, Simla?
- (b) Is it not a fact that this order will reduce substantially the local allowance already drawn by these poor clerks?
- (c) Is it not also a fact that these clerks had submitted a memorial asking for increase in the said allowance which has now been reduced rather than increased?
- (d) If answer to parts (a), (b) and (c) is in the affirmative, will the Government give reasons for the reduction also stating whether it was proposed to reconsider their decision and maintain the existing scale if not further increase it. If not, why not?

Sir S. D'A. Crookshank: (a) and (b). The orders were passed by Government and not by the Postmaster-General. There has been no reduction in the case of clerks on pay below Rs. 50, while the local allowance in the case of those on Rs. 50 and above is reduced by Rs. 5.

(c) Government have received a telegram to this effect.

(d) Prior to the 1st September 1921, postal clerks in Simla on pay below Rs. 50 drew a local allowance of Rs. 20, while those on pay of Rs. 50 and above drew Rs. 25. As a result of the recent increase in pay, by the introduction of a time-scale of Rs. 40—130, local allowance at a uniform rate of Rs. 20 has been sanctioned for them with effect from the 1st September 1921. The Honourable Member's attention is invited to paragraph 26 of Chapter II of the Report of the Postal Committee of 1920. It will be seen that the Committee were of opinion that with the revision of pay proposed by them there was no occasion whatever to increase the amount of existing local allowances while the retention of two different rates was not considered desirable now that all the men are on a single time-scale.

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

TRANSFER OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF POST OFFICES AND FIRST CLASS POST MASTERS.

89. **Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha:** (a) Is it a fact that Postmasters-General transfer Superintendents and 1st class Postmasters in their circle without the previous sanction of the Director-General but that they are not authorised to order such transfers?

(1219)

(b) Do the Government propose to issue orders that no transfer of such officers, in any case, is made by the Postmaster-General and in cases of administrative emergency previous sanction of the Director-General is applied for and obtained by telegram?

Colonel Sir S. D'A. Crookshank : (a) Assistant Postmaster-General has authority to transfer any of his subordinates within his circle (Rule 484 of the Post Office Manual Vol. II).

(b) No such orders are considered necessary.

PROBATIONARY SUPERINTENDENTS AND POSTMASTERS.

90. **Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha :** (a) Will the Government of India state the principle under which the appointment of Probationary Superintendent and Probationary Postmaster is made in the Post Office and mention the qualifications and the educational standard that are required for such appointments?

(b) Will the Government lay on the table a list showing names and particulars of all the Probationary Superintendents and Probationary Postmasters at present?

Colonel Sir S. D'A. Crookshank : (a) The appointments are made on the nomination of the Postmaster-General. Probationary Postmasterships are being abolished in accordance with the recommendations of the Postal Committee, 1920. The educational standard required for appointment as a Superintendent is a university degree or its equivalent; social standing and physical fitness are also necessary qualifications.

(b) A statement is laid on the table.

POST OFFICE.

Probationary Postmasters and Probationary Superintendents.

PROBATIONARY POSTMASTERS IN SEPTEMBER 1921.		PROBATIONARY SUPERINTENDENTS IN SEPTEMBER 1921.	
Names and Circles to which attached.	Particulars.	Names and Circles to which attached.	Particulars.
BENGAL AND ASSAM.		BENGAL AND ASSAM.	
Sriachandra Basu ...	A graduate—son of a departmental officer.	1. A. B. M. Bedar Bakht 2. Dharendra N. Mitter.	A graduate. Do.
BIHAR AND ORISSA.		BIHAR AND ORISSA.	
Sadar Ali Khan ...	A graduate	1. Nripendra Nath Banerji. 2. T. F. Scott O'Connor.	A graduate—son of a departmental Officer. Received King's Roadship for Sandhurst.
		BOMBAY.	
		1. H. H. Hebbard ... 2. F. Ribeiro ...	Specially promoted from a clerical appointment in recognition of Field Service. An M. A.

PROBATIONARY POSTMASTERS IN SEPTEMBER 1921.		PROBATIONARY SUPERINTENDENTS IN SEPTEMBER 1921.	
Names and Circles to which attached.	Particulars.	Names and Circles to which attached.	Particulars.
MADRAS.		BURMA.	
G. G. E. Combes ...	Specially promoted from a clerical appointment in recognition of Field Service.	1. L. H. D. Walker ...	A qualified candidate—formerly a telegraphist—son of a departmental officer.
C. G. C. Walker ...	Son of a departmental officer.	CENTRAL CIRCLES.	
PUNJAB AND NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.		1. Mohd. Saidullah	A graduate.
M. J. A. Wood ...	Son of a departmental officer.	2. Rai Sahib Dhanpat Rai (temporary).	Do.
Indians ... 2		MADRAS.	
Non-Indians ... 3		1. E. O. Steale (temporarily attached w/o Burma).	Specially promoted from a clerical appointment.
		2. E. T. Dias ...	A graduate.
		3. T. Ramiah (temporary).	An M. A.
		PUNJAB AND NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.	
		1. Bishen Dass ...	An M. A.—son of a departmental officer.
		2. Gian Deb ...	A graduate—son of a departmental officer.
		UNITED PROVINCES.	
		1. S. M. Sabir Hussain	A graduate.
		2. H. C. Eccleston, M.B.E.	Specially promoted from a clerical appointment in recognition of Field Service.
		RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.	
		1. Amiruddin Ahmed	A graduate.
		2. Harbansial Jorath	A graduate—son of a departmental officer.
		Indians ... 11	
		Non-Indians ... 7	

APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF SUPERINTENDENTS OF POST OFFICES.

91. **Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha:** (a) Is it a fact that although the Director-General of Post Offices is to control the appointment and promotion of Superintendents, yet he very seldom comes in contact with such officers?

(b) Will the Government mention the details of the tours of the Director-General during the last four months, and the number of the Divisional offices that he visited during his tours?

(c) It is a fact that the Director-General does not generally visit the Superintendent's offices during the course of his tours? If so, why not?

Colonel Sir S. D. Crookshank: (a) Superintendents are under the immediate control of the Postmaster-General of the Circle to which they are

attached, but the Director-General nevertheless year in and year out comes into contact with a large number of Superintendents.

(b) A statement is laid on the table.

(c) The Postmaster-General being the chief Postal Officer in the Circle visits and inspects the Superintendents' offices as often as he can and submits his reports and recommendations to the Director-General. It would be impossible for the Director-General to do this work himself as he is concerned mainly with the larger questions of policy and administration. Government do not consider that any advantage would be gained by requiring him to devote part of his time to routine inspections as suggested by the Honourable Member.

Statement showing the details of the Director-General's tour during the last four months.

Names of places visited.	Dates.	Purpose of visit.	REMARKS.
1. Cawnpore ...	11th July 1921 ...	Inspection of the Cawnpore head post office with reference to the new extension to the building in which the office is located.	
2. Allahabad...	13th July 1921 ...	Inspection of the Allahabad head post office with reference to the many serious complaints received against the working of that office.	
3. Calcutta ...	16th July 1921 to 25th July 1921.	Although Simla is the headquarters of the Director-General, his main office is in Calcutta, and he has to visit that place and stay there at times as occasions arise, for settlement of complicated questions after personal discussion with his subordinate officers.	
4. Madras ...	29th and 30th July	Inspection of Postmaster-General's office and personal discussion with him of important questions relating to Postal Administration in that Circle.	
5. Calcutta ...	3rd to 13th August	Return to main office.	
6. Bombay ...	16th and 17th August	Same as in item 4.	

PUSA AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE.

97. Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha: Will the Government be pleased to state

- (a) What amount of money has been spent up to date on the Pusa Agricultural Institute, since its establishment?
- (b) How many students have been admitted in the Institute every year, and how many of them have come out successful up to date?
- (c) What practical steps have been taken by the authorities of the Institute to popularise the improved method of Agriculture among the people?

Mr. J. Hullah: The information is being obtained and will be supplied to the Honourable Member.

TRANSFER OF MANAGEMENT OF THE TIRHUT STATE RAILWAY.

93. **Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the terms on which the Tirhut State Railway Section was handed over to the Bengal North-Western Railway for management?

(b) When does the term of lease expire?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn: (a & b) The Honourable Member is referred to the information published on pages 162 to 164 of the History of Indian Railways constructed and in progress corrected up to 31st March 1920.

MANAGEMENT OF THE BENGAL NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

94. **Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha:** Is the Government aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists among the travelling public with regard to the management of the Bengal North-Western Railway on the following points:

- (a) Difficulty in obtaining wagons.
- (b) Habitual over-crowding of third class passengers in the trains and the practice of conveying third class passengers in goods wagons during occasions of festivals and fairs?
- (c) Absence of, or inadequate supply of drinking water at the stations?
- (d) Dirty conditions of carriages, and absence of fans in first and second class carriages?
- (e) Slow running of trains and unnecessary stoppages at road side stations?
- (f) Incivility of Railway employees towards Indian passengers, especially at Junction Stations?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn: The Government of India are aware that a Resolution on the alleged unsatisfactory working of the Bengal and North Western Railway was carried unanimously by the non-official members of the Bihar and Orissa Legislative Council on the 22nd July 1921. Enquiries have been made and where considered necessary the various matters will be taken up with the Railway Administration:—

- (a) Until recently, the position as regards wagon supply was difficult. This was due in a great measure to the fact that a large proportion of the available supply was absorbed in the coal traffic. The coal position however is easier, and the wagon position generally has much improved. The position was also accentuated owing to congestion on the Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railway and the strike on the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway. 300 wagons have since been added to the stock and it is expected that the supply will, in future, meet the demand.
- (b) Overcrowding is due to passengers being unwilling to wait for following trains. Special trains are invariably run when necessary and goods vehicles are only used when the passenger stock is taxed beyond its capacity. I can assure the Honourable Member that everything possible is being done to improve matters, but he will realise that this is necessarily a question of time and funds.
- (c) The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given during this session to question No. 487 asked by Rai Bahadur Luchhmi Prasad Sinha on the same subject.
- (d) Government are not aware that the condition of the carriages on the Bengal and North Western Railway compares unfavourably

with those on other railways in India. Fans are provided in some of the 1st class compartments and provision of further fans in the remaining 1st class compartments is being arranged. As regards the provision of fans in 2nd class compartments the Honourable Member is referred to the reply given to question No. 562 asked by Rai Bahadar Pandit Sankata Prasada Bajpai during this Session.

- (e) The matter is under reference with the Railway Administration.
 (f) The railway staff have special instructions to treat passengers with courtesy and give them all possible help.

In this connection the Honourable Member is referred to the answer given during this session to question No. 123 asked by Haji Wajihuddin on a similar subject.

RAILWAY PASSENGER SUPERINTENDENTS.

95. **Babu Baidyanath Prasad Sinha:** Is it a fact that in spite of the Resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly, in its last Session recommending the appointment of Passenger Superintendents, on all Railways to look after the comforts of the passengers, no such appointments have been made by the Bengal North-Western Railway?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn: Government are aware that up to about the middle of last month no Passenger Superintendents had been appointed on the Bengal and North-Western Railway, but they have ascertained that the Agent has recommended to his Board of Directors the appointment of fully qualified men, selected from the existing Traffic Staff, to be stationed at certain of the more important junctions as Passenger Superintendents.

AMENDMENTS OF THE RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS ACT.

96. **Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to state whether they have any intention of amending the Religious Endowments Act?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: No. The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the facts that the subject of religious and charitable endowments is a provincial transferred subject, and the Religious Endowments Act, 1863, is not one of the Acts specified in the schedule attached to the Local Legislatures (Previous Sanction) Rules.

MUNITIONS FRAUD CASE.

97. **Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) If the Advocate General of Bengal was consulted prior to the launching of complaint in the Munition Fraud Case which has been withdrawn?
 (b) The amount of expenses incurred in the said case up to the date of withdrawal?

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: The answer to (a) is in the affirmative.

With regard to (b), I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer I gave to similar questions on the 20th September 1921.

COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION IN INDIA FOR INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE.

98. **Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar:** Will Government be pleased to state whether they propose to hold competitive examination in India for selection of officers for the Indian Civil Service, and if so, when?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given to Mr. P. L. Misra's Question on the same subject on the 20th September 1921.

CONSTRUCTION OF A RAILWAY BETWEEN POLLACHY AND MADATHU KULAM.

99. Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar: Will Government be pleased to state if they have sanctioned the construction of a Railway between Pollachy and Madathu Kulam in Coimbatore District, Madras Presidency?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn: The reply is in the negative.

I would invite the Honourable Member's attention to the reply given to him in this Assembly on the 17th March last, regarding the Dindigul-Palghat Railway of which the Pollachi-Madathu-Kulam line forms a part.

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THEIR TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE.

100. Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar: Will Government be pleased to state whether effect was given to the Resolution moved by Rai Bahadur J. N. Majumdar in the last session of this Assembly recommending that Members of the Assembly should have equal status and recognition in regard to travelling allowance, etc., to that enjoyed by Members of the Council of State?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: The daily allowances admissible to Members of the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly have been equalized. The question of the removal of the distinction now existing between the concessions admissible to Members of the two Chambers for railway journeys is under consideration. For the reasons indicated in the speeches of Mr. O'Donnell and myself at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on the 2nd March 1921, the Government of India were unable to accept the recommendation regarding the title of "Honourable."

THE PRESENT MONEY MARKET AND BUSINESS CONCERNS.

101. Rai N. N. Chaudhuri Bahadur: (a) Are the Government aware of the fact that many of the commercial, industrial and manufacturing undertakings lately started in India are in great financial difficulties, in some cases threatening their very existence owing to the present tightness of the money-market?

(b) Do the Government know that such concerns started by Indians do not generally receive any financial help from those exchange and other banks, which are controlled by Europeans, in spite of their having assets to cover any loan or credit required?

(c) Was the attention of the Government drawn to a paper entitled "A state-bank for India" read by Mr. J. C. Mitra of Calcutta before the All-India Industrial Conference held in that city in December 1918?

(d) If the answer be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state if they took due notice of the proposals formulated in that paper, while organising the Imperial Bank of India and if so, what step, if any, they took or propose to take to give effect to the suggestions contained in that paper?

(e) If the answer be in the negative, do the Government now propose to consider the possibility of giving effect to such proposals through the Imperial Bank of India?

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey: (a) The Government are aware that many of the undertakings started in India during the company promoting boom of 1919 have not fulfilled the expectations entertained at the time of their

flotation. I do not however agree with the Honourable Member's observation regarding the present tightness of the money market. I should myself be inclined to say that money conditions generally are at present decidedly easy, so far as concerns borrowers whose credit is good.

(b) The Government have no information which would lead them to suppose that the banks exercise any racial discrimination in the matter. So far as I am aware, in dealing with applications for loans the banks have regard mainly to the credit of the applicant.

(c) The answer is in the negative. I may note that the paper was read in 1917 not in 1918 as stated.

(d) Does not arise.

(e) The scheme contained in the paper is mainly based on a proposal for financing a state bank by the issue of paper money without backing. Government would be entirely averse from any such proposal.

FOREIGN AND POLITICAL DEPARTMENT PRESS.

102. **Mr. K. Ahmed:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state if it is a fact that the scale of pay in all the Government of India Presses except the Foreign and Political Department Press was revised last year?

(b) When was the present scale of pay in the Foreign and Political Department Press introduced?

(c) Has the Government received any memorials from the employees of the Foreign and Political Department Press for a revision of scale? If so, how many up to the present time and since when?

(d) Do the Foreign and Political Department Press and the Private Secretary to the Viceroy's Press perform the same nature of duties? If so, do the Government propose to give the same scale of pay in both the Presses?

(e) If the answer to (a) be in the affirmative will the Government be pleased to state if they intend to revise the scale of the Foreign and Political Department Press also? If so, when?

(f) Is it a fact that the Foreign and Political Department Press employees were not allowed Family Travelling Allowance during the last Delhi move? If not, why not?

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: (a) Yes.

(b) 1st April 1890 except in the case of 3 minor appointments the pay of which was revised about 1891. Since 1918 the men have been receiving temporary war allowances to compensate them for the high cost of living.

(c) Yes. Six memorials have been received since May 1908.

(d) No; the work done in the Private Secretary to the Viceroy's Press is of an exceptionally confidential nature, and the employees of that Press have therefore to be accorded special consideration.

(e) The question of the revision of the scale of pay in the Foreign and Political Department Press is under consideration and orders will be issued as soon as possible.

(f) Yes. Family travelling allowance is not granted to the staff of the Private Secretary to the Viceroy's or any other Press.

ASSAM-BENGAL RAILWAY STRIKE AND TEA GARDEN COOLIES AT CHANDPORE.

103. **Munshi Abdul Rahman:** (a) Is it a fact that the Honourable Sir Thomas Holland and the Honourable Sir William Vincent, Executive Members of the India Government and the Honourable Sir Henry Wheeler, an Executive Member of the Bengal Government, went to Chandpore after the Assam-Bengal Railway Strike to enquire into the real cause of the strike

of the Assam-Bengal Railway employees and the Assam Tea-Garden coolies? If so, will the Government be pleased to lay on the table the results of their enquiries?

(b) Has the attention of the India Government been drawn to the statement of the Honourable Mr. J. H. Kerr, a Member of the Bengal Executive Council, on Tuesday, the 6th September 1921, in connection with the Assam-Bengal Railway Strike in the Bengal Council Meeting to the effect that out of 8,000 men who went on strike last May 3,500 have returned to work up to date, approximately 3,400 new men have been appointed and there are still 1,100 vacancies on the pre-strike establishment to be filled?

(c) Do the Government propose to take any step for the early settlement of the Assam-Bengal Railway Strike? What step have they taken up to now to settle the strike and to what effect?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state whether there is any truth in the rumour that the Assam-Bengal Railway authorities privately promised to pay a sum amounting to one lakh to some so-called Muhammadan Leaders of Chittagong and they in turn signed a confidential agreement to break the strike at a very early date?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn : (a) The Honourable Sir William Vincent and the Honourable Sir Thomas Holland did not visit Chandpur. The Honourable Sir Henry Wheeler did visit Chandpur to enquire into the conditions obtaining there and his report has been published *in extenso* in the Press.

(b) The Government have seen the statement referred to. They have also received later reports from the Agent, Assam Bengal Railway. All those men who expressed their willingness to return to duty have been taken back. Those who have not yet returned to duty and for whom places can be found will be taken on. The establishments of all branches of the railway service are however practically full.

(c) The strike is now over. While it lasted every effort was made by the railway administration to induce the strikers to return.

(d) There is no truth in the rumour.

CONCESSIONS FOR A FEW CLERKS AND ASSISTANTS OF THE IMPERIAL SECRETARIAT.

104. **Rai Bahadur J. L. Bhargava :** Do the Government propose to consider the desirability of making some concession in the case of such Assistants and Clerks employed in the Government of India Secretariat as will not be able to reach the maximum pay even after putting in 30 years' service, by giving them a few increments in advance of the due dates?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : The Honourable Member is referred to my reply in this Assembly on the 22nd September 1921 to part (e) of Lala Girdharilal Agarwala's Question on the same subject.

THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX BILL.

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey : Sir, I beg to move :

'That the following eight Members of the Legislative Assembly be nominated to serve on the Joint Committee to consider and report on the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to Income-tax and Super-tax, namely :

Mr. Manmohandas Ramji, Mr. N. C. Sircar, Mr. Narayandas Girdhardas, Munshi Iswar Saran, Mr. P. P. Ghitwala, Dr. H. S. Gour, Mr. Sim and myself.'

The motion was adopted.

THE MAINTENANCE ORDERS ENFORCEMENT BILL.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I move :

'That the Legislative Assembly do agree to the further amendments made by the Council of State in the Bill to facilitate the enforcement in British India of Maintenance Orders made in other parts of His Majesty's Dominions and Protectorates and *vice versa*, as passed by the Legislative Assembly.'

The Bill has been before the Assembly on more occasions than one and the only modification which the Council of State have made in it is a drafting amendment which was proposed by Government. The definition of the term 'reciprocating territory' in clause 2 of the Bill was found to be inappropriate and after the word 'Dominions,' the words 'outside British India' have been added. It is a purely formal amendment and, I think, an improvement in the Bill. I trust that this Assembly will accept it.

The motion was adopted.

THE CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, I have the honour to move for leave to introduce :

'A Bill further to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908.'

From the short Statement of Objects and Reasons appended to the Bill, Honourable Members will see that the object I have in view in amending the two rules 32 and 33 of Order XXI in the Code of Civil Procedure is to bring the Indian law into line with the English law. As Honourable Members will see, by the Matrimonial Causes Act of 1884 (Sections 2 to 4) the imprisonment of women in execution of a decree obtained against them for the restitution of conjugal rights has been abolished. In India in the early sixties women could be bodily handed over to the husband. Later on the Legislature came in and substituted imprisonment in lieu of manual delivery.

In the existing Code of Civil Procedure, the matter is left to the discretion of the Court. Now Honourable Members will realise that the wife may have very good reasons which she may not like to disclose to the Court; and the Court may then send her to jail for disobedience of the decree for restitution of conjugal rights. I submit that the time has now come when we should place our law on the same footing as it is in England and with these remarks I crave leave of the House to introduce this Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

*RESOLUTION *RE*: INDIAN AUTONOMY—*contd.*

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: Sir, I rise to move the amendment which stands in my name on the agenda paper. It runs thus :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to appoint a Committee consisting of officials and non-officials including Members of the Indian Legislature to consider the best way of bringing about provincial autonomy in all the Governors' provinces and of introducing responsibility in the Central Government and to make recommendations.'

* This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to move the Secretary of State for India in Council for taking necessary steps for ensuring :

- (1) the transfer, from the beginning of the next term of the Legislative Councils, of all provincial subjects to the administration of the Governor acting with ministers
- (2) the transfer, from the beginning of the next term of the Legislative Assembly from among the central subjects of all subjects except Army, Navy, Foreign and Political Departments to the administration of the Governor General acting with ministers, provision being made for such constitutional changes as may be necessary in that behalf, on the lines of the provision for administration of transferred subjects of the Local Governments; and
- (3) conferment from the beginning of the fourth term of the Legislative Assembly, of full Dominion Self-Government in India.

Sir, there is before the House the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar, and the amendment to that Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Agnihotri.

If I rise to move this amendment, it is not for the purpose of opposing the principle that underlies the Resolution of my Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar, but only to suggest a different method of bringing about the end that his Resolution has in view.

My amendment divides itself into two parts. The vital part of the amendment recognises the fact that the time has come when consideration should be given to the question of bringing about full provincial autonomy in the Governors' provinces and of introducing responsibility in the Central Government. The second part, which is not a vital part of the Resolution, aims at the suggestion of a method for the purpose of securing that end. So far as that part of the amendment is concerned, many methods have been suggested and are likely to be suggested, and I am sure the House will accept the method that appeals to it as the best. I do not personally accept the method suggested by the Honourable the Mover of this Resolution for this reason. The Honourable the Mover of this Resolution fixes a time limit for the securing of Dominion status for India. He also suggests a time limit for the securing of certain steps by way of progress towards responsible Government. Now, personally, I am not prepared to accept a time limit, because I am one of those who hope that this country will reach Dominion status, considering the rapid pace at which we are making progress, much earlier than the time limit contemplated by the Honourable the Mover. At the same time, it is hardly fair even to the Government to tie its hands down to a particular period. It is not possible, I believe, at this stage to say how long we shall take in securing for this country full Dominion status. On that ground I cannot accept the Resolution of the Honourable the Mover.

There is another method also, of which the author was my Honourable friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, and that is the method of accepting at once dyarchy in the Central Government, a system of Government that obtains in the provinces at the present moment. Now, I do not think we should be prepared to accept that method arbitrarily without giving a chance to a Committee to investigate the matter thoroughly and decide as to whether it is at all necessary to repeat the experiment of the provinces in the Central Government. I shall remind the House of what took place in the Committee room of the House of Commons when Mr. Curtis was being examined by Mr. Montagu. The Secretary of State, Mr. Montagu, asked Mr. Curtis, 'is it not possible that you may have to dispense with dyarchy in the Central Government and that responsibility may come in the Central Government without the intermediate stage of dyarchy.' Mr. Curtis replied, 'it is possible, but not highly probable.' The House will therefore recognise that even when the Reform Bill was being discussed in the Joint Committee, in the mind of the Secretary of State there was lurking assuredly the idea that it would be possible to introduce responsibility in the Central Government without resort to dyarchy.

Having disposed of these two methods, suggested by the Honourable the Mover and my esteemed friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, I now come to the vital part of my amendment, namely, the recognition of this fact that the time has now come for a consideration of the question of introducing responsibility in the

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

Central Government and of giving full provincial autonomy to the provinces. Now, Sir, it is hardly necessary for me to repeat here that this demand for the introduction of responsibility in the Central Government has not come up suddenly, and that this demand existed even when the reform scheme was being discussed, and it is hardly necessary for me to remind the House and the Government of India that when the evidence was being taken by the Joint Committee, almost all the deputations, the Moderate deputation, the National Home Rule League deputation, the Congress deputation, and almost all the other deputations, were at one in making this demand that responsibility should be introduced in the Central Government. It is also hardly necessary for me to remind the House that the Moderates urged this demand with as great zeal and enthusiasm as the so-called Extremists did, and it would not be out of place here to inform the House that one of our own colleagues, my esteemed friend, Mr. Samarth, who belonged to the Moderate deputation, said in answer to a question, I believe, by Mr. Montagu, that it was the unanimous will of the country that responsibility should be introduced in the Central Government; and asked as to what the result would be if responsibility were not introduced, Mr. Samarth frankly said that it would be followed by an agitation in the whole country which would stagger the imagination of the Government. I want to emphasize this fact once more that this demand for responsibility in the Central Government has not sprung up suddenly; that it was a demand made, if I may say so, by the whole country at the time when the Reform scheme was being discussed. // The two main objections that were then taken to the introduction of responsibility were these, that in the first place, in the absence of a wide electorate in the country, it was not possible to introduce responsibility and to dispense with the responsibility of the Members of the Executive Council to Parliament, and, secondly, that India was not yet a nation in the sense in which other nations were nations, that there were many castes and creeds, many communities and many interests in India, and, therefore, in view of the responsibility of the Government of India to Parliament, it was not possible for the Joint Committee to suggest that responsibility should be introduced in the Central Government. //

I shall deal with these two objections. As for the question of a wide electorate, I believe it hardly lies in the mouth of any one nation to say to another that 'we refuse responsibility in your Government because you have not got an electorate wide enough.' I venture to believe that when the Reform Bill was introduced in the House of Commons in 1832, the electorate was not wide enough; and if the argument had been applied then by the Members of Parliament, then probably the Reform Act of 1832 would not have come into existence. But apart from that consideration, I venture to submit, that considering the progress that we have made in this country and considering the fact that the political consciousness of this country has grown and is growing most wonderfully, I venture to submit that it would be possible to work out an electorate which would be wide enough. The second objection, that India is not yet a nation, hardly deserves an answer. Sir, it is futile to say that India is not a nation and has not a national ideal. On the contrary, I believe that the events that have taken place in this country point clearly to the fact that India is not only a nation, that not only has there grown in India a national ideal, but ambitions have arisen in this country as a consequence of the growth of the national ideal which, if not met in the proper spirit and at the

proper time, I am afraid the danger is that the ideal of India might grow too national, and perhaps it may be then too late to bring India to accept the right ideal which would be conducive to the welfare both of Great Britain and India.

Sir, at the time when the Reforms Scheme was being discussed, in the mind of the Government of India and in the minds of even some Members of Parliament, there was a lurking suspicion that the experiment, which was, I admit, a unique experiment, might not prove successful. There was, if I may say so, want of sufficient confidence in the people of this country, in their ability to manage efficiently a system of representative government. Is there any ground for any such apprehension now? What does Lord Chelmsford, our late Viceroy, say? He says that the sense of reason and balance that have been displayed by the Members of the Indian Legislature and the Members of the Provincial Councils have been to him a marvel and a revelation. What does our own President, if I may, Sir, refer to your opinion, himself say? In the letter that found publication in the 'Observer' by the happy mistake of a friend.....

Mr. President : Order, order. The Honourable Member has said that it is a happy mistake; I lay stress on the word 'mistake,' and the Honourable Member will treat it as a mistake.

Mr. Jamsadas Dwarkadas : I accept the verdict of the President and admit that it was a mistake, from my point of view, happy. By the mistake of a friend who committed an indiscretion....

Mr. President : The Honourable Member has not understood the meaning of my intervention. The private opinion of the Chair should not be brought into a debate. As far as this House is concerned, the Chair has no opinions.

Mr. Jamsadas Dwarkadas : I bow to your ruling, and I will not refer to the opinion that you were good enough to express. However, having quoted the opinion of Lord Chelmsford, I now come to this point. I may be permitted, Sir, to cite the opinion of my friend, the Honourable the Home Member, who, I am told, at the dinner that was given to Mr. Muddiman, himself admitted that the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly had acquitted themselves in a most excellent manner. Sir, ever since the Assembly was adjourned at Delhi, we have been hearing of opinions expressed by responsible English statesmen that the Assembly and the Council of State and the Provincial Legislatures have done remarkably well. Sir, I may also point out that His Excellency the Viceroy the other day said that the present constitution was nothing more than a compromise, and that there were in this constitution anomalies and difficulties which we are bound to get over in course of time. Mr. Montagu himself, in an interview to a press representative, said :

'I can say without hesitation, there is a remarkable and most distinct advance in the position of India. There is no use disguising the fact that transitional periods are a very awkward thing, full of anomalies and full of difficulties, and I am giving the views of my two colleagues.'

He was referring to the Right Honourable Mr. Sastri and the Maharaja of Cochin.

'When I say that we cannot help recognising these difficulties, finding in them every reason for accentuating the hope for an early termination of the transitional stage and the acquisition by India of full dominion status.'

[Mr. Jammadas Dwarkadas.]

Sir, the Secretary of State himself, who is joint author of the Reforms Scheme, admits that the transitional stage should be gone through very quickly and that full dominion status should be given to India.

Then, again, Sir, you will remember and this House will remember, that when the Congress League scheme of 1916 was presented to Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford, it was rejected on the ground that an irremovable executive was incompatible with an elected majority. If that scheme was rejected on that ground, is it justifiable that that very anomaly should exist in the present constitution? At the Delhi Session the Honourable the Home Member rightly pointed out that this House had powers wider than were contemplated by the authors of the Reforms Scheme.

I entirely agree with him, but is it not a greater reason that if this House has wide powers of controlling the administration, is it not a greater reason for introducing responsibility into this House? If I may say so, I think that the position of the Government Members here in this Assembly is more difficult than the position of Cabinet Ministers in Parliament. When a Minister of the Cabinet brings in a Bill or a motion, he is sure of the ultimate backing of the House, and if he fails to secure that, he has in most cases to go out of power; but when a Member of this Government comes to this House with a Bill or a resolution, I am not exaggerating when I say that all the time he is trembling in his shoes as to whether he will get the support of the House or not. I submit, Sir, that this state of affairs should not be allowed to continue even in regard to Government Members, and nothing is more desirable than that they should also have a sense of responsibility to this House. If I may be permitted to do so, Sir, I should like to pay a warm tribute to the keen sense of responsibility that the Members of the Government have shown to Members of this House in spite of the fact that by the Act they are not required to do so. It is needless for me to say that the Indian Members are sure to feel that sense, but I would emphasise the fact that even the English Members of Government have shown a sense of responsibility which is remarkable and which, I am sure, will be an example to be emulated by their successors, even, by their Indian successors.

Sir, I hope you will forgive me if I exceed the time limit but I promise to curtail my remarks.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time.

Mr. Jammadas Dwarkadas: I shall endeavour to bring my remarks to a close in a very few minutes now.

Sir, so far as responsibility in the Central Government itself is concerned, I do think that I have established a case for it. So far as full provincial autonomy is concerned, I do not think that we are in a position to say whether dyarchy has succeeded in the Provincial Governments, but we have the opinion of a responsible Minister of the United Provinces, my friend, Mr. Chintamani, who says that in the United Provinces the system has succeeded because dyarchy has been on paper and that the Governor of the Central Provinces has taken Ministers as well as Members into equal confidence; that, therefore, accounts for the success of the system in the United Provinces.

Sir, that very success encourages us to believe that if full provincial autonomy was established in other provinces, there would not be the slightest

ground for fear that responsible Ministers would not recognise alone with their responsibility to their constituents, also their responsibility to Parliament. I submit therefore that I have made out a case for considering the question of introducing responsibility in the Central Government and of establishing full provincial autonomy in the provinces. I also venture to submit that all these methods require that the whole subject should be considered by a committee and should not be decided arbitrarily. I hope therefore that the Government will accept this amendment and that Honourable Members of this House will accord their support to it.

Mr. President : Before I put the amendment I had better remind the House of the exact position in which we stand. I need not put the Resolution as it is well known to Members of the Assembly.

There was moved by Mr. Agnihotri just before the adjournment on the last occasion, the following amendment, to substitute for the original Resolution the words :

‘With a view to very early conferment of full Dominion Self-government in this country, this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council, to appoint a Joint Committee of both the Houses of the Indian Legislature to frame proposals for :

- (a) The transference of all provincial subjects to the administration of the Governor acting with Ministers responsible to the Provincial Legislature ;
- (b) The transference from among the Central subjects of all subjects except Army, Navy, Political and Foreign Departments to the administration of the Governor General acting with Ministers responsible to the Indian Legislature ; or conferment of increased powers and control on the Indian Legislature over all the departments of the Central Government.’

since which an amendment has been moved :

‘This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to appoint a Committee consisting of officials and non-officials including Members of the Indian Legislature to consider the best way of bringing about Provincial Autonomy in all the Governors’ provinces and of introducing responsibility in the Central Government and to make recommendations.’

The amendment moved by the Honourable Member from Bombay I propose to take as an amendment of the original amendment moved by Mr. Agnihotri.

Mr. E. L. Price : Sir, it was with great regret that I found that Mr. Majumdar secured a place for his Resolution, and I was very glad of the adjournment of the debate the other day because it gave me time to think over the matter ; and I have come to the conclusion that I am opposed to the Resolution itself and to all and sundry amendments thereof. The reason is that I am a moderate man and I do not care for revolutions more than once a year. Now, Sir, I would lay great stress on the fact that this year we have already had in India a great political revolution, and I would like just to indicate the lines on which, I think, that revolution has taken place. Mr. Majumdar has endeavoured to shed the worthy reputation he earned last Session as a humourist, but I would much prefer that he would endeavour to retain it. He quoted to us Chandra Gupta. Now, Sir, the rule of Chandra Gupta was a personal one. He was an orthodox Hindu and therefore Brahminism flourished. Mr. Majumdar also quoted Asoka. Now Asoka was a Buddhist, and because he was a Buddhist, Brahminism no longer flourished. In both cases the element, the determining element, was that of strong personal rule. If we go on to the time of the great Moghuls, is there any change? Isn't it true of the great

[Mr. E. L. Price.]

Moghul 'whom he would, he slew, whom he would, he kept alive.' Because Akbar was tolerant, the administration was tolerant; because Aurangzeb was intolerant, the administration was intolerant—the strong personal element of rule still prevailed, and when on the ruins of the Moghul Empire, and I might almost say '*faits de mieux*' the British raj took over, the strong personal element still prevailed and has prevailed up to within the last 12 months. Akbar rode 220 miles in 48 hours to save from *suttee* a Hindu princess, and that is a fact which will never be forgotten to his credit. Job Charnock rescued with his strong right arm that Hindu lady from the funeral pyre whom he afterwards made his wife.

You see how personal will overrides everything else, whether that of an Emperor or simply of an administrator? In 1826, Lord Bentinck forbade *suttee* by law. Can anybody claim that Lord Bentinck, when he forced that law on the country, had the support of the country or even of his own councillors? It is on record how much many of his councillors were against the measure, for they thought that it was contrary to the wishes of the people. But personal rule in superiority to all laws and rules such as I have mentioned still obtained. Later, these very reforms under which we sit here—does this House realise how greatly the personal element prevailed in forming them, the personal element in a strong Secretary of State and a strong Viceroy, Lord Chelmsford? I have not done with the strong personal element in the rule of India yet. In September 1920, when the Government of India in the Imperial Legislative Council had an automatic majority, the same automatic majority that passed the Rowlatt Act still remained and passed the law that the gold sovereign was worth Rs. 10. This in defiance of the fact that the market has always been far above that and even up to double. Another instance. According to what I understand is an accepted fact, the Ali Brothers in certain speeches had broken the law. The question was whether they should be prosecuted for it. Lord Reading, the Viceroy, decided that if they apologised for that offence, they should not be prosecuted. It is the same principle of this personal rule. Again, take Sir Thomas Holland's unfortunate affair. What was the offence? Not so much, I think, acting in a strong personal way as acting on the mistaken assumption that his personal decision was the decision of the Government of India. That would seem to show that still the Government of India holds itself above the law. Sir, the element of personal rule bound by no constitutional legal limits is still very strong in this country, and the whole attempt of the Reforms is to change it. I lay the greatest stress on the revolutionary change which is involved to change from personal rule to constitutional rule. Do Members ever realise that the very corruption we discussed in this House is really nothing but an element of the old idea of the personal right of the man in authority to do as he pleases? It is almost impossible to put power in the hands of certain persons without their conceiving they have the right to use it as they will, even though not always in accordance with the highest virtue. Now, in a pamphlet I find on my desk from Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, a gentleman, a Member of this House, with whom I have personal friendship and for whom I have high respect, I find he lays great stress on the idea of this Assembly being competent to do this and that. But, Sir, I must put it that the basis of these Reforms is far broader than this Assembly. The basis of these Reforms must be the country itself and the constituencies which send Members here. Are these constituencies ripe for the elimination of the personal and the

substitution of the constitutional yet. I do not find it is so, Sir. In all the constituencies, to a more or less degree, I find the craving for something like the dictum of a quasi-God or a hero and a willingness to accept dictation from such a person in a most extraordinary manner, which, believe me, is absolutely impossible in a really constitutional democratic state. If I believe in the Reforms, if I have done my best to help them along and to persuade everybody within my orbit that they are worth trying, it is with this idea that as we advance and take each position, we must consolidate it and not dissipate our chances of final success by too rash a forward movement. As a matter of fact, we have gone a certain distance. The revolutionary changes are constitutionally so great that even when Government comes to us for Rs. 2 lakhs to bring a certain Committee to India, the money is denied and the Committee cannot come. That could not have happened last September. Now, as a matter of fact, having advanced so far in a brief six months, I still say that no one can say that we are able to advance a great deal further on this line. It will take time to try and to prove, and it is possible—I am not saying it is likely, but I do say it is possible—that it may turn out that after all, the advance in this direction of a constitution based on democracy which depends not only on the abilities of the Members of this House but on the political capacity of the constituencies from which they come, will be found premature. It is possible that we may even have to retrace our steps and make another start in another direction. For the peace of the country and for the safety of the country I caution moderation. It is not merely a matter I find of a number of men in this Assembly being very anxious for further political reforms. At the same time there is combined with it an apparent desire to weaken the Executive. One or the other at a time. The combination of the two, I suggest, is most dangerous. Let me give some instances. In 1689, we had our first revolution in England, practically bloodless. James II went out and William III came in. The two previous Kings, Charles II and James II had been the pensioners of France, and France had taken the opportunity to encircle England with an iron ring that portended her defeat. William III took another course and smashed that ring, and we have met France ever since as equals. But why was this revolution so smooth and bloodless? The new administration, the new court, displaced none of the old executive. Affairs went on in England as before. The only exception was, I think, certain non-juror bishops. When the Czar was dethroned and Kerensky came to power, there are some people who suppose that if only his Government had remained in power, all would have gone well. I do not think so, because as Kerensky came into power, he destroyed the old executive. In the French Revolution, in the same way, the revolutionist Robespierre destroyed the old executive. When Napoleon became the first Consul, his first anxiety was to restore it, and he accepted back and gave office again to every man who would accept the new regime; and with Napoleon's restoration of the executive, the country again rose from ruins to being the first in Europe.

What was greater than the revolution in Germany? When the Kaiser and his son and his Court fled into Holland, the country was left without a head. It looked as if the whole administration would break down. Further, their armies were still in the field, defeated and in retreat and compelled to sue for terms on what conditions they might. The new Republican Government that took over, however, maintained the old executive and in spite of the

[Mr. E. L. Price.]

disasters that overwhelmed Germany and all her troubles and the severe economic conditions that now prevail against her, the country has maintained itself in comparative peace and quiet. So, Sir, while I object to further constitutional change at this moment not for my own sake but for India's, still more do I deprecate those efforts of further revolutionary political measures at the very time that a great number of persons in this House are anxious to weaken the present executive. I oppose the Resolution, I oppose all the amendments, I oppose the whole thing lock, stock and barrel.

Sardar B. A. Dalal: Sir, at the outset let me assure my Honourable Muhammadan, Hindu and other brethren in this Assembly and outside that I have not the slightest intention of offending their feelings, nor that I am in no way less anxious to secure us Responsible Government. Let me further assure all of you that I am not expecting any favours from Government for myself, but what leads me to believe and I confidently trust that good many Honourable Members here and outside will go with me in a great way that our friend, Mr. Majumdar's Resolution is premature, and hence I rise with due deference to him and to his supporters to oppose this Resolution on following grounds:

Firstly, because that we have not been given sufficient trial in the Reform New Scheme. We all know that Rome was not built in a day, in the same way we must trust in Government, have patience and perseverance to secure our real and long desired aim, *viz.*, Responsible Government.

Secondly, because we have been given many additional powers in the Reform Scheme, and not only that but in both our Councils and in all Provincial Councils the non-official Members have an overwhelming majority, so that when *real time* comes, we can very well urge and press Government to give us Responsible Government. Good many Members of this House and outside will no doubt ask me has not yet that time come? To which I boldly say, No. We do not wish to imperil the welfare and security of the country by undertaking Swaraj before we are in a position to carry it on with success and confidence; more especially when unrest is prevalent and we can see with our eyes open that there is no real, internal and genuine unity at heart in many, many diverse communities of India, and I am very much afraid that there will be no genuine permanent unity for a long time yet. Look at the present Moplah horrible and most abominable deeds in Malabar. Many Muhammadans have ruined Hindu temples, converted Hindus into Moslem religion by force, looted their properties and, last but not the least, being not satisfied with so many atrocious deeds they ventured to commit rapes on young Hindu girls of high repute and esteem. Do you ever think that Hindus will ever forget these intolerable and undesirable grievances when their time comes. Look at the magnificent and generous hearts of British that they behaved themselves quite gentlemanly and never polluted and demolished Mosques, etc., although Turks fought against British with full might and power.

Thirdly, we have not yet proved ourselves competent enough to manage District Boards and Municipalities successfully and therefore our British Government have been reluctantly forced to suspend some Municipalities. What does this go to prove.

Fourthly, our British Government have been graciously pleased to confer very high and most responsible posts on Indians in good many departments of

Government and will no doubt give further many responsible and high posts to Indians of ability and good birth whenever further vacancies occur in future. Kindly wait and see how they successfully carry out their responsibilities, I have no intention whatsoever to cast any slur on their abilities and I am confident that they will discharge their duties to the entire satisfaction of Government and people as well.

Fifthly, it is only education, development of Industries and Agriculture that will no doubt lead us in future to reach our long and ardently desired aim, *vis.*, Swaraj. I must say Government have done as much as they possibly could in these subjects as far as their financial circumstances allowed, but at least to my mind it was and is the fault of Indian parents that they did not and at present too do not care much for sound and higher education. Looking to the entire population of India I make bold to say that they have acquired very little education which is merely a drop in an ocean and have done very little in Industries.

Sixthly, I am informed and, I believe, I am rightly informed that Indian Civil and Medical examinations are to be held in India. We shall have Supreme Council, Forest and Agricultural colleges, Telegraph and Imperial Police Institutions,—and Territorial Force on a very large scale are to be established in India. We have got repeal of Repressive Legislation. What more do you want for the present ?

Mr. K. Ahmed : On a point of order, Sir. Is the Honourable Member speaking for the Resolution or any amendment ?

Mr. President : That is not a point of order.

Sardar B. A. Dalal : Seventhly, is it not a fact that all the Indian independent Maharajas and Chiefs sincerely wish for the continuance of our just, peaceful, religious and moral preserving British Government ? I firmly believe one and all can not deny this fact. Had there been no paramount power in India, I am very much afraid, there would have been no peace and prosperity as hitherto exist, but on the contrary there would have been anarchy in whole of India as was previously the case under Mogul and Hindu rulers which can be easily proved from old historical books. By the grace of God, such is not the case now, and peace and prosperity are prevalent in greater part of India and there is a proverb prevalent amongst Indians that lion and lamb can drink water in one tank in British reign. Now, then, in that case, will it be proper and quite just for us to ask for Responsible Government when we are not yet ready for it ? We all very well know a proverb 'Deserve and desire.' I am of firm belief that this proverb can only be achieved by acquiring sound and sufficient education and extending industries in which we are still very very backward. What is the reason of this backwardness ? The reason is that we the Indians are not at all enterprising and have no patience and perseverance and strong will power to carry out their enterprise successfully, and if one, unfortunately, endangers himself to take the risk, he is not only laughed out but many a time discouraged by his brethren and relations. Amongst the British such a man would receive praise and encouragement. We the Indians are very much benefited by the advent of British in India, so much so, that we have now railways in greater part of India, canals, telegraph and telephone services not only in one city but from Bombay to Poona, from Delhi to Lahore, etc., all sorts of postal facilities, electricity, wireless telegraph across the oceans, waterworks, very short, most

[Sardar B. A. Dalal.]

expensive, vast improvements in communications in most difficult country, wonderful roads taken across mountains and even through mountains tunnels which were I believe not even a dream in ancient times to our Hindu and Muhammadan rulers. I would respectfully ask Honourable Members in this Assembly and people outside to read the book called ' Blessings of British Rule in India ' by Maulvi Idris Ahmed, B. A. I respectfully ask our benign British Government to get this book translated in all the vernacular languages of the districts and distribute them freely. I, on my part, am quite prepared to get it translated in Gujerati language at my cost, if I am allowed to do so by Government and the author.

Let me again assure all of you in this Assembly and people outside that it must not be inferred from my objection and from my plea for caution that I am not keen to attain responsible Government but I most confidently tell you that I am as keen as you all are here, but I must make bold to say that it is premature as we are not yet ready. We must wait and keep patience and do our level best to attain our long and ardently desired goal by being ourselves worthy to achieve our responsible duties with credit and success in near future.

With these few remarks I wish to take my seat.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanyan : Sir, the subject under discussion is of a very wide and far-reaching character. Well, I was accused on a former occasion by my friend, Munshi Iswar Saran, that I was possessed with the devil or the malady of caution. True, I am possessed with that devil, but with all due respect to my friend I must say that his speech delivered in the most regular episcopal manner, which befits him so well in his speech as well as in his appearance, has not yet driven or exercised that devil out of me. Equally my friend, Dr. Gour, tries to pound me, slash me, with his uniformly emphatic and heavily weighted speeches. I feel that I am not the only one to be under his hammer. Probably every one in this Assembly has a share in it, and, as the weight is equally divided, I feel the greatest consolation that I have got so many others to share with me the tribulations which he inflicts. Therefore, barring these two learned friends, for whom I have the highest respect, the question arises whether constitution-making is not a very pleasant occupation. I consider it is an invigorating occupation which stimulates the brain and which stimulates, when opportunity arises, the tongue. Constitution-making was a pastime indulged in by a great many people, qualified or not, before the Reforms were announced and, when the Reforms were announced, there were a good many people who came out with criticisms. And the most remarkable feature of this constitution-making is that our school-going elders—they are not youngsters—have taken a great pleasure in it and have demonstrated the practical inutility of these Reforms, by absenting themselves from and abandoning the schools in which they were. So constitution-making has been the occupation of all, whether qualified or not. Well, for a short period, during the last seven or eight months, there has been a lull; we have not heard much of constitution-making. Now, we start again. Well, is it right that you start this game of constitution-making? Well, among certain gentlemen, there is a feeling that the Assembly is not quite good enough company for them. There is such a lurking feeling in the mind of Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar who is here in this Assembly by the grace of the

Government of Madras who with good sense have recommended him as a Member of this Assembly. He at one time held a very strong opinion that this Assembly should be dissolved. Well, the dissolution of the Assembly is a matter provided for by Statute. Why Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar should have been so hasty in calling for a dissolution of this Assembly and starting on a new constitution he has not yet explained to us. He presented to the Assembly three different bases of constitution. Well, that reminds me of the story of an eminent counsel who was presented by his client with three different lines of defence, all based upon the common ground of an *alibi*, and he was given the choice of taking one of the three. Well, it was in that same spirit that three different bases were offered for our discussion. One of them was the instant resignation of those unfortunate Indian Members of the Executive Council. Why an exception should have been made in the case of the Honourable the Home Member and of the Honourable the Finance Member, he could not say. It would be a jolly good thing if the Home Member could resign and seek election after all that is attributed to him in connection with the Punjab and other provinces, and also if the Finance Member, with the burdens of taxation which he has imposed, could face the music in Bombay and Calcutta. I refer to these things because once we start constitution-making, well, we do not know where we shall land ourselves. We have got a statutory constitution at present. Is it not good to evolve out of it something better, something to our liking, or are we to start without a call to tinker with it.

There is one other aspect which is a more serious one.

Have we a mandate from the country to ask or call for any change? Now, our position in this Assembly is rather peculiar. We are often told that Members of this Assembly represent none but themselves. That is the slogan. They all say, the country does not approve of the Reforms and, therefore, those who have entered this Assembly do not represent the country. That is the most clamorous and most vociferous view put forward. Well, so far as we here are concerned, we have received no mandate from the provinces. So far as the change regarding the Provincial Councils is concerned, will it not be wise to wait till they themselves make a pronouncement on the experiments they are making? No Council has as yet put forward any demands for a change. But supposing we suggest changes, is it not necessary that those changes should be approved by those Councils? Some Councils, at any rate the Council of my province, seem to be satisfied now with what they have got; they do not seem to be dissatisfied with the conditions under which they are now working; at any rate there is no expression of opinion from that Council that the system under which they are now working is unsatisfactory; and I have not heard of any complaints from other provinces. Now, there is one other difficulty about the venture on which we are called upon to enter. We appoint a Committee. Speaking for myself no Committee will satisfy me unless it is a Committee of the whole House. A dozen men chosen from this Assembly and from another place and sitting and drafting a new constitution for us will certainly not meet with my approval; because I think the constitution should be one that I have promulgated and I have helped to relieve. Therefore, I should think, whatever be the upshot of this discussion, it is a matter in which the Assembly ought to take some of these points into consideration. Has there been a demand in regard to this matter? Well, I have just now seen a written memorandum addressed, I suppose, to all

[Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanyan.]

Members of this Assembly. One of the points taken in it is this : that in no country outside India do Members of the Civil Service attain Cabinet rank. Here, again, there is a great fallacy which all political students, or those who claim to be political students commit. You cannot pick out one solitary fact from any other constitution and then ask that a totally different constitution should be engrafted here. It must be a symmetrical whole. If there is some political student or some political philosopher who could give us a symmetrical whole and place it before us and ask us to consider it, it will be worth while spending time on it. But if each one who claims to be a political student—and at the present day every one in this country seems to be a political student—presents us with theories, we must say, no. It seems to me, a person who has reached certain conclusions hurls those conclusions at all and sundry. In this state of affairs, we cannot understand the wisdom of picking out a point here and a point there and presenting it to us as a feature to be adopted in the proposed constitution.

Well, Sir, my difficulty is not merely a temperamental one ; it arises out of the very serious disturbance which it causes in our outlook and in our methods of work. Another argument that has been used and will be used very strongly is that we must placate somebody outside. Now, who are the persons outside whom we should in all seriousness and earnestness try to placate ? At present the prevalent feeling, judged by speeches and writings in newspapers, is 'you shall have nothing to do with the Government ; nothing to do with anything, anybody or any system which has the remotest connection with the present Government.' That is we should not touch this Government or its offshoots even with a pair of tongs. That is the feeling that is proclaimed. Then we are told that there are some people outside who are sitting on the fence. Is that a presentation to be offered to us that we should go out of our way to those time-servers and to those people who are sitting on the fence ? Is it a decent call upon our intelligence, upon our integrity and upon our public spirit to ask us to do certain things, not for those who ask, not for those who ask us in some form or other, but to do certain things for those who will not ask and who do everything to undermine our position, and at the same time who will sit on the fence ? That seems to me an undignified position to take, either for this Assembly or anywhere else. It is talk like this which, I suppose, gives room for all sorts and conditions of criticism. Well, I am glad I spoke first, because my friends who follow will have an opportunity of demolishing me. If I had spoken last they would not have had an opportunity. I join with the others that we want more and more and more ; but I also think that it is better that we get to work in matters of this sort with a great deal of thought. I do not by that mean to say that there is no ambition in this House ; there is plenty of it, but it should be the sort of work which ought to be done as a preliminary, to be settled beforehand before launching out on a discussion in this Assembly. If my learned friend, Dr. Gour, and my respected and really learned friend, Mr. Majumdar, could get together and draft a constitution and give us the details, the shape of what they want, something definite in fact, we could then sit together and give our opinion. A large order like this, that we want changes, that some one whom we do not know, some here and some there chosen at random to draft something, is very vague ; and I submit, Sir, that is a thing with which I cannot agree ; I do not want to surrender my judgment at this stage to the opinions of the

conclusions of a body about whom I do not know, and I should know where I am. I say this with great respect to the wisdom and humour of my learned friend, Mr. Majumdar; because his great sense of humour ought to have told him that he is placing this Assembly in a very difficult position, putting one section against another, one Member against another, and dividing us and enjoying in his grim humorous way the scene that he has created in this Assembly.

I must say that my Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar, is unconscious of the fact that he has raised a ghost by his proposition, and it proves that he cannot be without a sense of humour by bringing forward his Resolution before this Assembly.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, in rising to support this Resolution and in moving my own amendment thereto, I congratulate myself that I have lived to this day to be able to raise my voice for the liberation of my motherland, and in doing so, I shall not weary the House by any reference to first principles or go back to the historic or epic lore of this country, but ask Honourable Members to consider the facts—not any unusual statements made by the Secretary of State to interviewers or to members of the Press,—but statements made from his place in Parliament, and to consider the message sent on the eve of the enactment of the Government of India Bill by the Mother of Parliaments to the infant institution which it intended to create in this country. When this Reform Bill was the subject of discussion in the House of Commons, Honourable Members will find that the Secretary of State in commending it to the House used these deliberate expressions. He said, ‘I cannot reiterate too often that the basis of this whole policy is of a transitional nature. You want to get on to something else at the earliest possible moment.’ Then, Sir, when this Bill was finally passed by the House of Commons, the message which the accredited spokesman of that august body sent out to this country is contained in the following pregnant words. Speaking on behalf of the House of Commons the Secretary of State said:—‘We can say, as I should like to say, with the authority of the House, to the peoples of India : : The future and the date upon which you realise the future goal of Self-government are with you. You are being given great responsibility to-day, and opportunities of consultation and influence on other matters in which for the present we keep responsibility. You will find in Parliament every desire to help and complete the task which this Bill attempts, if you devote yourself to use with wisdom, with self-restraint, with respect for minorities, the great opportunities with which Parliament are entrusting you.’ This is the message which concluded the labours of the House of Commons on the Indian Reform Act, and I ask you, Sir, if the condition laid down by Parliament in their message to India has not been more than amply fulfilled.

I venture to think that it is now an accepted fact that the balance and responsibility which has been acknowledged by two Officers, by the Honourable Leader of this House, and, last but not least, by the President of this Assembly, are testimonials which cannot be lightly ignored, and I assure Honourable Members of this House that the time is now ripe for a further advance, not in the language of this House, not in the language of an official of the Cabinet, but in the deliberate language of the collective opinion of the House which constitutes the Imperial Parliament.

I think, Sir, it is too late now to talk about personal rule, a strong Executive, and things of that character which might have been relevant

[Dr. H. S. Gaur.]

before the solemn declaration of His Majesty's Government in 1917. I feel, Sir, that my friend, Mr. Price, has unearthed an old oration of his which preceded the inauguration of the Reforms which constitute the Magna Charta of India. I submit, Sir, that it is too late in the day to talk about the necessity of personal rule or the charm and strength of an Executive. We are obliged to find a democratic form of Government for this country, and let me remind Honourable Members that only a few months ago when our representatives sat in the Imperial Conference, they were described not as the representatives of a dependency but as the representatives of the Dominion of India. India finds a place as an independent unit of the British Commonwealth in the League of Nations, and when the British Cabinet holds out to other nations that India has an accepted place as an independent unit round the table of the Imperial Conference, can she deny to her that independence in her domestic relations with the Supreme Government? I submit that these are questions which cannot be lightly passed over as they have been by previous speakers, particularly by my esteemed and learned friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, who addressed his remarks to me before I had actually opened my mouth. Now, Sir, it has been said by my Honourable friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, that there is really no popular demand for the advancement of our claim. I am sure that my Honourable friend will agree with me that except perhaps in the doubtful case of the reforms of 1882, no popular feeling, at any time anywhere else in the long history of this world, has ever given pace to a constitutional reform.

If my friend will read the illuminating pages of that great historian and constitutional lawyer, Viscount Bryce, he will find the following pregnant sentence as summing up the constitutional history of the world. In his first volume on 'Modern Democracies' at pages 35 and 46, we have the following sentence which you will find elaborated throughout that Chapter. 'Nowhere have the masses shown a keen or abiding desire for political power.' Sir, it is a notorious fact that the masses nowhere have led revolutions or evolutions, which have always been the outcome of the agitation led by the educated middle classes. Can my friend deny that the intelligentsia, the educated middle classes of this country, are not clamouring for reforms? Can my friend deny that throughout the length and breadth of this country organised political associations are with one breath calling for urgent and immediate reforms? Can my friend deny that irrespective of political differences, irrespective of differences in principles and policy, if there is one point upon which they all agree, it is upon this, that India must now obtain the full autonomous status of a Dominion? My learned friend, Mr. Price, exclaims 'No.' If he had just emerged from a political cave, I should not have been surprised at that interjection. But having come from the busy town of Karachi, he presumably reads the daily Press. If so, I feel not only surprised but astounded at his ejaculation. Now, Sir, one of the Members of this House said: 'What do you want? You have not got a well-defined and well-considered plan of reforms upon which the Government of India could act.' Well, Sir, so far as the time at my disposal will permit me, I shall try to supply that defect. Let me then point out.....

The Honourable the President: Let me warn the Honourable Member that he has already reached his time limit.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Let me point out to this House that so far as the provinces are concerned, it is now a recognised fact that the duality of administration has led to an enormous expenditure which has made the whole administration top heavy. In Bengal, for instance, where we had before the reforms only two Executive Councillors, we have now four Executive Councillors and three Ministers, altogether seven officials. It is a notorious fact borne out by an appeal that would be made to you to-morrow that Bengal finances are on the verge of bankruptcy, and I may inform the House what is true of Bengal is equally true of the other provinces of this country. I submit, Sir, that with all the advantages that this tentative proposal of provincial autonomy may have brought to the provinces the provinces are now labouring under a heavy weight of increased expenditure and with no possibility of additional taxation. The Honourable Mover of this Resolution said that we could introduce complete provincial autonomy by enacting rules under the existing law. Well, in this connection, I beg to point out to the Honourable Mover that even though all the subjects of the provinces were transferred to the charge of Ministers, it would not amount to provincial autonomy, because, as the Honourable Mover will see, under Section 45 of the Government of India Act, the Provincial Governments would still be under the general control and superintendence of the Government of India. Similarly, my friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, suggests that the three Indian Members of Council should resign, get re-elected and re-appointed to their present offices, and then the millennium would be reached. In his note which I find deposited on my table, the same idea has been elaborated at greater length. Let me examine this fascinating suggestion. If the three Members come back to this House after their re-election—let us assume that they are re-appointed to their present portfolios—what will be the result? Their pay will not be on the estimates. They will be still subject to the Government of India Act, Section 33 of which lays down that the Governor General in Council shall have the superintendence, direction and control of the civil and military government of India subject to the provisions of this Act and the rules thereunder. Their position, I submit, would be an extremely invidious one. In their self-political inmolation they would have resigned their offices and come back to join a Government the responsibility of which is to the Secretary of State and not to this House. Further, Honourable Members will see that if these Members obey you, then they may conceivably be disobeying the orders of the Governor General in Council collectively, made for the purpose of carrying out the orders which are necessary under Section 33 to fulfil their statutory duties. The position, I submit, is an impossible one, and I am only surprised that it came from so responsible a speaker in this House as Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar.

I further submit, Sir, that the real situation can only be improved by amending the Government of India Act. Because, assume for the sake of argument that the Government of India were voluntarily to surrender its power to this Assembly. What becomes of the Secretary of State and his existing Council? Honourable Members will see that under Section 2 of the Government of India Act, the Secretary of State is possessed of the same power of direction, superintendence, and control over the Government of India as the Government of India possesses over all Provincial Governments. And therefore even if the intermediate and subordinate Government of India was to sacrifice its powers and delegate them to this Assembly, no great advance will be made unless the Secretary of State's powers are circumscribed and defined.

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

These are the limitations under which we labour at the present moment and the reform, that I suggest, and which I hope the Honourable Mover will accept, is the only logical sequence of his Resolution in that we want a complete revision of the Government of India Act with a view to convert all provinces into federal States subject to the local Councils on which must be conferred all and complete provincial autonomous powers. What we want is that Section 33 which gives plenary powers of superintendence to the Government of India and Section 2 which gives certain powers to the Secretary of State be amended, so that the Government of India must consist or may consist of the same sort of Government as we have in Australia, Canada and in the South African Dominions. We further want, Sir, that so far as the Secretary of State is concerned, his Council must go and the Secretary of State for India must possess the same power and bear the same responsibility as any Colonial Secretary. These are in short the reforms that we seek and my Honourable and learned friend tells me I can only give a broad outline of the proposal and cannot work it out into details within the short ten minutes at my disposal. Now, Sir, one word more

Mr. President : The Honourable Member is aware that he has already exceeded the time limit and I must ask him to resume his seat.

Mr. Abul Kasem : Sir, there is an old English proverb that 'Speech is silver, Silence gold.' It would have been wiser or, at any rate, safer for me to adopt that proverb, but a sense of duty and a sense of responsibility compels me to choose the less precious metal. At the very outset I want to tell the House, Sir, that I only support the principle on which the Resolution of my learned friend, Rai Bahadur Jadunath Majumdar, is based. I appreciate and admire his zeal, his enthusiasm and energy in the cause of the country and I might add that I share it in full. I am as anxious to get Self-government for this country as anybody else and the sooner I get it the better. But unfortunately methods differ and mine and his proceed on two different lines. Sir, a quarter of a century ago when I came into the arena of political life, it was considered dangerous and it required some courage, some strength of mind and some stamina to criticise Government officials or administrative measures or administrative policies. Things have vastly changed since then. To-day I feel that Government is a dead horse, whip it, however much you like, and it requires a good deal of courage and a good deal of strength of mind and not a little stamina to speak out one's own mind against what are known as popular ideas or may I call them popular heresies. I will take the advice given to the Government by my Honourable and learned friend, Rai Bahadur Jadunath Majumdar, I will take courage in both hands and speak out my own conviction, let the consequence be what it may. I have said that I want Self-government as much as anybody else and I want it as early as possible and I repeat it by saying that the change of constitution is a very easy matter. We can pass a Resolution in this House recommending it to the Secretary of State for India, and he can do it by an Act of Parliament passed at a single sitting at Westminster. But the other side of the question is the proletariat, the democracy to whom the power is to be transferred, whether it is fit to undertake that responsibility. Everybody wants power, everybody wants independence, but we should not forget that powers and rights carry with them their concomitant responsibility and duties. Are we prepared to discharge our

responsibility and perform our duties? I certainly heard with great interest and amusement the repeated encomiums paid on this House by no less personages than the Viceroys of India, Leaders of this House and the Presidents of the Councils. When I heard speaker after speaker referring to those courteous comments made by high officials and authorities, it reminded me of the story of the English school boy. His master once told him that he was a duffer. The boy retorted by saying 'Sir, you call me a duffer. My father says, I am clever. My mother says, I am clever. My sister says, that I am clever and above all I consider myself to be clever and you are wrong in saying that I am a duffer.' We all think, that we are very good people. The President says, that we have discharged our duties very well. We ourselves think, that we have discharged our responsibilities, but the question is—Does the country appreciate it and respond to the compliments paid to us? That is the real test. It is the master who is the best judge of a boy's mental capacity and not his father or his mother or his sister and I believe the country at large is the best judge of the work of this Legislative Council and not the President, or the Leader of the House or the Viceroy. Sir, I do not want in any measure to belittle these compliments paid to us. But I cannot help reminding the House that during the present Session we have had five non-official days to carry on non-official business and I regret to say that I felt a little disappointment when I found that on each day we could not proceed beyond one or two Resolutions and expressions of pious opinions and pious sympathy, whereas in matters of modern administration and administrative questions we chatter like the monkeys of Jakko. That is not a very business-like way of conducting proceedings and does not show much capacity for substantial work. It is no use shutting our eyes to our own defects. Now, Sir, to revert to my proposal and my method of getting Self-government. I appeal to this House and I appeal to my countrymen who are not within the range of my voice that the real means of obtaining Self-government is to educate the democracy and to prepare it for responsibility and educate it sufficiently to discharge that responsibility and, as to the second stage, quoted by my Honourable and learned friend, to make it learn to respect the feelings, the sentiments and the interests of the minority, while the majority does not want to carry things at the point of the bayonet. Has that time come? Let us try and make that time come as early as we can. Let us make the proletariat active, energetic, and educate them. We had great hopes of the Government of India Act, when it passed through its various stages in the Houses of Parliament, but, unfortunately, as soon as it came into operation, a certain wave of enthusiasm in this country and certain incidents interrupted the work we had before us, the work of preparing the proletariat for their responsibilities, of educating the proletariat in the discharge of their duties and the value and meaning of the franchise. I ask every Member of this House to put his hand on his heart and say, though he has been elected by his constituency, whether that constituency was trained or educated or knew what were the principles on which we were going to act in this Assembly. These elections have been held in a hole-and-corner fashion, and as long as the electorates have not learnt to exercise the franchise properly, so long it will be neither sane nor wise to trust the whole power in the hands of the proletariat. I do not for a moment mean to say that my countrymen, as such, are not fit to administer the country or to take over the responsibility of the administration. No nation in the world can charge the countrymen of Sir Bahar Jung, Sir T. Madhava Rao, Sir Shesadri Aiyer, Homesh Chunder Dutt,

[Mr. Abul Kasem.]

Behari Lal Gupta, Kazi Shahabuddin and last, but not least, Lord Sinha of Raipur, with being unfit to administer the affairs of their own country. The Resolution does not want to transfer the administration from the white man to the black, but the real issue is the transfer of the administration, directly and immediately, to the proletariat, and the question we have to judge on its merits is whether the proletariat is prepared to accept the responsibility. History, and history alone, should be our guide in this matter. And what are the lessons of history? There are three countries which are in my mind at the present moment, England, France and Russia. Let us look and see what has been the development of representative institutions and of democratic systems of Government in England since 1832, to which reference has been made. It has been peaceful, gradual and progressive. Look at France. There was the overthrow of one Government, an autocratic Government and the proletariat took charge of it, but they had to go back to the system of absolute autocracy to save themselves from that democracy. Lastly, the example of Russia is before us and we should profit by it. I have been a critic and I may add a hostile critic of the administration for more than 27 years. I know that it is anything but satisfactory. I know its defects and I know its shortcomings, and I would wish them to be remedied, and I think this House has some power at least to remedy them. But, at the same time, we should not shut our eyes to our own defects, and, in our attempts to save ourselves from the bureaucracy which at present rules us, we should not commit the greater error of 'falling from the frying-pan into the fire.'

Sir, I have taken a good deal of time in showing that we ought to prepare ourselves for this. By this I do not mean it to be understood that I do not share the feelings of my friends on the other side, and, if I have not said all about our desire to get Self-government and the rights we claim under it, it is simply because it has been said more eloquently, more ably, and with greater force by my Honourable friends. I only want to direct the attention of the House to the other side of the picture, and I hope I will not be misunderstood either by this House or outside. I can assure my countrymen here and elsewhere, that as soon as the proletariat and the democracy is made fit, is properly educated and is strong enough to bear the burdens of this Empire, nothing can keep them out, and I will conclude by repeating the memorable words uttered on a memorable occasion by Mrs.—I beg her pardon—Srimati Sarojini Naidu that 'God will not and man cannot keep you out of Self-government if you are fit to take it.' I would add, 'God will not and man cannot give you Self-government if you are not fit to take it.'

With these few words I wish to say, that as a practical man, I would prefer the amendment moved by Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas to the original Resolution as put forward by Mr. Majumdar.

Sir Jamsetjee Jejeebhoy: If I rise, Sir, it is with a view to dissociate myself and my community from the views expressed by Mr. Dalal. While agreeing with him wholeheartedly in all he has said about the benefits of British rule, I must dissociate myself from the opposition he has shown to the appointment of a Committee as suggested by my Honourable neighbour (Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas). I do not wish any Member of the Assembly to go away from here with an impression that we, Parsis, are not beholden to the Hindus and Mussalmans for the protection they have afforded us for the last

1,500 years in their land. It is true, Sir, that until the advent of the British we had not made our mark in the history of this country, but I will ask you to remember that the general standards, as judged by the present day standards of education, material prosperity and industrial development, were not worth any notice. I venture to submit, Sir, that, if the Parsis did advance in various walks of life under the British rule, it would be ungrateful on our part if we put stumbling blocks in the way of the advancement of the children of the soil. It is, in my opinion, our clear duty to advance the cause of India on the progressive path of Dominion Self-government under the British Crown.

With these few words, Sir, I will support the amendment of Mr. Jinnadas Dwarkadas, which he has moved with the soundness and sobriety which usually characterise his utterances.

*** Rai D. C. Barua Bahadur :** Sir, in my humble opinion, Mr. Jinnadas Dwarkadas' amendment should hold good. Let us be judged by an independent Committee, whether we are fit for diarchy in the Central Government or whether we are fit for a full instalment of Self-government in all its branches. This Committee may find that the present reforms are inadequate and should be supplemented by more powers given to the people through their representatives. Till then we should wait and see. We should not be afraid of being judged by a Committee. Rather should we be glad of it. Now, therefore, the House may be pleased to see its way to ask the Governor General in Council to appoint such a Committee.

Sir, I am hopeful that such a Committee will report most favourably as our work in these Councils has given nothing but satisfaction to the people and Government alike. Therefore, I submit that this amendment should be accepted. 'Deserve and desire' should be our motto.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Sir, I think it would be well if, in the first place, the Assembly were quite clear as to what the various proposals before them to-day are. The effect of the original Resolution would be to give complete provincial autonomy in 1924, to constitute a system of diarchy in the Government of India at the same time, and to give complete responsibility in the Government of India in 1930 or, according to another motion by Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, in 1927. There are many amendments to this proposal, the chief, outside the proposals for a Committee, being to give provincial autonomy at once and, similarly, to inaugurate a system of diarchy in the Government of India immediately, giving in fact complete control over the Government, save in one or two subjects. I notice that one amendment, that of Dr. Gour, proposes even to transfer the control of the Army immediately to the Assembly. This is a point worthy of particular consideration. The Resolution therefore really invites the Government to propose a radical and very great change in the Government of India Act, when that Act has not been completely in force for a period of nine months. I believe I should be right in saying that some sections have not been in force for six months. But I am not quite certain of that point. It is a tempting proposition obviously to Members of this Assembly, and it is natural that they should desire to increase their direct influence over the Government of India. Further, I must admit that they have done much to justify the demand. I have never been backward in acknowledging the assistance that Government has received from this Assembly. I have always realised it, and, I think, I may also say on the other

[Sir William Vincent.]

'band that the Government have gone as far as possible to meet the Assembly in all legitimate demands. The position of the Government of India in regard to this amendment is, however, one of great difficulty. I want to cite to the Assembly, first of all, what the policy of His Majesty's Government laid down on the 20th of August 1917 was. I cite from the speech of the Secretary of State :

'The policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of responsible government.'

Later, the Secretary of State went on to say :

'I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India, on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian peoples, must be the judges of the time and measure of each advance, and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred.'

In the Government of India Act, again, the position is clearly laid down in the provision :

'That at the expiration of ten years after the passing of the Government of India Act, the Secretary of State, with the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament, shall submit for the approval of His Majesty the names of persons to act as a Commission who are to inquire into the working of the system of government, the growth of education and the development of representative institutions, and to report as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government.'

The Joint Committee Report again is quite clear on the point :

'The Committee are of opinion that statutory commission should not be appointed until the expiration of ten years, and that no changes of substance in the constitution, whether in the franchise or the lists of reserved and transferred subjects or otherwise should be made in the interval.'

I cite these passages to explain what the position of the Government of India is in this matter. I do not say for a moment that these decisions are like the law of the Medes and the Persians, or that they cannot be altered; nor do I personally believe that the present transitional scheme of this Government can last as long as is expected. I think we in the Government of India appreciate that as much as any one; indeed the Secretary of State dealing with this matter himself said :

'If there is a remarkable and unforeseen development in Indian conditions in the short space of ten years—because ten years is a very short time—my Honourable friend is quite wrong. The Act does not tie the hands of Parliament and there can always be a commission in the interval.'

And in a more recent speech still, to which I think Mr. Dwarkadas referred, the Secretary of State again emphasised the difficulties of the transitional period and his desire to accelerate the progress of reforms. So that there is no indication of any want of sympathy on the part of the Secretary of State with the demand for progressive realisation of the hopes of many Members of this Assembly. But what I want to put to this Assembly as practical men is, whether they think that, with our very short experience of reforms in this country, His Majesty's Government are likely to accept or even to consider seriously proposals for their extension in the immediate future. Is Parliament likely to undertake legislation, setting aside the results of all the previous and careful inquiries made, after the very short period in which these reforms have been tested? I think that there really can be, for any practical man in this Assembly, for any reasonable person, only one answer to

that question. Further, I put it to this Assembly that it is not consistent with the duty of the Government of India to accept proposals which are not consonant with the directions of the Secretary of State and not consonant with the decision of Parliament. I do not want any one to think for one moment from what I have said that the Government of India fail in their appreciation of the work done by this Assembly or by Ministers and by Provincial Councils. I am quite prepared to confirm anything that I have said on previous occasions, about this Assembly, although on principle I rather deprecate reference to speeches made on private occasions in the manner adopted to-day. I think that a man ought to be allowed to express his opinions privately, without being quoted in a public assembly in this manner. But appreciating as we all do the work done by this Assembly, their attitude *vis a vis* the Government, and their great sense of responsibility, if I may say so, can it be affirmed that this system has been adequately tested in nine months? In an ordinary business proposition, would any one accept that as a sufficient test? Or are we, quite frankly, here in a position to say that from a fixed date in the near future it would be safe to confer complete autonomy on India? Can we say this with safety, remembering the difficulties and the many and great interests concerned in this matter? I want the Assembly to consider this question, not as a question of sentiment, or as a question of political feeling; I want them to consider it calmly and dispassionately. Would it not be more reasonable to admit that we have not sufficient experience of the capacity of this Assembly or the Councils, and what is more important still, of the electorates? Can any one here affirm that the electorates of this country are sufficiently educated and experienced to appreciate even the responsibility now conferred on them? Let us examine the facts frankly. Now, the purpose of the reforms in this country is not to transfer power to an assembly of this kind, unless it is really representative of the people. That is not the meaning of responsible government, as I understand it.

And from this aspect let us consider what occurred at the last election. Was not the proportion of voters that went to the poll distressingly small? Are Honourable Members of this House aware of the fact that out of approximately 250 millions of people residing in British India, in the area affected by the Reforms, there are only one million registered voters for this Assembly? Are they also aware that out of those 1 million voters about 182,000 only recorded their votes in the last election? Is not that an indication that the electorate of this country has failed fully to realise its responsibilities or the great value and power of the franchise given to it? I put these facts forward for the consideration of the Assembly. Is it not indeed true that the whole of the reform constitution—Assembly and the electorate alike—are at a very early stage of life, and that though the Assembly has made astonishing progress they have not yet come to anything like maturity? Is not that a fair statement of the case? I doubt myself, even, whether the Members of the Central Legislature have so fully utilised or appreciated their powers, although they are rapidly doing so as we on the Government benches have every reason to know. The changes made were so great, so unexampled in their magnitude, I may say that I feel confident His Majesty's Government might fairly say to this Assembly or the people of this country 'Let us at least know something more of the effect of the Reforms already given before you ask us to make further changes in the Government.'

Can any Honourable Member say that we have sufficient experience now in this Assembly to predicate definitely that within a very few years this Assembly will be capable of exercising complete autonomy? What are the main

[Sir William Vincent.]

tests of a right to Self-government? I should say that they are, firstly, a spirit of citizenship and nationality and, secondly, a power to defend the country. Now, there is a growing spirit of nationality in this country, created and fostered very largely, I believe, by the British Government, and its great unifying influence. It is permeating the educated community, but no man can say or, as Mr. Abul Kasem said, no man can say with his hand on his heart that it has permeated the masses or rural areas.

Consider for a moment in this connection the Moplah outbreak—I do not wish to make too much of the outbreak, but certain facts are very noteworthy. Is it an Indian Republic that the rebels seek to constitute? not at all; it is a Muhammadan Republic with the Khilafat flag as its banner: Is not this significant and are there not other divisions of a very serious character between different races in this land? I know that it has been suggested that we adopt the motto of divide and rule. I emphatically repudiate that suggestion. We are trying, and shall continue to try, to develop in this country a spirit of nationality to make India capable of governing itself as an integral part of the British Dominions, but we cannot neglect patent facts.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar—I am sorry he is not here to-day—cited to the Assembly two instances of Asiatic countries which are self-governing—Persia and China, I think. But I would ask Honourable Members, could any instances be more unfortunate? What is the state of affairs in China at the present moment? the north divided against the south, and no orderly government of any kind in existence. The Government is practically a despotism of different military Governors. Let us turn for a moment to Persia and examine the position there. The country is in a state of grave disorder with a Government only living on hopes of borrowing money from foreign Powers. A fair comparison might be made with Russia where conditions are in many respects similar to those in India. Like India, it is a country with a vast and ignorant rural population. Well a revolution was promoted there by the educated classes. And here may I pause to say that in my opinion Dr. Gour was quite right in his statement regarding such movements, and that in fact there is no historical instance of a successful movement of the character which I know of that has not been started by the educated classes with the support of a large proletariat behind them—that is a common place of history. To continue the comparison of Russia with India, in both countries we have an uneducated rural proletariat and an educated intelligentsia represented largely by the Bourgeoisie, in Russia and also to a certain extent by the urban population.

Well what has been the result of precipitate hurry to secure a change of Government in Russia? I ask Honourable Members to think for one moment. Has it not been chaos, murder, ruin and famine? And this is in a country in which the conditions, to my mind at any rate, are very analogous to the conditions here.

The other great test of a claim to dominion self government, in my opinion, is the military strength of a country, that is, its power to defend its frontiers from invasion by foreign countries, to maintain internal tranquillity and to resist various disintegrating forces within its own borders, and here I will ask Honourable Members in this Assembly a question. Is any Honourable Member here prepared to say that by 1926 or 1927 or by 1930 this

country will have an Indian Army officered by Indians which will be capable of defending the frontiers, capable of protecting India from external aggression and capable of preventing internal disorder? I want the Assembly to consider this because it is a most important factor in deciding the question before us. If I had been a non-official member of this Assembly, the one consideration that I would have constantly pressed upon the Government would have been the development of an Indian Army officered by Indians, because on that really rests very largely the future political progress of this country. Again, can it be truly said by any one that the support of the British Government, the unifying influence of the British administration, will not be necessary in this country for many years to come for the protection of minorities? That again is a question which I suggest each and every member of this Assembly should put to himself and answer honestly. In all these circumstances, is it not really better for India at this juncture, when the reforms are so new, when so little is known of their operation, that Indians should develop the powers they have got, should use them to the full, should educate the electorate as to the value of those powers and teach what the franchise means, and what their responsibilities are before demanding a further advance? Is there not also a great deal of truth in the statement which was made by an authority who I know is a great friend of the Mover of one of the amendments that 'The most stable constitutions grow and are not made.' Has not that been the lesson of history and is it not justified by practical experience in the past?

And now I wish to dwell on another point and that is, the particular time at which this Resolution has been brought. May I put it to Honourable Members that they might ask themselves whether the present juncture is, from a practical point of view, not a singularly inopportune moment to bring forward a demand of this nature? Remember that we have at this moment the non-co-operation movement permeating the country. We have the Khilafat movement, some of the extremist leaders of which, I do not hesitate to say, are openly provoking the masses to acts of disloyalty and violence. Are not these matters which are calculated to give great anxiety to the Government of India and grave apprehensions in the public mind and in the mind of His Majesty's Government?

Is this a moment at which any Government would be willing to undertake momentous changes of the kind now proposed? What was the effect of this non-co-operation movement on the electorate at the last election, if I may revert to that subject for a moment? Was it not to keep away large numbers of people from the poll? What would have been the effect if all the non-co-operators entitled to the franchise had attended the polls? Would all of the Members now here have been present? Or should we have had a somewhat different class of Members in some cases? What guarantee have we, that at the next election, the non-co-operators will not see the folly of their move last time and put into this Assembly a large number of men, not possessed of the same sense of responsibility, or the same restraint or the same desire to help Government in its difficulties as is apparent in the present Assembly? That, again, is a possibility which this Assembly and Government have to consider. I do not want to over-emphasise these points, but they are all, I submit, which must, naturally cause apprehension to any sane man in this country, and certainly must cause the gravest concern to His Majesty's Government, especially when the proposal is to

[Sir William Vincent.]

progress of the political reforms in this country. That is our object. Another point which I wish to press before I close, is the importance, indeed the necessity, of educating public opinion in England on the subject of political progress in this country before attempts are made to secure further powers, as I believe this to be a matter of the greatest moment. It is for this reason that I look forward to this visit from the Empire Parliamentary Delegation as I believe it will throw the greatest light on this subject, will disseminate information and do a great deal to promote political progress in this country. Sir, may I, in conclusion, cite a quotation from a very great, if old, authority on political science:—

'It were good therefore that men in their innovations should follow the example of Time itself, which indeed innovates greatly but quietly, and by degrees scarcely to be perceived.'

Mr. Zahir-ud-din Ahmed: Sir, I have an appeal to make to the Honourable Mover and to the Honourable leader of the House. That is, to wire to-day a copy of the Resolution with some speeches supporting it, as soon as it is accepted by the House to the Moplahs in Malabar. I am certain the people will be immediately peaceful as they are also asking for the same which my Honourable friend has secured in this Assembly. The Moplahs will find that they have got the thing through the help of the Honourable Mover which they could not get through fighting. The Magistrate and the military will find the task of restoring peace and order ten times easier. Why this military, why those police, when we have got in this House such a genius as can move such a Resolution and have it accepted? I can assure you, Sir, he has certainly got congratulatory telegrams both from Mahatmaji Gandhi, as well as from the leader of the Moplahs. One thing I am certain, he will not show them to me. If my Honourable friend will go to the Moplahs they will make him their Khalifa or leader as he has done such signal services to their cause. Both the Khalifat agitation and non-co-operation will come to an end at once. With these few words I oppose the Resolution on the ground that I never kicked my wife when she was pregnant to give an early delivery. Let those who have done so vote for the Resolution but not I. Is there any use in being thankless and ungrateful or silly and impudent? What other nations have got at the enormous cost of blood, we have got as a free gift from the British people. The value of the gift cannot be lowered simply because we have got it without the cost of blood. From my experience in this Assembly I must say it looks like it. Some Honourable friends in this House mentioned that the House has been congratulated by so and so. I have personal experience of such a congratulation. In my infancy I ran a race with other boys and had a severe fall and injured myself severely, and when I was crying bitterly from pain, a few elderly gentlemen who were in charge of the race approached me and instead of congratulating the winner of the race congratulated me for 'doing excellently well, which stopped my crying. Let my friends here take stock and see if the House has not been congratulated on similar grounds.

India is a country peopled by more different classes of people than even Europe, not only are the languages different, but their religions, habits, ideas and thoughts are also not the same. When the reform scheme came into existence, we Muhammadans felt great alarm and I must say our fears have not yet been allayed. I may further say that our apprehensions are being more

and more confirmed by the way in which this Assembly and local Provincial Councils are working.

I will take this Assembly only now and I will give my reasons of our fears. From the day this Assembly opened at Delhi up to this day I have never missed a single sitting. In my own way I have examined the proceedings, I found out that four classes of Resolutions were moved and I classify them as follows:

1st.—Pious Resolutions; the objects of those Resolutions are good but unworkable due to more reasons than one.

2nd.—Stabbing Resolutions; the Resolutions which drew profuse bleeding. This class of Resolutions sometimes were aimed at Government, at other times against minorities such as Mussalmans, Anglo-Indians and non-official Europeans. Such Resolutions have created great alarm.

3rd.—The third class of Resolutions are Bravado Resolutions. The desire of the Movers of these Resolutions is to earn easy notoriety.

4th.—The fourth class of Resolutions is stupid Resolutions. Some Honourable Members have the belief that in each Session one Member must move at least two Resolutions and put 50 questions, of whatever merit they may be.

I put this Resolution before the House under classes two and three, stabbing Resolutions and bravado resolutions. The Honourable Mover of the Resolution made a long speech in which he did not say one word as to how he wishes to protect the interests of the minorities. Does he mean to say that the minorities have no interest or stake in the country at all? Let him put forward any programme which will protect the interests of all the minorities, satisfying their just demands I shall be the first man to move this Resolution myself at the next Session in Delhi.

I say India is not one country but a collection of countries. People here have so many different thoughts that what is meat to one is poison to his next neighbour. I admit that the collection here in this room is a representative collection, a collection which can be fairly compared to the world collection which, I believe, you have seen, Sir, while you were in Calcutta and the other similar one which you have seen, Sir, in London. There are no doubt some rarities and specialities. Some one may retort here that 'you are one of them'. I will accept the compliment with a low bow. I am not a Zoologist, hence my inability to admire them properly. It is only the trainer in the chair that is keeping them from biting one with another. When I hear arguments and debates in this Assembly, I am often prompted to ask some of the Honourable Members 'Where have you been caged.'

Sir, I will try here to put the position of the Resolution by an illustration. Supposing an intelligent child out of a set of boys in the lowest class, that is beginner's class, immediately after admission, proposed a Resolution that as soon as they had finished the first book of reading they should get the M. A. degree and were to request the Headmaster of the institution to convey the prayer to the Chancellor of the University. I am certain the boys would carry the Resolution unanimsly. May I ask what would happen to that boy who approached the Headmaster with the copy of the Resolution. The

[Sir William Vincent.]

Headmaster would certainly not argue the point with the boy, he would only look for his cane. Supposing I were the boy what I would have done is I would have covered both my ears very tightly with a pagri for their very safety. I would have considered myself very fortunate if these two organs of my head were left in their proper places by the Headmaster whom I had approached.

My Honourable friend said Hindus, Muhammadans and others are one in asking for this 'Swaraj.' I must say the Hindus and Muhammadans are not yet one people. There is no use mincing matters and ignoring facts. The upper branches in some cases may have intermingled, but the two trunks have remained as separate as ever. I will narrate here a case from which you will see, Sir, that even the upper few are not united. I am a resident of Manickganj, a sub-division of the Dacca district. In the local board election only a couple of months ago, we, Mussalmans, voted solidly for the Hindus and six of them were elected by the majority of the Mussalman votes, as in that sub-division two-thirds of the population is Mussalman. The Government appointed two Mussalmans and one Hindu by nomination. Of the nine Members thus composing the local board, seven were Hindus and two Mussalmans, and these nine men had to elect four of their number to the District Board. We Mussalmans begged the Hindu Members to vote for at least one Mussalman. They pointblank refused and elected four of their own number only. Last month, before I came here, I said to my Hindu friends at Dacca that 'you use our shoulders to get on the wall and kick us out of the vicinity of the wall as soon as you are there instead of leading us a hand to reach the top of it.' How long can a man trust another when trust means betrayal? If I am a rebel, my rebellion is against the selfish mentality of our friend.

Sir, the Honourable Mover of the Resolution will no doubt retort that the slave mentality in me produced this 'dog in the manger' policy. I can assure him and the House it is not that. We must know how to walk properly before we try to run. We must learn swimming in shallow water and then venture out into deeper and deeper, as we go on learning. There is no use drowning ourselves. We have got a big feed which I think we have not been able to digest and to take another feed at once will not only bring on indigestion but may injure the health altogether. Another thing is this. No community can live for the good of another community alone. There must be give-and-take; there ought to be mutual graceful concessions. I have met none of these in this Assembly. As for myself, I am not prepared to take anybody on my shoulders until I am certain that the man will not be breaking my ribs by kicking my sides at the same time that he will be purging on my back.

My Honourable friend will accuse me of vulgarity and, in reply, I must say a cane is not enough for the thick hide of a donkey or a camel but a thick *lathi*.

With these few words, I oppose the Resolution.

Sir Frank Carter : Sir, it is with considerable reluctance that I intervene in this discussion; but at the risk of being misunderstood I desire to say

something of what I feel after hearing the speeches of some Honourable Members. I do not wish to refer to the particular paragraphs of the Resolution, I will only speak generally. What I feel, Sir, is that this is only our second Session under the new Government of India Act, and what we are asking the Secretary of State to do is to scrap this Act and proceed at once with the framing of a revised constitution for this country. The Honourable Mover of this Resolution, Mr. Majumdar, so often enlivens this House with flashes of humour that I must say, Sir, with all due deference to him, I cannot bring myself to believe that he is really in earnest in putting this Resolution forward. But, if he is really in earnest, then I do feel that he is treating far too lightly a matter which is of the very greatest importance to the future of this great country. After the pronouncement of August 20, 1917, which we all of us almost know by heart, I think it took over two years of hard work to put this Government of India Act through, and, after that, it took a year to complete the necessary arrangements for getting this constitution fairly started. Barely nine months have elapsed since we started the Legislative Assembly's Session at Delhi, and I feel, Sir, that we are now only getting into our stride on the road which is going to lead us, we hope, by progressive stages to the realisation of responsible government. Surely my friend the Rai Bahadur cannot think that nine months' experience of this new constitution is sufficient to justify us in going before Parliament and demanding more concessions. I will admit at once that both Chambers of the Indian Legislature, the Council of State and the Legislative Assembly, have, so far as we can see, been successes. I am also told that most of the Provincial Councils have been comparatively successful. But what I would ask Honourable Members is this. Why has this success attended the Indian Legislatures and the local Councils? Is not this success due to the direction and guidance of the Executive Members of those different Councils? I am confident that every Member of this House will frankly admit how much we all owe to the Honourable Members on the front Bench. And I am told that in the local Councils the Ministers also vie with one another in making their Councils a success. I suppose Members of the Governors' Councils and of the Executive Councils have got so used to criticism of all descriptions that they are no longer surprised at anything, and I take it the last thing they expect is an appreciation of services most ungrudgingly rendered. But surely they are entitled to a little more consideration than the proposer of this Resolution gives them. To suggest that the services of Members of Governors' Councils and of the majority of the Members of His Excellency the Viceroy's Executive Council should be dispensed with *et dum*, or I think it is really at the end of three years' experience of the reforms, to suggest I say a radical change of this description seems to me, Sir, to be not only ungrateful, but also to show a want of responsibility or statesmanship on the part of my Honourable friend.

Then, as regards the suggestion that full Dominion self-government should be conferred on this country some eight years hence, I cannot but feel that my friend is too optimistic. I fully recognise that the day will come when we shall see India enjoying responsible government as an integral part of the British Empire.

But, Sir, that time is not yet. This House will, however, realise that European Members are working and will continue to work as hard as any

[Sir Frank Carter.]

other Member of this Assembly to achieve responsible government at the earliest possible Moment. I would suggest, Sir, that we await the report of the Statutory Commission provided for by the Act of 1919 before we proceed to dictate to Parliament to what extent it is desirable to establish responsible government.

Mir Asad Ali, Khan Bahadur : Sir, the amendment which has been moved by my friend, Mr. Jamnadas, is a very reasonable one. The Mover merely wishes to appoint a Committee, consisting of officials and non-officials including Members of the Indian Legislature, to consider the best way of bringing about provincial autonomy in all Governor's Provinces and of introducing responsibility in the Central Government; and to make recommendations. The function of the Committee is a very important one; it concerns not a particular community, but all the communities residing in India. So the Committee should be a representative body consisting of all the Members of the important minorities to safeguard their interests. The object of the amendment can only be achieved by the personnel of the Committee. Sir, in appointing the Committee, I hope the Governor General in Council will have due regard, in carrying out the aims and objects of the amendment successfully, and to safeguard the interests of minorities. With these observations I support the amendment.

Mr. President : If Honourable Members wish to continue the discussion on the Resolution and the issues raised by the various amendments, we had better adjourn now.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Half Past Two of the Clock. The Honourable the President was in the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE

Mr. President : I have received a message from the Council of State which the Secretary will now read.

Secretary of the Assembly : Sir, the message received from the Secretary of the Council of State runs as follows:

'I am directed to inform you that, in accordance with rule 36 (8) of the Indian Legislative Rules, the amendments made by the Legislative Assembly in the Bill further to amend the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, were taken into consideration at its meeting to-day, the 29th September, 1921, and that the Council agreed to the amendments.'

RESOLUTION *RE*: INDIAN AUTONOMY.

Maulvi Amjad Ali : Sir, I desire to rise and say a few words in regard to the Resolution which is before this Honourable House, because as the representative of the Muhammadan constituency of Assam, I consider that I should be committing a sin if I failed to rise and voice the sentiments of the Muhammadan population of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, so far as this Resolution goes.

Sir, this Resolution as drafted by my Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar, may be a pleasant one so far as his own angle of vision is concerned, but I as a Muhammadan, coming from Assam, look upon it, from a Mussalman point of view, as one calculated to do a great deal of harm and, if passed will lead the Mussalman community of India to the brink of precipice because, in my opinion, it is wholly against their interests in this country.

Sir, I entered the arena of public life as far back as 1901, and my bitterest experience has been that the desire to have *Swaraj* in this country would simply be ruinous to the Muhammadans not only in Assam, but I may say, in the whole of India. There was a time after the advent of the English in this country, the Muhammadan religious leaders were against imparting English education to Mussalman youths out of religious prejudice, with the result that the Muhammadans lagged far behind their Hindu brethren in point of education. This was the first blow to the Moslem English education.

However, Sir, English education found a place worth the name amongst the Muhammadans only recently, say, about 12 or 13 years ago and Muhammadan students began to pour into the colleges and high schools, in this country, and in my own district, Muhammadan students numbered about a half of the total number of students in the schools and colleges; and the Government of Assam was pleased to open a first grade college in the District of Sylhet and I feel heart of heart that I cannot help saying without pain that non-co-operation for *Swaraj* has caused irretrievable damage especially to the Mussalmans, as their wards in large number, have boycotted all educational institutions and given up their studies. This is the second deathblow to my community, being the result of non-co-operation for *Swaraj*.

I may inform this Assembly, Sir, that I was one of those, appointed by the Local Government in the month of June to assist Mr. Lloyd, I.C.S., in going about my District to explain to the people,—Hindus as well as Mussalmans,—how they were being led to ruin by the propaganda of non-co-operation. That movement was so violent in its character, that it was falsely reported throughout the Province of Assam that, at the instance of the Government, British soldiers had killed outright about 150 of the Tea-garden coolies at Chandpur Railway Station....

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : Sir, may I rise to a point of order? May I inquire from the Honourable Member what connection his remarks have with the Resolution that is before the House? We are not discussing non-co-operation, Sir, and....

Mr. President : Order, order, I was just waiting to see how the Honourable Member proposed to bring his remarks in order.

Maulvi Amjad Ali : Well, Sir, I was going to say that the result of that false report was that for days the poor people did not even get the bare necessities of life owing to complete *Hartal*, and in addition, that *Hartal* was followed by a strike on the Assam Bengal Railway, and the result was extremely disastrous to the public convenience. This is the result of non-co-operation.

[Maulvi Amjad Ali.]

Now, Sir, the Resolution before the House is one which, if accepted,—and if the amendments thereto are also accepted,—will never safeguard the interests of the Muhammadan community.

I suggest, Sir, that autonomy will be ruinous so far as the interests of the Muhammadan community are concerned for want of proper representation. In every department of life, in every department of administration, I submit, the Muhammadans are very badly handicapped. Nowhere will their interests be properly represented and safeguarded. This Resolution, Sir, is a Resolution, so to say, about *Swaraj* and I must say the very name of *Swaraj* is frightful to the Muhammadans.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : On a point of order, Sir, if I may say so, *Swaraj* is the definite goal accepted.

Mr. President : Order, order. That is not a point of order. The Honourable Member ought to know that.

Maulvi Amjad Ali : This Resolution, Sir, asks for nothing short of *Swaraj* and the very name of *Swaraj* is frightful to the Muhammadan community of India. There can be no dispute or question about it. It may be said by some of my Muhammadan friends here that Messrs. Muhammad Ali, Shaukat Ali and other Muhammadan gentlemen are speaking about *Swaraj*. I must say that they are all nothing but fraud, and it is they who have been leading the uneducated Mussalman masses to ruin. To prevent that ruin, there are Mussalmans, including myself, who have been doing their best to dispel all ideas of non-co-operation in the name of *Swaraj*. Sir, as I have already submitted, I look upon this Resolution with the Muhammadan angle of vision, and I appeal to this Assembly, especially to my Muhammadan brethren not to lend any support to this Resolution or to this amendment. As for myself, I do not support it. I set my face against this Resolution and against this amendment. We want to be left as we are now. When the Mussalmans are properly educated, of course, the question of autonomy, the question of *Swaraj* and all other questions would be ripe for discussion. But this is not the proper stage at which we can pray for or long for anything like *Swaraj* which is detrimental to the cause of Muhammadan interests.

Mr. S. C. Shahani : Sir, I rise to support the amendment of my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, and my reasons for supporting it are these. Firstly, if we adopt the amendment that has been proposed we shall not be causing disappointment in the country. It has been said that at this moment the question need not have been raised. I quite agree. Perhaps this is not an opportune moment. There is the *Khilafat* agitation outside. There is the non-co-operation movement outside, and we have got really to know for certain if the tension that has been caused by these two movements will be reduced by the kindly offices of the leaders who are responsible for these two agitations. That is of course an important consideration, and I have incorporated it on that account in my own amendment. My Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar, suggested that perfect autonomy might be given to the Provinces in the year 1924, and he further suggested that the beginnings of responsible government might be made in the case of the

Central Government in the year 1924. He also suggested that full Dominion status should be given to India in the year 1930. I in my own amendment suggest 1928. Really I look upon the year 1928 as an important year. That, according to me, is the year in which the work done by the Central Government, as also by the Provincial Governments, might very rightly be reviewed; and when we have secured a sure basis for our generalisations, then we shall have only minor details to work out. But the question has been mooted just now, and after it has been mooted, and after we have listened to speeches such as Mr. Price's, I think we might reasonably consider the advisability of adopting the amendment that has been proposed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas. I think he has done a very wise thing. He has noted the conditions that prevail at the present time and has suggested a compromise. Let not the Assembly commit itself to any particular view but let it appoint a Committee. I would most earnestly request my friends and brethren in this Assembly not to discard the amendment that has been proposed by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas. You would be creating a very wrong impression on the people outside if you reject the amendment. My Honourable friend, Mr. Seshagiri Aiyar, was perfectly right when he said that many would be sitting on the fence and watching what this Assembly does on this question of our progress to responsible government. It is easy to pour ridicule on such a statement as this. But those who do pour ridicule on such a statement should think twice over before finally rejecting the amendment. It is very necessary to take heed at this moment. No doubt the Government need not be afraid of any second Ireland in India. People are not armed, like the people in Ireland and the Government is very strong. Still, I think, the attitude of reckless indifference is on the whole not advisable for Government to assume. Considerable trouble might arise. It will not be in the interests either of Government or of the people to let people understand that the Government is not minded to consider sympathetically the view of further political progress that has been put forward. People have come to be conscious. It may be semi-consciousness on their part, but there it is. This semi-consciousness or semi-sensibility in people, has to be respected, and whenever this has not been respected, I, as a student of history, must say that it has led to disastrous consequences. Mr. Price has ventured to tell us that the Executive, whatever its character, must remain intact, that the English Revolution was calculated not to weaken the then existing Executive. In his idea of the Executive, he must include King as a part of the executive machinery, and if he is a good student of history he must realise that in the year 1688 when the bloodless revolution was accomplished, the King was deprived of the position that he occupied before 1688. He became more a social head of England from then than a political head. (Mr. Price : No, no.) We read history differently. According to me it goes without saying that the ministerial responsibility was firmly established about then. The Cabinet system was established in the days of William III. William III: was undoubtedly a very wise and diplomatic man. If he would enter London, he would insist upon English forces preceding the Dutch.

In a very imperceptible manner, in the days of William III was brought about a most radical change. It is in the year 1688 that the hereditary line of succession was interrupted. Coming to the French Revolution of 1789, I differ from Mr. Price in the reading of the character of this revolution too. It was a social revolution and not a political one, and it came to be political

[Mr. S. C. Shahani.]

simply because the King threw his influence and authority on the side of the noblemen who were tyrannising over the common people. Some of you may nod your heads, and say, 'No.' I can confidently assert that your reading and your interpretation of the French history does not tally with mine. But that by-the-by. Let us now consider whether any attempts have been made by the Assembly as Mr. Price has alleged, to weaken the Government. It is said that Lord Lytton's Committee's coming to India, which was a settled fact, has been upset by the Assembly, quite true. Perhaps the Secretary of State did not count on the possible opposition of the Assembly, but such are the evils of diarchy, and if diarchy is a necessary evil in the transitional stage, then the possibility of such an opposition from the Assembly should have been contemplated. If a reference had been made to the Assembly in the first instance, I have no doubt that no disappointment would have resulted. Let me, however, remark that the action of the Assembly is perfectly justified. We have reasons to believe that the Advisory Committees that have from time to time been appointed in England have not done much good. I am of course open to correction here. I have come into contact with several students returned from England, and I know that according to them these Committees have not in the past served their purposes, so that such a large outlay on the visit of a Committee, such as the one that was proposed, did not appear to me justifiable. I should have been very glad if other instances had been given of the manner in which the Members of the Assembly have sought to weaken the Executive. The Honourable the Home Member has borne testimony to the fact that the Assembly has always aided in the passing of necessary laws and he feels disposed on behalf of Government to acknowledge the manner in which the Assembly has done its work. My Honourable friend, Mr. Abul Kasem, has poured considerable ridicule over the manner in which the Assembly has been doing its work, but according to me he has not indulged in humour, but horseplay. He has said that some of the more important Resolutions have been thrown to the monkeys on the Jakko Hill and that the Members of the Assembly have not to say themselves that they have been doing good work. He has in this connection recited the story of a school boy who was told by his schoolmaster that he was a duffer and the boy retorted that his mother, his sister, nay, he himself believed that he was not a duffer. True. But here it is not the Members of this Assembly who have come forward and said that they have done their work rightly, but men in responsible positions like the Honourable Sir William Vincent, Lord Chelmsford and our own President. It is said that we ought not to quote the opinion of our President expressed on private occasions, but it should not make any difference whether an opinion is expressed publicly or privately. Private and public expressions of opinion should not differ. Surely, the President is the one man who notices best the character of the work that is done in the Assembly, and if by any chance the opinion that he entertains has come to be expressed, I really do not see why it is in any way improper on our part to refer to it. Those that are responsible and those that have had opportunities of noticing the work that has been done by the Assembly have come forward to say that the Assembly has done well. My friend, Mr. Price, came forward to say that the constituents were showing a craving for a quasi god or hero and were being dictated to. If the dictation does last we may certainly halt and ponder and say, 'Well, if the dictation does endure, then our progressive march to responsible government must be delayed.' I agree so far with Mr. Price, Sir William Vincent too was

perfectly right in emphasising the danger from this attitude of the constituencies. So far so good. But when Mr. Price comes forward and says that personal element in Government is essential and that without it you could not.....

Mr. E. L. Price: On a point of personal explanation, Sir, I did not say that the personal element was essential. I said the whole effort of the Reforms was to get rid of the personal element.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: Very well, Sir. Then I and Mr. Price here agree, and say that the personal element is to disappear, that the Parliament of England has thought it right that it should, and that in the reforms which they have given us they have deliberately gone in for a policy which will ensure in the long run responsible government to India. The question is, whether that should happen in ten years or less. Sir William Vincent has rightly pointed out that the Parliament and the Joint Committee of Lords and Commons have expressed it as their opinion that ordinarily ten years should be considered as the limit. They say 'Try the experiment for ten years and seek further progression afterwards.' But Sir William has himself said that the transitional stage is fraught with difficulties such as my Honourable friend, Mr. Price, alluded to when he instanced the refusal of the grant requested by Government for Lord Lytton's Committee. Several other difficulties would arise in the transitional stage. If difficulties have arisen and will arise in the country, if there are many in the country gravitating to extremism, it is considered by many, by me for instance and several others, that it will be a wise thing at this stage to at least appoint a Joint Committee of the two Houses which must take a long time, may be about two years, to send in its report if the report is to be a well considered report. You have got to bear in mind the attitude in the matter of reforms of the people outside and to consent to a compromise. I always like to consult and, as far as possible, to follow Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar. I discussed the matter with him the other day, and I suppose he would pardon me when I come forward to state that his own view is that the matter might not have been brought up for discussion, but if it has been, some such measure as the appointment of a committee would not be unreasonable, precisely on this ground that the Committee will take some time to formulate its recommendations, and that within that time we shall be in a position to see exactly whether or not we should do what is being suggested in the matter of reforms. Before I sit down I should like to refer to one thing and that is, that the Honourable Sir William Vincent said that the interests of the different elements in India must be protected. I agree. I am not unmindful of that fact. So many Muhammadan Members here have got up to say that minorities have to be protected. Possibly these gentlemen are not representing the feeling of the people correctly. Possibly the feeling outside is different. Muhammadans and Hindus are coming nearer together.

Still I do not for a moment disguise the fact that considerable differences between Hindus and Muhammadans do exist. Supposing *Swaraj* is given us to-day, we shall not be, I am afraid, able, on account of the differences between us, to carry on the government on our own responsibility at once. But have we not got here to remember that all along in the matter of reforms we proceed on the assumption that we all are to continue as Members of the British Empire, and that Englishmen are to be with us; and, if they are to be with us, they will certainly continue to play their important unifying rôle, as they have been

[Mr. S. C. Shahani.]

hitherto doing, in the polity of India. And whence this apprehension that minorities will not be protected if responsible government is given to India? We have just now had some of the Government work transferred to Ministers. It is being said that the Governors in most Provinces take the Ministers into their confidence, and that there prevails not di-archy but mono-archy. If the necessity of coalescing and doing things rightly is adequately realized, it may become quite feasible to run responsible government in India on lines that would be satisfactory to the Government, to the people and to the Empire. It was said in the discussion to-day that the British Government had never attempted to divide and rule. I do not say that it does divide. I think the British Government have yet got to be careful in what they say and do. The other day my Honourable friend, Sir William Vincent, when he referred to the Moplah risings, said that the Moplahs were a poor, illiterate class, that they were fanatical, that they believed that, if they exerted themselves to the utmost in the cause of their religion, they would be translated to Heaven, and that on that account we had got to realise that their action was more attributable to the Khilafat agitators or some such thing as that. I think if such an impression reached the Moplahs, they would be only emboldened in their career of brutality

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: May I inquire if the Honourable Member denies the truth of the statement which I made.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: I do not deny the truth of that statement, but I say that two elements are responsible for what has happened, the brutal nature of the Moplahs on the one hand, and the agitation on the other. To belittle the action of the brutal element in the Moplahs will, I say, have a tendency to divide the Hindus and Muhammadans there. As a matter of fact, we should be careful to distribute the blame rightly.

Before sitting down, I should also like to refer to one other matter. We have been taunted with the fact that fewer constituents went to the poll at the last election, only 182,000 out of a million voters in a population of 250 millions. I want to point out the reason why people did not turn up at the polling stations. The people say that the reforms which have been given us are inadequate, and my friends in this Assembly do remember that this is the reason why fewer people went to the poll. They said that the constitutional reforms that were given to us were not adequate, and therefore it is that they did not vote. The Extremists say, 'These reforms are not real reforms at all; no opportunity is being given to us to put our affairs right.' It is to be remembered that they are leading the masses, and the masses are under the impression that the constitutional reforms are not really calculated to give responsible government to the people. It is on that account that the voters did not turn up to vote.

With these remarks I beg to support the amendment that has been so wisely brought forward by Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, and on two grounds, firstly, because this amendment fixes no time during which responsible government should be given to India, and, secondly, because if this amendment is accepted by the House and by Government—and I make an earnest appeal to

Government also to accept this amendment—disappointment will not be caused in the country.

For these two reasons I beg to support the amendment.

Mr. S. K. Barodawalla : Sir, there is no doubt that this question which we are discussing is one of the most important questions that have come before this Assembly in the course of the present Session. Looking to the important issues involved, and because it is a question of vital importance, I beg leave to say that it is necessary to proceed with very great great caution. Having given due consideration to the Resolution and to the amendments proposed, and if the House adopts any proposal, I have come to the conclusion, and I hope the House will share my views, that the House will do well in adopting the amendment for a Committee moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.

Sir, everyone of us here recognises the need for further advance. But, Sir, looking to the important questions and several issues involved and as it has been suggested, *viz.*, provincial autonomy and responsibility in the Central Government, the two avenues of advancement which, if carried out, will fundamentally alter the character of the constitution, I am entitled, therefore, to ask the House are we as responsible men justified in tying down the hands of my countrymen and all concerned to an arbitrary method about which we had not much time to deliberate. The natural course I think would be to provide facilities for calm and careful deliberation, followed by the suggestion of a method which will be acceptable to all. If this House at all adopts any measure such as the proposal or the amendment, I would, Sir, in that case, as I said, support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.

Mr. H. Clayton : Sir, I rise to speak with some diffidence, in the first place, because I come from a Province in which no reforms have as yet been introduced, and, in the second place, because for the last 18th months I have been at home in England on leave. Therefore, except for the three weeks' experience that I have had in this Honourable Assembly, I have not been able to see the working of these reforms at close quarters and, consequently, my only claim to the attention of this Honourable House is as that unfortunate student of political institutions on whom Mr. Subrahmanayam poured such scorn just now. Sir, on a subject like this there are bound to be considerable divergencies of opinion, but there is one point on which the House is in full unanimity, and that is, that our final objective is the realisation by India of self-government. The issue before us to-day is therefore one of means and not of ends. On the one hand, we have the Government of India Act which aims mainly, if I may say so, at stability during the period of transition. On the other side, there are the Honourable Mover and his friends who rely on the inherent merits of democracy and self-government to ensure success. Now, the Government of India Act has been explained to the House in the course of the debate. It grants, shall we say, a partial measure of responsible or representative government with a restricted electorate, and provides for a series of periods of probation at the end of each of which reconsideration can occur. But, Sir, I would like to point out to the House that a constitution is not a statue which comes out complete from the sculptor's studio and remains thereafter unchanged for ever as a memorial of the artist's art. It has the power of

[Mr. H. Clayton.]

developing an independent life of its own, of developing special tendencies which I may add are often extremely surprising to its authors.

Now, Sir, we may take it that Parliament was perfectly well aware that constitutions have this power of development, and we may also take it, therefore, that the ten years' probation was not intended to be a period of marking time, but rather a period of gradual development of democratic institutions in this country. So, that when at the end of ten years, two of which have already passed, the final gap to be bridged would be much smaller than now appears. Now, Sir, I would like, as a student of political institutions, to point out a few steps which have been reached in these two years. In the first place, the persons associated with Governors in the Provinces are predominantly Indian, the Legislatures, central and provincial, are predominantly elected; the Legislatures have full power over legislation; they have large powers of finance, and it appears to me that, at the present time or within a very reasonable period from the change of constitution, there is no subject, central or provincial, reserved or transferred, in regard to which public opinion as represented by the members of the Legislature cannot bring great and very effective influence to bear upon the Government. Well, Sir, that may not be *Saraj*, but it certainly is not foreign domination and it certainly is not bureaucracy. It seems to me that it is a very distinct advance towards responsible government. I suppose, Sir, that there are many in this House who are fathers of families, and I take it that they must know how impossible it is to judge of the future development of any infant by its appearance shortly after its birth. Well, Sir, the wrinkled baby of 1919 appears to me to be developing into a fine healthy child, and it seems to me extremely probable that by the time he reaches the year of ten he may possess some very prominent democratic characteristics. What is the procedure which during the course of this debate we have been asked to adopt as to the treatment of this baby? Dr. Gour tells us to have it killed off at once and to get a new one. The amendment before the House proposes that, instead of its being allowed to grow up in the natural way, we should give it a Committee of dry nurses who are to sit on it for a period of three years. I put it to you, can any baby possibly survive that? My advice to the House is give the baby a chance. It is doing very well; all you have to do is to leave it alone and see what it will develop into. Now, Sir, let us pay attention for a moment to what are the powers reserved to the Central Government. I put it to the House that the only case in which the Government, whether Central or Provincial, are in a position really to exercise what may be called autocratic powers, is in matters affecting the actual stability of the State. This is a most important matter, because all history shows that the besetting sin of democracies is weakness, whereas strength in a democracy is more necessary than elsewhere. In all times and in all countries there have been forces of disorder at work; and when I say that forces of disorder are at work in India, it is casting no slur upon it; India is a great nation and that being so she suffers from the same diseases as other nations. It is the object of these forces of disorder so to upset the existing state of society, that they may wring some advantage or possible supreme power to themselves. Now, history again shows that it is in times of political transition that the opportunity comes for forces of disorder. Professor Shabani has tried to decry the political instances given by my Honourable friend, Mr. Price, especially in the case of France. But, Sir, I would ask him to carry his inquiries into French history.

a little later. Let him take them down to the year 1870, and down to the present time. May I ask him why it is that France, the most democratic nation perhaps in Europe, finds the best guarantees for her republican constitution in a constitution which was made by monarchists for a monarchy and an administrative machinery which was invented by an autocrat for the preservation of autoeracy? Then, again, Sir, I can give further instances, in addition to those given by Mr. Price. In this connection I would like to refer to South America. Dr. Gour has begun reading Lord Bryce's *Modern Democracies*; but he has ended with the introduction; I suggest that when he has leisure he should carry his reading a little further and read what Lord Bryce has to say about South America. There he will find that when Spain left the continent new constitutions were started, new republican constitutions of the latest type, by the intelligentsia of the country, but there was no basis upon which those democracies could be established, and therefore South America has endured eighty years of military despotism out of which it is now only beginning to emerge. Sir, all the examples that can be given from history show that stability and security are the very corner-stone upon which alone autonomous government can be established. Now, Sir, when I say stability, I hold that stability consists of three things: first, you require statesmen, statesmen capable of undertaking the direction of government and protecting the country against the forces of internal and external disorder. In the second place, you want an informed electorate which will return statesmen of that character to power. In the third place, you want an effective administrative machine. Well, Sir, it is stated by the supporters of this Resolution that India has the strength required. I do not propose to make any criticism of the abilities of this Assembly, or of the Provincial Councils or the Ministers. No doubt, Sir, India has always possessed statesmen and nobody has ever denied it. We possess an administrative machine of great efficiency. Yes. But there have been several Resolutions put down both in this House and in the Council of State which are definitely aimed at weakening that machine. Thirdly, there is the electorate. I suppose it may be said that if the electorate has returned this Assembly and the Provincial Councils, it is capable of returning a Government which could administer the country. But, Sir, one swallow does not make a summer, and one election at which only a portion of the people have voted cannot possibly be regarded as full proof. Democracies are not always successful, and there is no magic about the particular word democracy which is going to make it successful if the proper conditions for its success are absent. I do not propose myself to use any words of my own to show what are the qualifications which are necessary. I propose to quote to the House the words of a distinguished American philosopher; Mr. George Santayana is a Spaniard who has spent many years in America and has filled high positions at American Universities. The House may be quite sure that he is completely free from any connection with England or from any bureaucratic tendency. This is what he says :

'The practice of English liberty pre-supposes two things, that all concerned are fundamentally unanimous and that each has a plastic nature which he is willing to modify. If fundamental unanimity is lacking and all are not making in the same general direction, there can be no honest co-operation, no satisfying compromise.'

'To put things to the vote, and to accept unreservedly the decision of the majority, are points essential to the English system, but they would be absurd if fundamental agreement were not pre-supposed. Every decision that the majority could conceivably arrive at must

[Mr. H. Clayton.]

leave it still possible for the minority to live and prosper, even if not in the way they wished. Where this is not secured, a decision by vote would be as alien a fatality to any minority as the decree of a foreign tyrant, and at every election the right of rebellion would come into play. In a hearty and sound democracy, all questions at issue must be minor matters; fundamentals must have been silently agreed upon and taken for granted when the democracy arose.

It will be noted here that Mr. Santayana speaks of English liberty; he uses the expression of set purpose as contrasted with absolute or natural liberty of which he writes :

'The spirit in which parties and peoples outside the pale of English liberty comfort one another is not motherly nor brotherly. Their valourousness consists in their indomitable egotism. The liberty which they want is absolute liberty, a desire which is quite primitive.'

He then goes on to say :

'The parties meet, however diplomatic their procedure, as buyers and sellers bargain in primitive markets. Each has a fixed programme or procedure, or, as he perhaps calls it, an ideal, and when he has got as much as he can get to-day, he will return to the charge to-morrow.'

and the result of that in any State is war.

Now the difference between two ideals on the one hand is the existence of fundamental unanimity and, on the other hand, the demand for absolute liberty which means that each man insists on getting exactly what he wants. I ask the House to consider which of these two ideals is the more prevalent in India to-day? These words of Mr. Santayana were written without a thought of India, and I think that if we apply what my Honourable friend Dr. Gour would call the 'acid test' we must know that this fundamental unanimity has not yet been attained in the electorate in the great mass of the people or even in this Assembly. The fact is, as already pointed out, that in a system of full self-government, the ultimate guarantee of stability rests upon the presence of this fundamental unanimity in the people, and if this be so, and if it be agreed, as I think all will agree, that this fundamental unanimity is at present lacking, surely it was the highest statesmanship that Parliament, while conferring a far-reaching measure of self-government and responsible government on India, reserved at the same time to the Governor General in Council and to the Governors of Provinces, power to maintain the stability and security of the country until such time as the electorate have developed the power to do it for themselves. Sir, I venture to think that this is a view which ought to appeal to all the interests of this great country of India: the great landowners, the industrialists, the merchants, the professional classes, the small proprietors, the tenants and even to the small artisans and the labourers, of whom my Honourable friend behind me (Mr. Joshi) is so great a supporter. All these classes have very much indeed to lose by insecurity, far more than they have to gain by the power to go to the poll.

I have noticed, Sir, in this House that it is the custom of some Honourable Members to clinch their arguments by some Latin legal maxim. I am no lawyer, Sir, but I would commend to the consideration of Honourable Members of this Assembly the words '*Salus Reipublicae suprema lex*' the security of the State is the first law.

Mr. B. S. Kamat: Sir, I venture to make a few observations regarding the speech which has been delivered by the Honourable the Home Member. At the outset, let me remark that the speech from him struck me in many respects as sympathetic, but, Sir, on many points, I must admit that his speech entirely

failed to convince me. If he was cogent on any arguments at all, he was cogent on throwing out the main proposition of my friend, Mr. Majumdar, that Government should not commit itself to the principle of a fixed limit in giving a further political advance in the Indian constitution. But where he failed, to my mind, was when he tried to make out that this question should not even be referred to a Committee, thus blocking any further investigation, or taking stock, as it were, or reviewing the position so far as our progress is concerned.

His arguments were, first of all, that Parliament would not be in a mood or would not be prepared to listen to us so early as this. I agree that he was on rather firm ground in saying this, but as he himself put it, the Government of India Act is not like the laws of the Persians and Medes, so that we should not ever refer this question to this Committee which my friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas proposes to appoint in order to make reasonable recommendations, not for a wholesale revolution as my Honourable friend, Mr. Price, put it, but to remedy and repair a few flaws and defects in the constitution which we may have found. I do believe that Parliament would not be so short-sighted as to say 'Well, we are not going to listen to you for ten years certain.'

Sir, the Honourable the Home Member next referred to the fact that the reforms have not been sufficiently tested. I certainly agree with him that, in running the reforms machinery, we ought not to go too fast, but if there are difficulties in running at break-neck speed, on the other hand, I would point out to the Honourable Sir William Vincent that there are dangers in going too slow. While we have not to run the car of reforms at a terrific speed for the next ten years, on the other hand, you have not to put your foot and hand brakes full on, to keep it at a standstill. It is our duty to see which parts of the machine are defective; the start has been given to us no doubt by Parliament, but some parts of the machine are sure to be found to be defective even after the short period of nine months, and we must replace these defective parts. I for one, have no hesitation in saying that what is required in the machine of ours is a magnet in the Central Government rather than a dry cell battery. I agree that we have only nine months' experience; I am not prepared to dogmatise as to whether this Assembly has been a success or a failure merely on the strength of complimentary after-dinner speeches or any remarks in private letters of certain individuals in regard to the working of this Assembly. But apart from it, I really do consider that the time is ripe for us to take stock of our defects and deficiencies. That, at any rate, we must be prepared to do.

Then the Honourable the Home Member referred to the electorate. I agree that the electorate is not sufficiently educated in this country, but when the Joint Committee of Parliament gave us the Government of India Act, they were fully conscious of that fact, after all they knew what the electorate was like. And when the Honourable Sir William Vincent said that only 20 per cent. of the electorate recorded their votes on the last occasion, and though I am convinced that the working of the electorate on that occasion was far from normal, still the very fact that the remaining 80 per cent. of the electorate did not go to the poll showed that they were educated by somebody in the country. They refrained from going to the poll, for the simple reason that some political party educated them—or miseducated them and persuaded them not to go to the poll; the fact remains that 80 per cent of the electorate were not entirely sleeping at the time of the last election.

[Mr. B. S. Kamat.]

And as I said, after all, to start with, we counted upon the fact that the electorate would be illiterate for some years to come. Therefore, this is no new factor, and for that reason we need not block the amendment that is before us.

Then, again, the Honourable the Home Member referred to diarchy and he thought that we were building conclusions *a priori*. Personally, I am not prepared to say whether diarchy is a success or a failure in the Provinces. That is just the point however for this Committee to find out, and if there is any reason at all for the formation of this Committee, it is this. It is the Committee which will find out whether diarchy has proved a success or a failure. I can point out what this Committee can do. It would be for this Committee, for instance, to go and obtain the first-hand evidence of the Ministers, ask them how they have worked the machine, whether the team between the Executive Councillors and the Ministers pulled well under the guidance of the Governor, and whether the Governor as a Busman could run his omnibus well. That would be for this Committee to find out. Then, again, it would be for this Committee to find out whether the Ministers are handicapped in the matter of finances under present arrangement and in the matter of proposals for new taxation. There, I believe, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas has made out a case why this matter ought to be referred to a Committee. Even supposing that the Government of India Act under section 45 does not provide for the transference of *all* the subjects to the Ministers, at any rate it does not preclude the Committee from making recommendations that barring only one reserved subject all the other subjects should be transferred consistently with the Act. That at any rate would be in consonance with the present sections of the Government of India Act. Therefore, although we may not get full provincial autonomy, we can at any rate make a further advance in transferring a few more subjects to the Ministers if this Committee recommends it, and if the Government of India find it acceptable. May I ask the Honourable the Home Member if the time has not come to take stock of the situation? What is the Home Member's argument on the other side? Is he going to stand still for ten years? Is it proper to wait till the next ten years under the present situation in the country? That is the only alternative that suggests itself to my mind. If for the next ten years the Government of India are not going to raise their finger, then may I ask why this Empire Delegation Commission is coming out here? That itself shows that the Government of India are prepared to reconsider this question at any rate touching some parts of the Government of India Act, and to re-model it, if not wholly, at any rate, in some parts, which require re-modelling and re-shaping. Then, again, what about the question of diarchy in the Central Government? If not diarchy, at least the next stage of responsible government whatever form it may take? As Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas told us, if there was a consensus of opinion throughout the country amongst all the parties on any particular item of political reform, it was about the point of regarding some measure of responsibility in the Central Government. If I am not guilty of indelicacy, I might even say that two of the present Indian Members of the Executive Council of the Government were in favour of some responsible government in the Government of India—I mean the Honourable Dr. Sapru and the Honourable Mr. Sarma. If, therefore, a certain measure of responsible government was acceptable to these Members, and to the country, I ask, is it not time that the Government should, without waiting for full ten years,

consider the matter which had earned the unanimous support of the whole country and even a portion of the Government of India, and touch the Government of India Act in those parts, at all events, which require a little bit of retouching? The Honourable the Home Member told us about the working of the Executive, how the present Executive of the Government of India feel in relation to the Legislature. I am not referring to the question of voluntary responsibility on their part. I make a frank admission that all the Members of the Government of India, since the inauguration of these reforms, have been no doubt behaving towards the Legislature as if, to all intents and purposes, they were responsible to us; they have always behaved as if our own interests were their own. But after all, what is the character of the responsibility? It is not a constitutional responsibility. That responsibility is guided, if I may say so, if we look beneath the surface, by the fact that there is a good deal of public opinion outside and that the pressure of public opinion is perhaps as irresistible as the pressure of the atmosphere upon our bodies. And, secondly, that responsibility is perhaps guided by the mere force of the weight of numbers—I mean the large elected majority in this House. When, for instance, a particular Bill is brought before this Council, Members of Government, although they may not be trembling in their shoes, certainly, I dare say, they must be feeling as if they are walking on peas—owing to this large elected majority here. The question now is, should this responsibility be only a moral, spontaneous, and willing responsibility on the part of the Executive, or should that responsibility be converted by a change in the Statute into a constitutional responsibility? That is the point we have to discuss, and we do really feel, I dare say the whole country feels, that instead of having a moral, spontaneous responsibility on the part of these Members of the Executive Government, we must have soon some measure of constitutional statutory responsibility. The Honourable the Home Member referred to non-co-operation outside. I agree that this is not an opportune moment. But this Committee which is proposed to be appointed is not going to introduce a particular change in the Government of India Act to-morrow or on the 1st of January. They will certainly take some time to deliberate and make their recommendations. The Government of India themselves will certainly take some time after that to go over them, and then, I believe, it will take time for Parliament and the English public at Home to consider whether such changes should be made. All this will certainly take some time, and all that while, I don't think that the present Moplah riots or the disturbances outside or the disloyalty which we see at present around us will remain in the country. Therefore, it is time to begin, although the present moment may not be opportune. The moment is inopportune in some respects, I admit, so far as English public opinion at Home is concerned. But let us make a move. Let us take stock of what we have done and what we have failed to do, and to find out whether the machinery is defective. If the recommendations of this Committee are too radical, if they are too revolutionary, if they are too premature, let us turn them down. Let the Government of India throw them aside. But if in some respects, for instance, in certain sections of the Government of India Act, I mean sections with reference to the Executive Councils, we can go one step further, by all means let the Government of India recommend to the Government at Home even before the ten years' time has arrived to make certain changes. Suppose, we want some change in the Government of India, where there are real defects, I believe it would be time to eradicate them and to go a step further.

[Mr. B. S. Kamat.]

These are the grounds, Sir, on which I support Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas' amendment, and I think I have been able to show that there is a very good case made out why we should refer the whole question to a Committee, although we may not be entirely in favour of the main proposition.

Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan : Sir, I oppose the Resolution as put by my Honourable friend, Rai Bahadur Jadu Nath Majumdar, and support the amendment put forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas. But, in doing so, I wish to tell the House that I do not, in any way, want to associate myself with the remarks which my Honourable friend, Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali has made in this House. I do not, think, Sir, that Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali, was speaking on behalf of his constituency when he was making his speech here. I hope he was speaking on his own behalf, and not on behalf of Mussalmans as he claimed to do. I represent also a constituency of Muhammadans, and I know their feelings. I know, Sir, that they want *Swaraj* just the same as anybody else in this country. There might be some difference of opinion as to what will that *Swaraj* mean, and how it shall be worked. But there is no second opinion about getting *Swaraj* for India whether soon or late. Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali says that the Muhammadans will be great losers if *Swaraj* is given to India. I repudiate that idea altogether. His position is that, if I cannot get something for myself, I do not want my neighbour to get that also. That is a funny argument that Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali puts forward. My objects in opposing the Resolution are different. I am alive to what Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali has said. I know what Muhammadans are fearing and their fears may be justified to a certain extent. There might be something in what Khan Bahadur Zahir-ud-din put forward. There might be certain individuals belonging to a particular community who might be ignoring the rights of the minority, but we cannot put the blame altogether on the whole community on account of the action of certain individuals. Undoubtedly, the Resolution, as it is worded, has got some tendency to bring forth certain evils. As a matter of fact, the whole process of appointing Ministers is pregnant with evil, and while supporting my Honourable friend Dr. Gour, that there should be an amendment of the Government of India Act, I beg to make a few remarks on the position of Ministers. Undoubtedly, the House will agree with me that a Minister is a person elected by a sect. He is a sectarian representative. He is not the representative of India. Undoubtedly, as he is elected by a certain community he has to please that community in order to be returned next time. This is a very difficult proposition to settle in this House. And I know the reasons why the Muhammadan community asked for a separate electorate. I know that the Muhammadans in India have not yet reached that stage when they can ask for a joint electorate. Certainly not. I will be the last person to say to-day that there should be a joint electorate and not a separate electorate, but, at the same time, I say that this difficulty has been put before simply on account of this minority and the interests of minorities. Now, you blame Government for this and say: 'Look here: The Muhammadans are suffering because they are in a minority. They want a separate electorate' and then you say, 'No, nothing further should be given because we are in a minority.' This is not a sound suggestion on the part of Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali. What he ought to have proposed to this House was a certain solution of this difficulty. Of course, I know the difficulty of a man who is elected by a certain community. He is the

servant of two bodies. He is the servant of Government to whom he belongs and he is also the servant of and has to please the community which has returned him. If he can please these two bodies he has got nothing to do with any third body. He may be inclined to favour certain individuals who might have influence in securing a seat for him in the next election, but as I said before, this depends upon individual cases, and for this we cannot blame the whole community. A man may be wanting in character. There might be some cases in which a wrong person might have been chosen to fill up that high post. There might have been certain individuals in certain provinces who have been put up as Ministers whose life-long work was a sectarian one and not for the general uplift of India as a whole. But it is a difficulty for which there can be a safeguard and there can be a solution, and that solution can be freely discussed in a small body like a Committee. If a man comes up duly elected by one community and if he enjoys the confidence of every one who belongs to that House, then certainly that difficulty is got over, but under the present law the Governor has to choose out of the elected Members. The Members have got no voice. He might do some thing which may not be liked by other people, but to say that the Muhammadan community at large will be ruined simply because Home Rule is granted to India, there cannot be a more fallacious argument and absolute misrepresentation than that before this House. I do not believe entirely in diarchy, and for this purpose I oppose the second clause of the original Resolution. Part I of course is fixing up a certain time in regard to which there are many difficulties and I do not agree with that portion as well. I would have agreed to the third clause of the original Resolution if it had not fixed any time, but by fixing the time the Honourable Mover has created great difficulties. I quite agree with my friend, Maulvi Abul Kasem, when he presented certain difficulties before this House. I can quite see the difficulties which the Government and the Parliament will have. They will come forward and say, 'After nine months you are putting up a new scheme before us.' What has made you to bring this up when you had not seen sufficiently how the reforms work? But here we have got before us the whole country which is demanding *Swaraj* by the end of December in the words of Mr. Gandhi, but there is another section, Sir, which is keeping quiet. There is only one party which is speaking and that presumes that it is speaking on behalf of the whole country. That is the section of Mahatma Gandhi and another note has been sounded by Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali. These are two extreme points and I do not know how to reconcile them.

What I contend is that both these views are extremist views and are not views which are held by the thoughtful people of India. I hope, Sir, that all my Muhammadan friends here in this House will agree with me in repudiating the remarks of Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali when he says that Muhammadans do not want Home Rule. The only point now left, Sir, is what should be done in this House. Of course, I quite agree with the Honourable Sir William Vincent that very few people came to the polls. In other words he means to say that this House is not representative of the whole of India. But I do not agree with him there. There may be some persons who might have been returned on account of non-co-operation, but I want to assure the Honourable Sir William Vincent that there are Members in this House who, even though all the non-co-operators jointly had stood against them, would have beaten them. These Members enjoy the confidence of the whole country and of the constituencies which they are representing, and they can speak on behalf

[Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan.]

of India. In the case of some Members who have been returned to this House, it should not be presumed that they would not have been returned if any non-co-operators had stood against them. In the same way, there is a representation here, we can speak and our position remains. There is a great section of the country which is led by Mahatma Gandhi and they are demanding *Swaraj* by the end of December. Of course, they have given three months more—before it was October, now it is by the end of December, that is by a different means. This House also wants Home Rule and *Swaraj*, but the method may be different. There is another section—there may be a few people like Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali who may not want it at all. What is the position of this House? Does this House reflect the views represented by Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali or the views of Mahatma Gandhi? Certainly not, we are not representing either of their views. We want that *Swaraj* should come; *Swaraj* will surely come and England has never denied *Swaraj* to India. They have promised *Swaraj* and it will come. The only question is time. When the time comes, *Swaraj* will come too. I agree so far with Maulvi Abul Kasem that we have to train our masses to understand their responsibilities and to know and return those persons who are quite capable and will be good administrators, and I know at present that there is not sufficient time to do that. I do not agree with the Resolution though I share all the aspirations of my Honourable friend, Mr. Majumdar. But we are still left in a difficulty. If we refuse even the amendment put forward, what will be our position in the country. Mahatma Gandhi and his followers will call us traitors; of course, they do so now, but they will call us traitors all the more. And there will be another body, I suppose very few, who will come and clap their hands like Khan Bahadur Amjad Ali. Being placed in this difficulty, I think the only solution to save our faces from the criticism from outside and also to achieve the object and aim for which the whole of India is waiting and has come forward to-day, is to accept the amendment put forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jannadas Dwarkadas, and, therefore I wholeheartedly support it.

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey: Sir, I shall address myself primarily to the amendment put forward by my Honourable friend, Mr. Jannadas Dwarkadas. I readily admit that an amendment of this nature has certain attractions; it recognises the difficulties attendant on the evolution of diarchy in the Provinces; it recognises also certain difficulties inherent in the introduction of responsible government in the Central Government; it further avoids the attempt to fix an exact period of time within which India is to realise what I may describe as its secular ambition. So much attraction it has. But for me it has also distinct advantages. It must be realised, and the House can never escape from this position, that the decision does not lie with this House itself; it does not lie with the Governor General in Council, nor with the Secretary of State. The decision lies with Parliament; and Parliament has specifically asserted that it will make no considerable change in the constitution which it has granted to India until a Parliamentary Commission has itself examined into the question. Now, Sir, what would be the result of appointing such a Committee as Mr. Jannadas Dwarkadas proposes? In the first place, its deliberations would in no sense be binding on Parliament, nor could we hope that Parliament would, when the time came, accept those deliberations as a sufficient substitute for the investigations which will be made

by its own Commission. That is one point. But there is a further point. If you will read his amendment, you will see that it inevitably pre-supposes agreement to the principle both of bringing about provincial autonomy in all the Governors' provinces and of introducing responsibility in the Central Government at some early date. It would be useless to appoint such a Committee unless we had accepted that principle. It is perfectly true that Mr. Jinnadas says in terms :—' Let the Committee investigate ; let it go forth and see what can be done in the matter ; let it take stock ; let it mark the progress achieved ; and then let it make its recommendations.' But, Sir, the very appointment of such a Committee pre-supposes that some early action is to be taken on its recommendations, certainly before the ten years which Parliament has laid down. Now, Sir, are we prepared, could we be prepared as a Government, to recommend to Parliament that we should forthwith accept the principle of the early introduction of complete autonomy in all Governors' Provinces and responsible government in the Central Government? I need not say that I am no enemy of constitution progress in this country ; the House knows well that the reverse is the case ; but let me give my view of some of the implications which the acceptance of this claim would convey. First as to provincial autonomy. Now, before you can satisfy Parliament that provincial autonomy can be safely granted at an early date, that is to say, complete provincial autonomy—and I use the same words as Mr. Jinnadas himself used—you will have to satisfy it that the grant of such autonomy would not impair the maintenance of proper arrangements for the defence of law and order. You have to be certain that you can satisfy a Parliamentary Committee that the provinces as now constituted would be prepared to make the necessary administrative arrangements for ordinary police, and perhaps for police battalions, to secure us against such further outrages as we once saw in the Punjab—I am not referring at all to April 1919—or those we have lately seen in Madras. Then you will have to satisfy Parliament that you can secure the finances of the country, and I would ask you to consider the grave implications contained in that assurance. Complete provincial autonomy would mean that the provinces must be financially autonomous also, and Parliament will have to satisfy itself that the provinces would be prepared to continue those contributions to central finance which are necessary for the carrying on of the great central services administered by the Central Government. Again, you will have to satisfy Parliament that autonomous provinces would secure the rights of minorities. That is no light question. These minorities are at present guarded by the fact that provinces are in such matters still under the supervision and control of the Governor General in Council, acting under the orders of the Secretary of State. Are we certain that an autonomous Punjab with its large predominance of Muhammadans would preserve the existing electoral laws giving rights to Sikhs? Are we certain that Sind, with its large Muhammadan population could secure from the Hindu majority in the Bombay Presidency a proper representation of its own interests in the Provincial Council? Are we certain that the million and a half of Muhammadans in the Central Provinces could secure separate representation at the hands of an autonomous Central Provinces Council? You cannot lightly put aside questions of that nature. I shall no doubt be reminded that the Hindus and Muhammadans came at one time to a compact (the Lucknow compact) regarding representation in the Provincial Councils ; but that was an all-India compact ; and it would not stand against the determined opposition of the majority in any single province.

[Mr. H. M. Hailey.]

Then, again, Sir, under complete provincial autonomy, can you secure that there shall be no legislation which will infringe the rights of religious communities? Remember that at present under a system of imperfect autonomy, before legislation can be introduced into a Provincial Council which will affect the rights of religious communities, the previous sanction of the Governor General has to be obtained. Are we yet ready for complete provincial autonomy which might deprive religious communities of that safeguard? These are the questions which Parliament would certainly ask, and these are questions on which you will have to satisfy a British House of Commons.

Then, I come to the second point, relating to responsible government in the Central Government. What is the implication there? You will remember that in those deliberations, both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, which followed what has been called 'the Speaker's Ruling,' the Secretary of State and his Under Secretary speaking in his turn in the House of Lords accepted the convention, that where Ministers' subjects were concerned Parliament ought not to interfere. If you are going to have responsible government extended to the Central Government, then equally you must establish a convention that Parliament shall not interfere in any decision which has been arrived at by responsible Ministers in the Central Government. Ministers derive their authority, which by all constitutional theory must be a final authority, from the Legislatures which they serve; you could have no responsible government in the Central Government unless Parliament were willing to give up its authority over the central subjects affected. How far is that likely at present? How far is it reasonable in the present circumstances to ask Parliament to give up its control and its supervision over central subjects? Take one only, the Army. Do you suppose in the present circumstances that Parliament would for one instant agree to give up such general control as it now exercises over the provision for defence? The Indian Army is the army of India, paid for by India, and maintained only for the defence of India; but Parliament is still the final judge of the adequacy of its strength and the manner of its constitution. Are you seriously going to ask Parliament at the present moment to give up such control and supervision as it exercises over the Army of India in the interests of India herself and her defence? Would you at present expect Parliament to give you authority, for instance, to disperse entirely with the British troops in our Army? Let us be practical; you know that it is an impossible proposition to put before Parliament at present. Then, again, take the railways. Are you going to ask Parliament to give up any control or supervision whatever over a subject so important as that, a subject in which a vast amount of capital and British capital is interested? Are you going to ask Parliament to give up all control over the subject of communications, which are the very life-blood of India? Again, let us be practical; you know that at present this also is an impossible proposition. Take, again, revenue. Are you going to ask Parliament at present to give up its entire control and supervision over the subject of revenue; that is to say, are you going to ask that a Province saddled with a permanent settlement, should have uncontrolled power to break it up? That, again, I take it is an impossible proposition.

Now, Sir, what are the arguments that we are asked to advance to Parliament in order to persuade it to agree to an early change in the Indian

constitution? Take the arguments, which the supporters of this proposition have put forward. They have based their case first on the achievements of this Assembly. Sir William Vincent has more than once in the course of this debate paid tribute to those achievements; I myself should be the last to depreciate them. But how far does this take us? Nobody, Sir, least of all we who have a strong interest and a strong belief in the future of reforms, nobody doubted that India could produce men of great political intelligence, great powers of expression, and full sense of responsibility; nobody has doubted that for a second. India has produced them and they are here in this Assembly. Parliament itself will grant you that and grant it without reserve. But the question that Parliament will ask is, how do these men stand with their constituencies? What is the effective influence which they have over their constituencies? Are they certain, particularly in view of the small number of votes that have hitherto been recorded, that they can promise a continuity of the policy of moderation and co-operation for which they themselves stand? Can they tell us what will be the result of the next elections? Can they tell us that an ensuing Assembly will be characterised by the same sobriety of judgment and sense of responsibility as this Assembly? That is the question Parliament will ask you, and you yourselves know best if you are likely to be able to convince it by your reply.

Beyond that argument I have heard other suggestions. We have been told that if we do not immediately give way on this proposition, we might have to face a secession from the British Empire and that we may have to face an agitation equal to that of Ireland. (Cries of 'No, no.')

Perhaps not; but the arguments were advanced. They were not advanced in the form of threats, but when you have two parties to an agreement, and in trying to persuade one party to give way you warn it of exceedingly undesirable consequences if it does not do so, these are very little short of a threat. I regret that anybody should stand here and suggest it as an argument that India may have to repeat the experience of Ireland. We all deplore what has happened there, and we do not wish to see a similar blot on the escutcheon of India; we do not want to see riots, revolution and midnight assassinations. But if the threat is undesirable, the argument is an exceedingly poor one. To suggest to the British Parliament that if they do not speedily alter our constitution, they may have to face over again the experience of Ireland, is indeed a very poor argument on the part of those who base their claim for a change in the constitution on the ground of their fitness for constitutional advance. And, Sir, what is the body which you are setting out to persuade? What is the constitution of the Parliament to which you will advance such very slender arguments? That Parliament, Sir, is a body which has not been accustomed to speedy constitutional changes. Generation after generation, nay, century after century, it has won its way by slow pressure, first on the Crown and then on the Executive, consolidating little by little what it has won and depending for its strength rather on tradition and convention than on legislative enactments. It will judge your request in the light of its own history; it will judge of your present position by the position which it itself has won and now occupies. For it stands, Sir, not on any legislative enactment, but on the political common sense, on the spirit of political compromise, the hard-earned political wisdom of those who elected it. Can you yet say that you yourselves stand on so firm and sound a basis? And yet you are going to make representations to a body with these traditions

[Mr. W. M. Hailey.]

and occupying this position that after the experience of a few months, after the passing of a period of time so brief that it certainly does not equal the time taken over the preparation of this constitution, the whole of the constitution should be radically changed. Again, I ask, do you realise that it is to that body you are going to put forward such a proposition? (Cries of No, no.)

Well, Sir, these are the implications of this amendment, and if it has not these implications, then the Committee which Mr. Jinnahdas Dwarakadas proposes to appoint would be a sheer waste of time and labour.

Is it seriously likely that you will persuade Parliament of the strength of the case for immediate action? I have tried to sketch to the House the kind of temper in which Parliament with its past traditions would be likely to approach this proposition. I will go further and put before you certain practical considerations and ask you to consider them as practical men. You have in Parliament a considerable party which I have heard described in this House as reactionary; take care that you do not play into their hands. They will say that an Assembly which after the experience of nine months can come to the conclusion that a radical change in its constitution is required, is an Assembly of such unconsidered judgment and so hasty a temperament, that Parliament should at once discount any claim it puts before it. Consider again that you have a Lancashire already resentful of what you have done in this House, and Lancashire, I think, has over 60 representatives in Parliament. Will you conciliate them, or will they not form an even more solid phalanx of opinion against you? I freely assert, that if you put forward a proposition of this nature you will, instead of advancing your cause, infallibly retard it. Your critics will ask you to remember the concessions which India has already gained. It was only a few years back—two or three I think—that you had a debate on a Resolution deprecating the preponderance of British officials in your Services. Who could raise such a debate to-day, when in every service we have agreed to proportion equal or nearly equal to half and half? The House has advocated that 25 per cent of commissions in the Indian Army should be given to Indians, and Government have supported your proposition. You have gained what I may describe as the fiscal convention, that is to say, if your Legislature and your Executive Government agree to any fiscal change, Parliament will not oppose it. I shall not refer to those domestic improvements such as the abolition of Repressive Laws, Press Laws and the like which you have gained; but you have attained one privilege to which Parliament itself in the long course of its history has always attached the greatest importance, and that is, the power of the Budget. In continuation of that power, you have also won in regard to one great branch of your taxation, namely, the income-tax, the right which you had claimed that it brought before you annually for re-enactment. These are your gains; and both your friends and your opponents in Parliament will ask you to explain the reason of this sudden haste on your part to secure a further change in the constitution? 'We,' they will say 'have given you an Act which provides that the whole system shall be examined at the end of ten years by a commission of ourselves and in that interval of time you have opportunities to make fresh conventions, and fresh traditions to your own advantage. It is an infallible rule in political history that where a representative assembly has once gained a concession, where it has once wrested anything from its enemy the Executive, it never lets go. You will have these opportunities

during the next nine years. Consolidate your position, take full advantage of the opportunities we have placed within your grasp, and at the end of that time we will see what further legislation is necessary.' That, I think, is the answer, and the only answer that you can receive. Sir, it has often been urged against Englishmen that they do not know when they are beaten. That is a fine trait, and one that has won in the end many a hard fight, that seemed to be turning against us; but it appears to me, and perhaps it will appear to Parliament also, that there are many men in this Assembly who do not know when they have won.

And now, Sir, I am afraid that I have trespassed on the time of this House; but my endeavour has been to state the problem, not as a theoretical and abstract question, (for everybody will agree that we have had enough of generalisations this Session), but as a practical one I have tried to view the question, not as in the light of our ambitions or our aspirations, but purely as we must put it before Parliament and purely as Parliament is likely to take it. I will conclude, if you will allow me, Sir, with a word of advice, offered respectfully, as any advice must be offered by one Member to others in this House. I would advise that we agree on this formula, that the Governor General in Council should inform the Secretary of State of the tenour of this debate, and also inform the Secretary of State of the opinions expressed in this Assembly that the progress made by India under Constitutional Government has been such that there is reason to urge that the period of ten years should be reduced.

I would ask the House that they should agree on this solution. Members of this House need be under no misapprehension that their constituents will misunderstand their attitude. They have put their views before us and they will be transferred to Parliament. Many have advocated an early date—and in some cases a very early date—for a change in the Statute which defines our constitution. Surely now the only practical and reasonable end to this debate is, that we should convey to Parliament the opinions we have heard expressed in this House that it ought not to wait ten years before the Parliamentary Commission investigates the whole question of further amendments in the constitution which has been granted to India.

Mr. N. M. Samarth: Sir, I am thankful to the Home and Finance Members of Government for the assurance that they have given, while impressing upon this House the desirability of not making any proposal which it is not possible for Parliament to entertain at the present moment. Knowing as I do something of what happened in the Joint Parliamentary Committee, I think it my duty to tell Members of this House that, during the deliberations of that Committee, the principle of dyarchy, even in so far as the provinces were concerned, was in peril. It was not, therefore, to be expected that the Joint Parliamentary Committee would sanction or recommend its immediate adoption in the Central Government. But as one who belonged to a certain party of which I had the honour of being Honorary Secretary, I gave evidence in strong terms, which were referred to by Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas, as to the necessity and desirability of further liberalising the legislative and executive machinery of the Government of India beyond what was contained in the original proposals; and I had the satisfaction of seeing that the Joint Parliamentary Committee did recommend a further liberalisation of the machinery. For instance, it laid down that at least three Members of the Viceroy's

[Mr. N. M. Samarth.]

Executive Council shall be Indians. Mark the words 'at least three'. It further gave up the original idea of the Council of State being made a super-seding and over-riding body over the Legislative Assembly and constituted it, as they say in their report, from the commencement as a true second Chamber. Thirdly, they gave us what was not contained in the original proposals, namely, power over the Budget subject to certain reservations and restrictions which are embodied in the Government of India Act. And, fourthly, they gave us what has been referred to by the Honourable Mr. Hailey and which I value most, fiscal freedom by means of the convention that whenever the Government of India and its Legislature agree, there shall be no interference by the Secretary of State, and therefore none by Parliament. In all these four respects, therefore, there was made a great advance over the original proposals contained in the Montagu-Chelmsford Reform Scheme, and all that was possible and practicable in the circumstances had been done. But there was one point upon which I was very keen and which I pressed earnestly, namely, the restoration of the original proposal in the Montagu-Chelmsford Scheme, to the effect that after the end of five years from the time the Reform Councils came into existence, it should be permissible to the Provincial Legislatures to pass a Resolution asking for more transferred subjects than have been already granted under the Reform Scheme, and that on such a Resolution being passed and conveyed either by the local Government or the Provincial Legislature to the Government of India, the Government of India should give effect to that Resolution. I pointed out that ten years was too long a period, and that having regard to the awakening of public consciousness in the country and the momentum that would be gathered during the coming years, if you kept this constitution without any amendment for ten years, there will be an agitation of a kind—I repeat the words which I used then, without, however, intending any threat—there will be an agitation which staggers the imagination. There were certain Members of the Joint Parliamentary Committee who thought that five years was too short a period in the lifetime of a nation, and that ten years was the period which was necessary in order that the Commission may come and inquire thereafter how far progress had advanced. I am glad that the Government of India agree that ten years is too long a period. At least the Honourable the Home Member said so. All I wish to impress upon this House and upon the Government of India is, that they should take care to represent to the Secretary of State not only the trend of this debate, but I also hope that they will consider the advisability of representing to the Secretary of State that at the end of section 84-A of the Government of India Act, which refers to the Statutory Commission coming after ten years, a proviso may be added to the effect that 'nothing herein contained (i.e., in that section) shall debar the Governor General in Council from making, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, such modifications as they may deem desirable, at any time during the period aforesaid, in the powers and functions of Governors' Legislative Councils or of the two Chambers of the Indian Legislature with a view to promote the growth of responsible government in British India.' Unless an amendment like that is made, I, for one, reading the Statute as I do, do not see that the Governor General in Council have any power to make any addition to the transferred list in the provinces or make any advance in the furtherance of responsible government in this country. I trust that the Government of India will, having regard to the nature of this debate and the general consensus

of feeling in favour of making an advance as early as possible, represent to the Secretary of State the desirability of making the small amendment in that section. Any drastic amendments of the Act are out of the question. No responsible Member of Parliament, no Member of the Cabinet, will entertain the idea. But this small amendment which I have suggested is necessary in order to give power to the Governor General in Council, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to propel this machine further and lead us on to greater progress during the five years of the present Viceroy's tenure of office.

Mr. E. A. Spence : Sir, I rise to oppose the Resolution and all the amendments that have been put forward. We accept that the reforms are, as Dr. Gour called, the Magna Charta of India, but this is no reason for bringing forward this Resolution or the amendments. The Mover of the Resolution referred to the future rather than to history. My Honourable friends, Mr. Price and Mr. Clayton, have given most excellent answers from history, and I therefore refer to the matter merely to have the pleasurable task and chance of correcting the Principal of a College on a matter of historical knowledge. I have been corrected myself very often by my masters in the past, but I am surprised to see the Head of a College with a wrong knowledge of history. Professor Shahani said that the system of Cabinet Government came in with William III. It came in when we had a King who could not quite understand English, George I. The whole history, Sir, of England shows the gradual development of all Parliamentary institutions. That has been dealt with by the Honourable the Home Member and the Honourable the Finance Member, and I do not want to take up the time of the House in referring to it. The work already done, as so many speakers here have said, is good. But it requires training. The time and opportunity for training is required. Yesterday morning—I think it was yesterday morning—my friend Dr. Gour and my friend Dr. Nand Lal laid the greatest stress on the fact that it was absolutely shameful for the Home Government to say that we were at once to put our house in order in regard to our medical institutions. They said 'we want time to do it.' To-day they say 'we do not want time to do it. Let us do it at once.' Mr. Agnihotri, I think, said yesterday that if we were not given immediate swaraj, it was because people would say we possessed childish incapacity. I do not agree with him at all. When training for a boxing match a man gives his whole attention to making himself fit. He takes on the services of an experienced trainer and relies on the advice and knowledge of his trainer. He does not go in for his fight untrained if he wants to win. Is not this the position of Government? Is not the British Government acting the part of the wise trainer whose sole aim is the good and ultimate success of the person he is training? I say, Sir, that without making big changes as proposed by those speaking in favour of this Resolution and its amendments, we should train ourselves and fit ourselves for this Dominion Self-government which we all look for. We have got the power of the purse. It is already in our hands and, as has been pointed out, that necessitates Government acting in accordance with our wishes. Let India be content with the power she has until she has trained herself to exercise greater powers. Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar says that steps ought to be taken to this effect. I say the whole history of the British in India shows that steps have been taken towards this Self-government for India. Let us effect it by steps and not go in for long distance jumping. If we do that we may fall.

[Mr. R. A. Spence.]

Munshi Iswar Saran, I think, said that true wisdom lies in adapting machinery to the progress of the country. I say 'certainly.' That is why I ask you to continue with the present system for a while. I think that if true wisdom lies in adapting machinery to the progress of the country as Munshi Iswar Saran said, that is very good reason why we should stay in the present position. Some Members have said that the reason why the electorate did not come and vote was because they had not got all they wanted. Have you ever heard of a boy or man who was expecting a tip and a fairly solid tip refusing it because he got a smaller tip than he expected, chucking it away because it was smaller? I think that man or boy was very foolish if he did it. I know I would not. I think Munshi Iswar Saran referred to our wanting to remain in the Commonwealth. What would have been the state of affairs if complete Swaraj had been in force before this year and if instead of the present Members, the Ali Brothers and Mr. C. R. Das and their followers had composed the Assembly. The election, it must be remembered, took place in accordance with the terms of the existing Act, which so many now want to get rid of. Well, Sir, in view of the speeches that have been made by Mr. Clayton, the Home Member and the Finance Member, I am afraid I am only wasting the time if I go on speaking and I am very annoyed about this waste of time. I think if we did go up to Parliament, as the Finance Member said, with this desire of ours, they would say: 'What have you done?' In your second Session which has only lasted a few days, on account of your having to adjourn for ten days for the Muhammadan holidays, you have wasted two hours of valuable time on the question whether you should move your Government from Delhi to a jungle. I regret that so much time has been wasted and it is time for me to sit down.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Sir, we have debated this question at considerable length, and I am very unwilling that the Assembly should incur the criticism made by the last speaker (Mr. Spence). I have therefore, in consultation with my Colleague here, framed a formula which might meet the Assembly and at the same time not be inconsistent with our duty *vis-à-vis* His Majesty's Government. If this formula is acceptable, I think the Mover of the Resolution might consider whether it is necessary to press the Resolution further. The substance of the formula is that 'the Government of India will communicate to the Secretary of State for India the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of constitutional reform warrants a re-examination and a revision of the present constitution at an earlier date than 1929,' that is earlier than the time prescribed by Statute. This is merely a suggestion thrown out in order to finish what really promises to be an almost endless debate...

Mr. N. M. Samarth : May I suggest that the words 'on the path of responsible government' be substituted for the words 'on the path of constitutional reform'?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Certainly.

Mr. President : Does the Home Member move that as an amendment?

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : May I ask the Home Member if he is prepared to substitute the words 'at an early date' instead of 'at an earlier date than 1929.'

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I am only trying to convey what I understand to be the sense of the Assembly. I am not quite sure what the sense of the Assembly is, but I think the words 'earlier than the time prescribed by the Statute' represent the general feeling.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : Will you put in the words 'much earlier date,' Sir ? (Cries of 'No, no'.)

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur : Sir, I am willing to accept the suggestion that has just now been conveyed by the Honourable the Finance Member and the Home Member, and I withdraw my Resolution. At the same time, I wish to make some remarks with regard to what has been said by the Honourable the Home Member and the Finance Member. The Honourable the Home Member has asked me whether this is an opportune moment to bring in such a Resolution. I say that this is the most opportune moment to bring in such a Resolution in order to save the Government from the difficulties which are facing it outside the House.....

Mr. W. M. Hussanally : On a point of order, Sir. The Honourable Member has withdrawn his Resolution. Is he now entitled to make a speech?

Mr. President : I do not think we need indulge in any hair-splitting over that.

Rai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur : My object in bringing this Resolution was to show the Government a way out of the difficulty it has brought upon itself by not granting the demands of the country in the matter of responsible government in the year 1919.

Our friends on the celestial heights of Simla should not be altogether indifferent to what is passing in the country just at present. We know it a hundred times better than our Honourable friends, in spite of their C. I. D. and their official reports, can profess to know. We know that the country is on the verge of revolution, and if something is not done in time, the National Congress will pass what is called the Civil Disobedience Resolution and the whole country will be plunged into anarchy. It is in order to save the country from this disaster that I have been actuated to move this Resolution to bring about responsible government by constitutional means earlier than was promised. Now, Sir, my friend, the Honourable the Home Member, has referred to Russia, to China and some other countries. But my Honourable friend also knows that the revolution in Russia is not due to the granting of reforms, but to their having been long overdue. If Tsar Nicholas had granted the reforms earlier, Russia would never have come to this pass. The same thing applies to China. But my Honourable friend might have cast his eyes further East towards the Land of the Rising Sun, which was in 1864 granted a constitution and which in these few years has raised itself to be one of the most civilised and powerful nations on the surface of the earth. Japan, which not so long ago used to be called barbarous, has in the course of a few years risen to the highest position which any nation may aspire to in the comity of nations by reason of leaving every thing to the will of the people. And my object in moving this Resolution was to induce the Government to base their rule upon the wishes of the people and not upon the sweet-will of the bureaucracy. Sir, I know how very difficult, how painful it is to part with power, but at the

[Rai J. N. Mujumdar Bahadur.]

same time when you have promised to part with power it should be parted with as easily and with as little compunction as possible, before things become worse than at present.

My friend, Mr. Price, has referred to what he called the personal element in Government. I do not understand what he meant by it. Does he mean personal government? Now if the personal element in the Government is to be kept, what is the use of passing all these reforms?...

Mr. E. L. Price : I never said it should be.

Bai J. N. Majumdar Bahadur : Then why refer to the personal element at all? I am glad my friend says that the personal element is not to be kept, and if representative institutions can be given to the people ten years hence, I do not see what difficulty there can be in giving them within the next 2, 3, 4 or 5 years. It has been said that the constituencies have not voted nor come to the polling station. But why was it that the people did not come? It was because they thought the reforms inadequate and unsatisfactory that they did not go to the polling stations. And you know that the Moderate Party even were not quite satisfied with what has been given, and it is therefore that the demand has come even before ten years are over for further reforms in the constitution of the Government. My friends seem to forget that if the people have been thought fit to be granted responsible government in one department, why should they be thought unfit for responsible government in other departments. This is an anomaly which no one can explain except as an excuse to delay the reforms as long as possible. If the problem of the Army, if the political problem, can be solved ten years hence, I think they can just as well be solved in two years. In these things there is no time-limit.

Again, our friends have asked us how can we move Parliament so soon? My answer to that is, that it is because the Parliament has not given us what we wanted that it should be moved again. If they had given us all that we wanted, we should not have moved them now, and that we are moving Parliament is in itself a compliment to the British Government in that we have not lost faith in it and have not gone outside this House, that we appeal to Parliament and through it the British Government, is because we simply rely upon what is called soul-force or non-physical force in order to bring about responsible government in this country. We have not joined the party who want to destroy the government by calling in the forces of revolution. Is that a reason why our reasonable demands should not be listened to by the Government. To put off the reforms till it is too late will only bring on reaction and make people demand more in the way of reforms than they are inclined to accept at present, for people become unreasonable when reasonable demands are refused. If the British Government, that is, the Government at Home, had granted Ireland all that she wanted in the time of Parnell, I think they would not have had to face the present crisis there. It is true statesmanship to take time by the forelock. A stitch in time saves nine. That is a maxim which embodies the result of past human experience. If you do not do anything now, then after 2, 3, 4 or 5 years you will find yourselves in greater difficulties, and the ambition of all far-sighted statesmen is that the two countries should pull together or their mutual good-will be crushed for ever. But I am glad that the Government have thought fit to

recommmend to Parliament that they should send out a commission at an early date, and in view of that assurance which I accept, I withdraw my own Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Sir, I want to correct one statement. What I did say—and I repeat it again—was that we are prepared to communicate to the Secretary of State the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path to responsible government warrants a re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1929.

But that is not exactly what the last speaker said. For the rest, I am content to leave, Sir, the various remarks which he thought fit to make in his last speech without comment, although it will be obvious to any person in this Assembly that it would be perfectly easy to answer—and indeed effectively to answer—most of the points which my Honourable friend has attempted to make.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : May I ask leave to withdraw my amendment, Sir.

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

Mr. President : The question is that leave be given to Mr. Agnihotri, to withdraw his amendment.

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

Mr. President : Amendment moved :—

'That after the word 'Council' where it occurs for the first time substitute for the words standing in the Resolution the following words :—

'that the Government of India should convey to the Secretary of State for India the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of responsible government warrants a re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1929.'

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. E. L. Price : Sir, is it possible to get the names of dissentients recorded. I wish to record my dissent because there is no mention of constituencies.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member can raise that point when I put the Resolution as amended.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I understood that on the assurance given by me the Mover of the Resolution withdrew his Resolution, and if he has withdrawn, I do not understand why these amendments are being put.

Mr. President : We have just had the amendments withdrawn by leave of the Assembly, and the original Resolution, except for half a dozen words in the beginning, was expunged by the vote of the Assembly itself, and after that the Assembly inserted, as an amendment, the words moved by the Honourable the Home Member.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I gave a certain assurance to this House, and on that understanding I understood, that the Honourable Rai Bahadur Mazumdar had withdrawn his Resolution.

Rai J. N. Masumdar Bahadur : I withdrew my Resolution because I accepted the amendment of the Honourable the Home Member.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I have no objection.

Mr. President : I regret that misunderstandings have arisen in regard to this matter. An amendment was handed up to me on the table in the form written out, and now the question is that the amended Resolution be adopted. It reads thus :

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he should convey to the Secretary of State for India the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of responsible government warrants a re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1929.'

Mr. E. L. Price : Sir, may I ask if it is possible for a member to record his dissent without a division ?

Mr. President : If the Honourable Member's dissent is strong, he can divide the House.

The Resolution as amended was adopted.

RESOLUTION *RE* : RECRUITMENT FOR ALL-INDIA SERVICES.

Mr. Jammadas Dwarkadas : Sir, the Resolution that stands in my name runs thus :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that, having regard to the Declaration of August 1917, he be pleased to arrange that, in future, the recruitment for all the All-India Services, excepting those of a technical character, shall be made, as far as possible, in India and also to take steps to provide in India such educational facilities as would enable Indians to enter these technical Services in larger numbers than is at present possible.'

(At this stage the President vacated the Chair and the Honourable the Deputy President occupied it.)

Sir, in moving this Resolution, I wish to make it perfectly clear at the very outset that nothing is further from my mind than that at any time in the future of this country, however distant it be, the principle of the Indianization of the services which I am advocating should be interpreted as the complete exclusion of the British element. I am one of those who believe in the British connection, not from motives of mere expediency or narrow national advantage, but because I hold the conviction that it is out of this connection between Great Britain and India in a mighty Indo-British Commonwealth and the result and blending of the ideals of the East and the West in a new and common civilization that the safety and the progress of the world lie. As Sir Jagadish C. Bose pointed out in a memorable speech recently in Calcutta, the future of this country will be enriched by the assimilation into our culture of the Anglo-Saxon element. I hope it is not necessary for me to assure the House that it is in no revolutionary spirit that I am bringing forward this Resolution. I am only urging a principle which has been endorsed by the high authority of the Cabinet in their declaration of August 1917. In speaking two days ago in this House on the question of the appointment of an equal number of Europeans and Indians as Governors, Chief Justices and other Judges of the High Court, I pointed out that His Majesty's Government were carrying out, and could therefore be trusted to carry out; the principle therein enunciated. But as I also pointed out, in the matter of the

Indianization of the services we stood on different ground. I yield to none in my party recognition of the great services rendered to this country by the Indian and other civil services. It is to them that we owe the building up of a system of administration which, with all its faults, remains none the less a model of efficiency. It is due, I think to them, now, especially because the services have come in for a great deal of criticism that we should recognize in our progress towards full responsible government that but for their early work the foundations of the democratic system of government now in force would have been difficult, if not impossible, of achievement.

I urge this reform on one main ground. Until the inauguration of the Reforms, it was maintained even by such a body as the Public Services Commission that the character of the administration must be predominantly British. It is on that theory that the whole report of the Commission was based, and by which the present arrangements for recruitment to the Services are regulated. However much one might differ from the conclusions of the Commission, it must be recognized, Sir, that the point of view which guided the Commission, namely, that the control of the administration was vested in the bureaucracy at least justly related to the then state of affairs. With the introduction of the Reforms and the passing of power into the hands of the popular representatives, a fundamental change has taken place which cannot but be reflected in the character, spirit and personnel of the administration. It would be inconsistent with the very nature of the Reforms to attempt to preserve the predominantly British character of the administration. I maintain that it is an irrefutable proposition that the present system of government demands a predominantly Indian and National agency of administration.

Sir, my Resolution does not contemplate the removal or the prejudicing of the prospects of a single European official now in India. I would also repudiate in advance the assumption that may be made in certain quarters that the carrying out of this Resolution would result in an immediate reduction, on a large scale, of the number of European officials in this country. But, at the same time, I am bound to state that the demand for further political reforms made in this House to-day, which is the reflection of a desire almost universally prevalent in this country, makes it imperative that the process of Indianizing the Services should be correspondingly accelerated. I cannot contemplate the picture of responsible government in India without the Services being predominantly Indian. Even if my Resolution is given the maximum effect and every vacancy caused by the retirement or death of a European official is filled by an Indian, it would take a long term of years before the desired change in the proportion of Indians to Europeans is reached.

Only two weeks ago, Sir, in reply to Mr N. M. Joshi, the Honourable Home Member laid a statement on the table giving the percentage of Indians in each of the various Departments and the proportion in which Indians are being recruited for them. I find 13 per cent Indians in the Indian Civil Service, 5 per cent in the Police, 14½ in the Forest, nearly 26 per cent in the Agriculture, 38 per cent in the Indian Educational Service, 38 per cent in the Engineering, 11 per cent in the Medical and 23 per cent in the Customs. Turning now to the maximum percentage of posts intended to be given to Indians, I find that the policy of the Government is not to give more than 48 per cent in the Civil Service, and 50 per cent in some of the other Services. In the case of the Civil Service the rate of recruitment for Indians is 34½ per cent of the total number of vacancies occurring, and will rise to 48 per cent in the

[Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas.]

course of the next nine years; in the case of the other services the position is even less satisfactory. For instance, in the Police, no definite ratio is laid down for the filling up of fresh vacancies; and it is impossible to say, according to the Government statement, when the maximum percentage of 88 will be reached from the extraordinarily low figure of 5 per cent now obtaining. In the case of the Forest Service in the year 1920, only 4 Indians were found fit for appointment as against 25 appointments made in England. I do not want to weary this House with elaborate statistics, but I think a reference to the Indian Educational Service will not be out of place. I regard the recruitment to the Indian Educational Service as more important to the future of this country than to any other branch of administration. Yet, what do I find? The Home Member says 50 per cent of the annual recruitment is to be Indian exclusive of Indians promoted from the Provincial to the Higher Service. But the door is shut on Indians at 50 per cent of the total strength of the Service. Is this a state of affairs that any one, however modest his aspirations, can view with equanimity? I cannot see on what principle intelligible or sound the percentages for recruitment to the various services have been fixed. It is however undeniable that these maxima are totally inadequate in view of the rapidity with which India is advancing to Dominion status. They are besides the result of no calculation, scientific or mathematical, appreciative of the claims of Indians or the possibilities of recruitment in India.

I urge, Sir, this important reform on another ground. If there is one question on which all parties whatever their political principles, are agreed, it is on the curtailment of the heavy administrative cost. It has been the cry of the Congress from the time of Balabhai Naoroji that India, one of the poorest countries in the world, has to maintain literally the costliest administration. The strenuous attack which was made on the salaries of the Ministers in every Province shows the trend of public opinion on this question. There is no doubt that it will crystallize itself very soon in a demand for the reduction of the salaries of the Higher Services and the abolition of some of the highly paid posts with a view to curtail public expenditure. I am not concerned here with the legitimacy or the reverse of the demand made by the Services for further increase of emoluments. But it is perfectly clear, however, that the straitened resources of the country do not permit of any further improvement in that direction. There are already indications of the services having begun to lose their attractiveness in England. I notice, Sir, that out of 86 candidates for this year's Civil Service examination in England, only 28 were British, whatever abnormal reasons might have operated to bring about this reduction in the number of British candidates, there can be no doubt that the services will not in future attract the same quality or the same number of young men from England.

Mr. K. G. Bagde: Sir, may I rise to a point of order? I think the number of the Members present here is less than 25, which is the number required for a quorum.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: I think there are more than 25.

The Honourable Mr. W. M. Hailey: May we ask for a count, Sir?

The Deputy President: 27. We are a quorum.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas: It is a pity, Sir, that on an important Resolution like this the House should be so thin, but I am glad at any rate

that there is a quorum. There is no doubt that we are all tired, and the hour is late, I don't know whether the Home Member would agree to having the debate postponed to to-morrow if there is time.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I gave the Honourable Member time for this Resolution to-day, on condition that he would not keep us here after the normal time. I don't know if he remembers that part of the arrangement. There is no possibility of this Resolution being debated to-morrow.

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju : Sir, may I request you to permit me to state that there is no use in discussing such an important Resolution at this late hour : it will take at least three or four hours as there are amendments. Unless we have a chance of discussing it to-morrow it may be dropped. I appeal to you Sir.

The Deputy President : It is not in the hands of the Chair. It rests with the Member in charge of the Resolution.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas : Sir, I am very grateful to the Honourable Home Member for giving me time to discuss this most important Resolution, and I do admit that the arrangement between us was that the Resolution was to be discussed on the 29th because on the 30th he could not spare time for it. Also I remember he told me that I had to finish the whole debate before 5-30. Now, seeing that there is a demand, because most Members have left the House, that the debate should be postponed to a more convenient date, I am entirely in the hands of the House.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Sir, may I ask if there is a quorum here now ?

Mr. K. G. Bagde : Sir, I again rise to a point of order as to whether there is a quorum here now.

The Deputy President : Order, order. The point of order has already been raised by the Honourable Home Member.

There is no quorum. So the House stands adjourned till 2 O'clock to-morrow.
