

2nd March, 1922

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

VOLUME III
PART. I

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1922



SIMLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1922

CONTENTS.

<p>TUESDAY, 28TH FEBRUARY, 1922</p> <p>Questions and Answers. Unstarred Questions and Answers. Votable and Non-votable Heads of Expenditure. The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill. The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill. The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill. The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill. The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill. The Married Women's Property (Amendment) Bill. The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.</p>	<p>2617-2652</p>
<p>WEDNESDAY, 1ST MARCH, 1922</p> <p>Budget for 1922-23. Message from the Council of State. The Delhi University Bill. The Indian Finance Bill. The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill. The Press Law Repeal and Amendment Bill. Messages from the Council of State.</p>	<p>2653-2688</p>
<p>THURSDAY, 2ND MARCH, 1922</p> <p>Governor General's Assent to Bill. Statement of Business. Governor General's Assent to Amended Standing Orders. Resolution <i>re</i>: Establishment of Railway Industries. Resolution <i>re</i>: Relief for Distressed Parts of Malabar. Resolution <i>re</i>: Privy Council in India. Reading of Newspapers in the Chamber.</p>	<p>2689-2739</p>
<p>MONDAY, 6TH MARCH, 1922</p> <p>Oath. Questions and Answers. Unstarred Questions and Answers. Message from H. E. the Governor General. Time-limit for Speeches in Budget Debate. General Discussion on the Budget.</p>	<p>2741-2812</p>
<p>TUESDAY, 7TH MARCH, 1922</p> <p>Unstarred Questions and Answers. General Discussion on the Budget—<i>contd.</i> Vol. II—Pt. III.</p>	<p>2813-2899</p>

WEDNESDAY, 8TH MARCH, 1922 2901-2914

Statements laid on the Table.
 Governor General's Assent to Bills
 The Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill.
 The Indian Official Secrets Bill.
 The Cotton Transport Bill.
 The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.

THURSDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1922 2915-2966

Communication from Mr. Speaker.
 Business for the week ending March 13th.
 Resolution *re*: Release of Ali Brothers.
 Resolution *re*: Committee of Inquiry on the causes of the Moplah
 Outbreak.
 Resolution *re*: Committee on Railway Risk Notes.
 Resolution *re*: Re-institution of the Ports of Chittagong and
 Calcutta for the Hedjaz Pilgrim Traffic.

SATURDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1922 2967-2998

Statement laid on the Table.
 Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Question and Answer.
 The Resignation of Mr. Montagu.
 Election of Committee on Public Accounts.
 Election of Standing Finance Committee.
 Demands for Supplementary Grants.

TUESDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1922 2999-3077

Statement laid on the Table.
 Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Motion for Adjournment.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

WEDNESDAY, 15TH MARCH, 1922 3079-3144

Oath.
 The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

THURSDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1922 3145-3219

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Message of Farewell to H. E. H. the Prince of Wales.
 Statement of Business.
 The Budget—List of Demands—*contd.*

FRIDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1922	3221-3312
• Question and Answer.	
• Unstarred Question and Answer.	
• Bill passed by the Council of State.	
• The Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	
SATURDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1922	3313-3339
• Questions and Answers.	
• Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
• Financial Adjustment between the Home Government and the Government of India.	
• Uninterrupted sitting of the Assembly.	
• Message from H. R. H. the Prince of Wales.	
• The Budget—List of Demands— <i>concl'd.</i>	
• Resolution <i>re</i> : Re-appropriation between Demands in the matter of Reduction.	
MONDAY, 20TH MARCH, 1922	3391-3472
• Questions and Answers.	
• Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
• Library of the Indian Legislature.	
• Motion for Adjournment.	
• The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill.	
TUESDAY, 21ST MARCH, 1922	3473-3553
• The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill— <i>contd.</i>	
WEDNESDAY, 22ND MARCH, 1922	3555-3618
• Statements laid on the Table.	
• Bill passed by the Council of State.	
• Precedence for Finance Bill.	
• Motion for Adjournment.	
• The Budget—The Indian Finance Bill— <i>concl'd.</i>	
THURSDAY, 23RD MARCH, 1922	3619-3677
• Questions and Answers.	
• References to Proceedings in another place.	
• Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
• Statement of Business.	
• Resolution <i>re</i> : Election by Indian Legislature of Representatives of India to Imperial and International Conferences.	
• Resolution <i>re</i> : Measures for increasing Cotton Cultivation in India.	
• Resolution <i>re</i> : abolition of Posts of Divisional Commissioners.	
• Resolution <i>re</i> : Measures for providing cheap and speed justice in India.	
• Resolution <i>re</i> : Appointment of Council Secretaries.	

SATURDAY, 25TH MARCH, 1922

PAGE
3679-3722

- Message from the Council of State.
- Election of Public Accounts Committee.
- Election of Standing Finance Committee.
- The Indian Merchant Shipping Bill.
- The Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill.
- The Cotton Transport Bill.
- The Press Law Repeal and Amendment Bill.
- The Indian Official Secrets Bill.
- The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.
- Resolution *re*: India's participation in the British India Exhibition.
- The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill.
- Resolution *re*: Message of Regret at the Resignation of Mr. Montagu.

MONDAY, 27TH MARCH, 1922

3723-3760

- Statements laid on the Table.
- Questions and Answers.
- Unstarred Questions and Answers.
- Election for the Public Accounts and the Standing Finance Committees.
- The Ranchi Mental Hospital Bill.
- The Criminal Tribes (Amendment) Bill.
- The Cantonments (House Accommodation) Amendment Bill.
- Resolution *re*: Adoption of Railway Finance Committee's Proposals.

TUESDAY, 28TH MARCH, 1922

3771-3850

- Questions and Answers.
- Present Position as regards Burma Reforms.
- Unstarred Questions and Answers.
- Motion for Adjournment.
- Governor General's Assent to the Indian Finance Bill.
- The Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments Bill.
- The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill.
- The Charitable and Religious Trusts (Amendment) Bill.
- Message from the Council of State.
- Resolution *re*: Appointment of Council Secretaries.
- Motion for Adjournment.
- Prorogation of the Session.

APPENDICES

1-25

Vernacular Speeches and Translations.

INDEX

1-131

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 2nd March, 1922.

The Assembly met in the Assembly Chamber at Eleven of the Clock. Mr. President was in the Chair.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S ASSENT TO BILL.

Mr. President: I have to announce to the Assembly that His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to give his assent to the Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Act, 1922.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : Sir, may I make a statement of the business that is likely to come before the Assembly next week? On Monday the 6th and Tuesday the 7th, there will be a general discussion on the Budget. On Wednesday the 8th, it is proposed to take into consideration, and, if the Assembly approves it, to pass the Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill. Motions for leave to introduce the following Bills if they are ready by that time will also be made :

1. The Official Secrets Bill,
2. The Ranchi Lunatic Asylum Bill,
3. A Bill to provide for the restriction and control of the transport of cotton in certain circumstances.

On this day, Government will allow time to Mr. Latthe to move that certain members be added to the Select Committee on his Bill for the Invalidation of Hindu Ceremonial Emoluments. On Saturday the 11th March, it is proposed to submit to the vote of the Assembly demands for supplementary grants for the current year.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S ASSENT TO AMENDED STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. President: I have further to announce that His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to give his assent to the amendments in the Legislative Assembly Standing Orders as passed by this Assembly.

RESOLUTION *RE* ESTABLISHMENT OF RAILWAY INDUSTRIES.

Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey (Bombay Mill-owners' Association & Indian Commerce) : Mr. President, I beg to move that :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee consisting of Members of the Indian Legislature be appointed to consider and report at an early date as to what steps should be taken by the Government of India to encourage the establishment of the necessary industries, so that as large an amount as possible of the Rs. 150 crores proposed to be set aside for the rehabilitation of the railways during the next five years be spent in India.'

[Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey.]

Mr. President, the House will remember that Government appointed the Railway Finance Committee to report upon the financial provisions arising out of the Report of the Acworth Railway Committee and that Committee reported that a fixed programme be passed by this House so that the Management of the Railways may know how much money would be available in the next five years. That Committee also reported that Rs. 150 crores be spent for capital expenditure during the next five years. During the discussion of the Committee, figures were also placed showing the probable expenditure over the Railways during the next ten years, and there also it was seen that a further Rs. 30 crores a year would probably be required during the subsequent five years. That means that during the next ten years we would be spending about Rs. 300 crores for our railway purposes alone. The Committee, however, thought that it was quite enough to look ahead for five years and, at the end of three years, the future programme might be considered by a Finance Committee. Now, my object in moving this Resolution in this House is that we should try to see if we cannot spend as far as possible and as much as possible out of this Rs. 300 crores in the country by special efforts taken in the direction of the development of industries manufacturing railway materials. I am sure, no one in this House will disagree with the policy I am enunciating. The only question is what active steps can be taken so that we can get an immediate result. It is true that Government have framed rules by which articles of Indian manufacture may be brought for the requirements of Government provided the quality is good and the price is not unfavourable. It is also true that Government have given more than once an indication that they are willing to encourage the establishment of industries in India. Government may take credit that they appointed an Industrial Commission in the year 1916 under the presidency of Sir Thomas Holland. That Committee took two years to report; they went very thoroughly into the several problems of industrial development and reported in 1918. I want to know what steps have been taken to bring into effect the recommendations of that Committee. Government appointed in December, 1919 the Stores Purchase Committee. That Committee took 7 months to report and made an excellent report by the majority, the minority, however, differing in many respects from the majority. One year and nine months have passed since this Committee has reported. We know the Government have taken action in appointing an officer as Chief Stores Purchase Officer in India; but, so far as actual steps taken to encourage industries are concerned, I maintain that nothing has been done.

If Government wanted to take immediate action for the encouragement of Indian industries, the Report of the Stores Purchase Committee is full of valuable suggestions, and they could have taken the necessary action. I will not take up the time of this House by going through the several recommendations made by that Committee, but I will read to you one most important recommendation that could have at once been accepted by the Government and given immediate effect to in the interests of India. The recommendation runs thus :

Paragraph 225—Assistance for Indian Industries.

‘We consider that, in addition to providing in this manner for the full utilisation of existing industries in India, Government must further give them practical encouragement specially in the initial stages of their enterprise and must assure them of a reasonable

measure of protection against outside competition. The measures advocated by us, subject to appropriate restrictions and safeguards are :

- (1) Guaranteeing of orders for a limited period ;
- (2) Placing of orders at favourable rates for a limited period ;
- (3) Favourable railway rates ;
- (4) Revision of the fiscal policy of Government with a view to protection of local industries.'

At the end of the paragraph, the Committee add :

' We consider that the conditions under which contracts are placed in India should be assimilated to those attached to contracts entered into by the Director General of Stores at the India Office which at present are in some respects more favourable to the British manufacturer.'

Now, I seriously ask Government whether the condition No. (1), in regard to guaranteeing of orders to the Indian Manufacturers, and condition No. (2), in regard to the placing of orders at favourable rates, have been adopted, although the Report has been before the Government for the last one year and nine months? Are we to go on considering the general aspects of the question, the rules and regulations, and appointing officers, while orders worth crores and crores of rupees are being daily and regularly sent to England in spite of the recommendations of the Stores Purchase Committee and the Indian Industrial Commission that the Railway stores should be purchased in India? I submit, Sir, we must take immediate steps, so far as the orders worth crores and crores of rupees for railway purposes are concerned, to place them with Indian manufacturers. Moreover, Sir, how many industries would be required to supply railway stores to the value of crores and crores of rupees? We can count them on the fingers of one hand. I will give the House a few instances from the figures placed before us by Government about the requirements of the Railways during the five years, and if you want to take the figures for ten years, you have practically to duplicate the amount that I am mentioning. Goods wagons will be required to the extent of Rs. 31 crores during the next five years, or 62 crores of rupees will be spent for wagons during the next 10 years. Coaching vehicles will be required to the extent of 18 crores during the next five years, bridges, girders, etc., four crores during the next five years, and much more during the next 10 years. Then, again, rails would be required—I do not wish to go through the whole list, but these are, I think, sufficient instances to show that one kind of industry, that is the industry for manufacturing goods wagons, if properly encouraged and supported, will keep in the country 62 crores of rupees during the next 10 years. If we support the coaching vehicle industry, it would give us 36 crores of rupees in 10 years. If we support the bridge industry, it would give us eight crores of rupees in 10 years. So let us sit together and consider what can be done immediately to enable Government to place these orders worth some crores of rupees in the country. I am leaving aside for the moment a thousand and one things like pens, pencils, and other small and big items that are required for our Stores Department. I do not attach less importance to those articles, but let us attach greater importance to these really important articles which will retain in the country some crores and crores of rupees.

Now, we have seen that the Stores Purchase Committee have recommended that a guarantee for orders for a limited period should be given to new industries, and this is perhaps the only country in which a

[Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey.]

Resolution like the present one may seem necessary to be brought before a responsible House like this. In all other countries, where the existence of Government depends upon the will of the people, there is no doubt that such a Resolution as this would be superfluous. In the first place, the patriotism of the officials would impel them to encourage the indigenous manufacturers and to place with them as many orders as possible which would go a long way to increase the prosperity of the country. (Hear, hear.) In the second place, the necessities of the case, the question of self-defence in time of war, and self-reliance, all these factors would impel the officials to make the country independent of foreign imports in case of necessity. In the third place, Sir, I believe, and the Council will agree with me, that the position of Government, if they do not follow such a policy, would be untenable. The next election would bring about their much deserved downfall. All these three reasons combined afford considerable help to foreign manufacturers much to the detriment of the Indian manufacturer, and we now, by our Resolution, appeal to Government to take immediate steps to make India as much independent as possible in regard to our Railway and other stores requirements. Now that the matter has been brought to the notice of Government, we do trust that active steps will be taken in the matter. After all, the suggestions I have made and the suggestions which the Stores Committee have made are not new. Government have followed that policy in the past. I will give one typical instance and I think it is a great credit to Government for what they did at the time. When the first Steel Industry was to be started by the Tatas, Government came forward liberally and guaranteed the purchase of 20,000 tons of rails every year for ten years at a price equivalent to the rate which would cost Government to import rails from England. That system works splendidly, and I firmly believe that steel industry could not have been started in those days without such a guarantee, and the result was that, during the war, we were independent of the foreign import of rails, and other steel products.

What we ask Government is to follow a similar policy to a greater extent. It was a great thing in those days to say that Government would buy 20,000 tons of rails from the new Steel Company. I would say that if new industries were started, Government would be perfectly justified in saying that they would purchase all their requirements from such companies. In regard to the Tata Steel Company, out of probably 150,000 tons of rails that were required for Railways in India, Government were liberal enough to say that they would buy only 20,000 tons from the Tata Steel Company. The question whether any preference should be given in point of prices, that is, whether any higher prices should be given to the new industries that we start, is one which I will not take up to-day. The question will solve itself with the recommendations that we may receive in the report of the Fiscal Commission. If the Fiscal Commission decides that protection up to a certain extent should be given to certain industries, then, under my proposal, those industries will automatically get higher prices to that extent. We hope it will not be very long before the fiscal policy is brought up for consideration before this House and I do not wish to touch at great length now on the relative advantages of protection and free trade in regard to the starting of new industries. Of course, one thing Government will have to consider and must consider, and that is, the protection of Indian industries against dumping. There has already been going on a little of dumping, and I am informed that because there are certain new industries of wagon-making starting

in India, a very strong ring of English manufacturers have now resolved to dump wagons for the time being. If they dump wagons at a lower rate than that at which they can be manufactured, I think that in the interests of the country it will be entitled to the same protection which Great Britain has given to England, and which Canada has given to the Canadians, by the anti-dumping laws. You may not give special preference, but surely you are not going to kill your industries by the dumping process of foreign manufacturers or the strong rings that may be formed to kill you and after killing you to exploit you in future.

Sir, it may be asked whether we can manufacture any or all of the articles required for the Railways if we give this encouragement. I made several inquiries of high officials connected with the management of Railways including my Honourable friend, Colonel Waghorn, who is taking such a keen interest in the matter, and I am sure that in time, if proper encouragement is given, if economic plants are introduced, and up-to-date methods are followed, India can supply most of her requirements, if not all. Take, for instance, the manufacture of wagons. I am told that most of the materials required for the manufacture of wagons can be made in India or will be made in India during the next year or this year. The only things required to be imported would be wheels and axles. The cost of wheels and axles, I am told, would come to about Rs. 1,000 per wagon, that is, about 10 to 12 per cent. of the cost of a wagon. If you calculate on these figures, you will find that out of the Rs. 31 crores, you can spend in India about Rs. 25 or Rs. 27 crores for the wagons alone, and send out of the country only Rs. 3 or Rs. 3½ crores. The same remark applies, in a greater or less degree, to other articles of requirements. Now, Sir, this shows that the larger part of our expenditure can be incurred in India. And, after all, what is this expenditure that we spend in India? How does it help? It helps first and foremost the working classes. What do you require in a wagon? You require steel. How is steel manufactured? You have to dig the ore. It goes into the furnace and is smelted with coal and flux which in their turn are products of labour. If we calculate the amount of labour required, 75 per cent. of the whole cost is labour one way or the other. Workmen will get more employment and the money will remain in the country. There is so much drain going out of India now. While on this question of drain, our economists have written in the past—the late Mr. Dadabhoi Naoroji has written a book about it, and Mr. Romesh Chandra Dutt has written about it—that the greatest harm done to India is this drain of money. It is not spent in the country. If you allow money to go out of the country, it is really pauperizing the country to that extent. We are already met with the difficulty of having to pay home charges, our interest charges and several other charges of the Secretary of State's Departments. All this is a drain which we cannot avoid. Are we going to add this Rs. 100 or Rs. 150 crores of additional drain during the next five years and thus pauperize the country to that extent? What will be the effect? Already we were told yesterday by the Honourable the Finance Member that our balance of trade was against us to the extent of Rs. 33 crores. If you add to that this Rs. 30 crores, the balance of trade will be Rs. 63 crores against us. How are you going to maintain your exchange? How are you going to solve your problem of exchange, which is already a difficult problem, by doing that which no other country in the world does, *viz.*,

[Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey.]

sending our money out which can be kept in India? I hope I have convinced this House that in our own interests, in the interests of the country and in the interests of our self-defence, everything must be done, and immediately done, for the development of industries in this country.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes (Commerce and Industries Member) : Sir, I have frequently discussed the subject matter of this Resolution with the Honourable Sir Vithaldas Thackersey. I may say at once that there is no difference of opinion between us regarding the object in view. I am just as keen as Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, or as any Member of this House, that steps should be taken to encourage the development in this country of industries which will enable as large a proportion as possible of this sum of Rs. 150 crores to be spent in this country. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey and I are entirely at one in that matter. But, Sir, I think I may legitimately feel a little hurt that in the course of his speech Sir Vithaldas Thackersey indicated that the slow progress made in the development of industries in India was due to lack of patriotism on the part of us officials. I, Sir, have spent 25 years in the service of this country. As far as it lies in me, I have done the very best I can for this country, and I may claim that I have the interest of this country as much at heart as anyone in this House. (Hear, hear.) The only difference of opinion between Sir Vithaldas Thackersey and myself is how precisely we should attack this particular problem. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey suggests that the right method is to appoint a Committee specially to consider what steps we should take to establish, what for lack of a better word I may call, Railway industries. I, Sir, regard this problem as merely one aspect of a larger and bigger problem. We will, I hope, shortly be establishing in this country an Indian Stores Department. This Department, if it is established, must conduct its business, I think every one will agree with me in accordance with the hard business principles. Otherwise, there may be an appalling waste of the taxpayer's money, and I am sure that I shall have the support of business men like Sir Vithaldas Thackersey in making that statement. On the other hand, I hold strongly that the definite objective of the Indian Stores Department should be the encouragement of Indian industries. Therefore, the problem when boiled down is this, how to attain this latter objective without sacrificing or derogating from the former principle?

Before, Sir, I proceed to develop this slight difference of opinion in the matter of method between Sir Vithaldas Thackersey and myself, I must utter one word of warning. I hold most strongly that the very best thing that we can do for Indian industries at the present time is to rehabilitate our Railways. I illustrated this point in the Railway Finance Committee by taking the example of metallurgical industries. I think everybody in this House knows that industrial development is a process of evolution. One industry leads to another and eventually you have chains of industries. If you get your key industries, the subsidiary industries follow almost as a matter of course. The example I took in the Railway Finance Committee of a key industry was the iron and steel industry. Steel is the raw material of many other manufacturing industries, and, given a healthy steel industry, you will find your subsidiary industries springing up around it. We see that process at work already now at Jamshedpur. We have there the great Tata iron and steel industry and there

are already signs that in Jamshedpur, subsidiary to and around that steel industry, other industries are springing up, and that is the natural process of industrial development. Now, you have got your key industry in this steel industry. You have got other projects for the establishment of other steel industries coming on. If you ask to-day of Messrs. Tata Sons and Company, or other firms who have started these steel industries what Government can best do for industries in India, what will they say? They will say to you: 'Give us adequate railway facilities. Let us get the coal we want and in the quantities we want. Let us get our raw materials, our iron ore, our lime stone and other materials of that kind. Let us have facilities for getting away our finished products.' I would like to draw the attention of this House to the evidence given by the representatives of the metallurgical industries before the Acworth Committee. They will find it well worth a perusal. What is the lesson we have got to learn from that? It is that we must put what money we can spare into the rehabilitation of our Railways and we cannot afford to waste that money at all. We must buy the best material we can get and in the cheapest market we can find. I am quite sure that that is our main duty to Indian Industries at the present time. (Hear, hear.)

Subject to these remarks, as I have said, I am entirely at one with Sir Vithaldas Thackersey in the object which we have in view. The only difference of opinion between us is as to how we should attack the problem.

Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, as I understand him, proposes that a Committee should be established to consider what steps we can take to get these Railway Industries started. As I understand his speech, he does not suggest that the Government itself should start any industries of this kind. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey's suggestion is that we should encourage private enterprise to come in and start these industries. He has mentioned certain particular devices. He has suggested that guarantees for orders should be given and other recommendations made by the Stores Purchase Committee should be carried out. I should just like to refer to the question of this Indian Stores Department. [If this Indian Stores Department is established, it will purchase for the State Railways all railway materials which can be procured in India. Further, if that Indian Stores Department is properly organized, if we have proper machinery and intelligence, and above all, inspection, if that Department acquires the confidence of other great consuming Departments, especially the Company Railways, then the Stores Department would be mainly occupied in buying railway material not only for State Railways but for Company Railways also. Any industries which we will be able to start, therefore, will have to deal with the Indian Stores Department.] My point is this. This Stores Department works in accordance with certain formulæ or principles. These formulæ or principles, when they have been finally settled, will be published, and private firms who desire to set up in this country will be guided in deciding whether to do so or not mainly by these formulæ or rules. Therefore, I say that the best thing we can do at present is to get our formulæ or rules into proper shape, to get them into such a shape that we shall give all legitimate encouragement to private firms which wish to set up in India the business of supplying railway material. Let us look forward and see what the trend of development in this matter is likely to be.

Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, in his speech, if I may be permitted to say so, glossed over all the difficulties that are ahead of us. The two main things

[Mr. C. A. Innes.]

which we require to make in India at present in order to carry out the objects which Sir Vithaldas Thackersey has in view are, firstly, railway wagons and secondly, locomotives. We have three firms making railway wagons at this present moment, but they only make a portion of the wagons. They import certain parts from Europe, they make other parts in India, and they assemble them together. They import from Home such things as axles, wheels, springs and the like. Similarly, I may mention that there is a large important firm which has already got under consideration the idea of starting the manufacture of locomotives in India. Here again, this firm will not be able to manufacture for some years to come the complete locomotive. As in the case of wagons, it will have to import some parts from England and other parts they can make out here. What is the difficulty, what is it that prevents us from making the complete wagon or the complete locomotive in India? It is the lack, in the first place, of open hearth acid steel. Secondly, we have not got in this country, at present, any manufacture of high-grade iron. Thirdly, we do not manufacture in this country rivet steel. Therefore, for the next few years, we must content ourselves with a partial manufacture in this country. What we can hope for is that firms will be attracted to come out to this country and manufacture such parts as are at present possible of railway wagons and locomotives.

Now, how will they be attracted? I think I can claim to know more about the precise difficulties of this matter than Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, even though he is a great captain of industry. These firms come to me and tell me their difficulties and their difficulties are always associated with these Stores Rules. We have these rules in a provisional form at present. They deal largely with the question of price; what our price formulæ should be in regard to articles wholly or partially made in India. The difficulty lies in getting those formulæ right. My suggestion to the House is this, that, instead of appointing a Committee *ad hoc* for the purpose of considering how railway industries should be started in India, they should allow me to appoint a small Committee of this Legislature to consider, in consultation with the Chief Controller of Stores and with myself, these price formulæ and I am perfectly certain that that is the right way of going ahead. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey thinks that that may lead to delay. I see no reason why it should lead to delay at all. We have these provisional formulæ already drafted. I myself see the difficulties in them and there is no reason why in the course of this month we should not have this Committee sitting and why that Committee should not make its Report. I have no objection at all to this Committee taking up the further question within what limits and on what principles we can adopt this expedient of giving guarantees of orders to firms. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey spoke as if it was the easiest possible thing extending assistance to every firm that came to us and said: 'I am going to start an industry; give me a guarantee of orders'. Well, I am perfectly certain that we cannot advance in that heroic way. We have already adopted this measure once. We have adopted it in the case of the Tata Iron and Steel Works as regards steel rails and now we are taking for our railways all the steel rails that Messrs. Tata Sons and Company can supply. We have adopted it in another case. In 1917, we offered a guarantee of orders to Messrs. Tata Sons and Company for steel plates. Unfortunately, they have not been able to build up their rolling mills and they are not yet making any steel plates. That device may be a very legitimate device if you

start a big industry on a large scale and put a lot of capital into it, but it cannot be applied to every firm. Supposing I want 5,000 railway wagons and I have a large capitalist firm which satisfies me that it is going to put down proper workshops and invest a large amount of capital in the business, then I should be perfectly justified in giving it a guarantee of orders. But, supposing half a dozen, 10 or 15 workshops all over the country come to me and say: 'I am prepared to make railway wagons: Give me a guarantee of orders' and I split up a guarantee, say, for 5,000 wagons among 10 firms, the result would be that none of these 10 firms could make a living. It would not be an economic proposition. That is one of the difficulties which I see. Then there are other difficulties. Guaranteeing of orders is not enough. In the case of Tata Sons and Company, we guaranteed them, as far as I remember, *c. i. f.* English price landed at Calcutta. That seems a reasonable proposition, but in these difficult times it may or may not be enough. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey has put his finger on one of the difficulties.

He alluded to the danger of dumping. He suggested that English firms were now dumping wagons in India. I have no reason to believe that that is a true statement of the case. But we know that Germany and Belgium can dump by reason of their depreciated exchanges. They can land iron and steel in this country at the present time at very low prices. If we guarantee orders at *c. i. f.* English price, Calcutta, that might be no use to a firm. That is merely one instance of the difficulty of this particular device.

Now, Sir, I have done my best to explain that I am in entire sympathy with the object which Sir Vithaldas Thackersey has in view. But I do take a different view of the right way in which we should attack this problem. I have pointed out that we hope to establish a Stores Department, that that Stores Department will purchase in India all the railway material which it can get in India and that it will have to deal with any firms which may be established in India for the manufacture of railway material. I have pointed out that the Stores Department will issue for common information its Stores purchase rules and it is those rules that any firm which wishes to establish itself in this country for the manufacture of any industry, whether it be a railway industry or any other industry, will have to look at before it comes to a final decision. I put it to the House that the best thing we can do at the present time is to get those rules as carefully drafted as possible and I should be very glad of the assistance of selected Members of the Legislature. I think that will be a better way of attaining the object in view than appointing a special Committee which will deal merely with the Railway question, for, if you appoint that special Committee to deal with Railway industries, what will it do? It will have to examine the Stores Rules. In view of what I have said, I hope that Sir Vithaldas Thackersey will accept my offer and withdraw his Resolution.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: (Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, is there an amendment moved by Government or is this simply a general discussion which dissipates the whole question?

Mr. President: So far no amendment has been moved.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam: Then I wish to say a few words I speak as a layman. I am not a captain of industry like Sir Vithaldas

[Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam.]

Thackersey nor am I, like Mr. Innes, who has taken up this subject rather late in life, has read a great many books and now claims to be a Sir Oracle on industrial questions. I am neither the one nor the other. I, therefore, put before the House, before those who are more intimately acquainted with this matter speak, a view which has been pressed upon me by all and sundry in the world. There are two definite impressions which have grown and which are at the root of all the political trouble in the country. There is first this concrete proposition that has been put before me. There is a great deal of unemployment in Great Britain due to causes mostly attributable to the war and they say that the Government of India is out to furnish work to meet the demand at Home. Therefore, the Government of India does not look with any affection or tenderness at the attempts made by Indians to get things done in this country. That is one thing. It is rather putting it in a very inartistic and clumsy manner, but that is the feeling and every one reads it when he opens his newspaper. There is another thing and that is that the Government of India, whatever its benevolent intentions may be with regard to the industrial development of India and questions connected therewith, adopts what may conveniently be called Fabian tactics.

When you put before it a proposition which has received the approval of all lay men, of all men in the country, the Government simply stands up and says : ' I am at one with you. I have my whole-hearted sympathy with you, and I am endeavouring night and day to do what you just now propose. Absolutely, there is no difference of opinion '. This reminds me of my experience of a matter in my profession. When a class of clients belonging to a certain community has not settled their accounts with me, and when my clerk or myself demand a settlement, they have that very good and simple way of saying in their colloquial style : ' What, Sir, what difference is there between you and me ; do you think that the money in my box is not in your box : what difference is there ? ' It is more expressive in the vernacular, but that is the spirit, and that is the spirit which one Member or another of the Government vies with one another in putting forward in very good, choice and sonorous language. Now, after all, all Mr. Innes said is, ' there is absolutely no difference between Sir Vithaldas and me, I have been trying to do this all this time, and you will get it soon '. When that ' soon ' is to come, there is no mention. If Mr. Innes had told him : ' Within six months from date, he will see something practical carried out, or within six years from date something practical will be carried out ', we would have been at once satisfied,—and that is the reason, Sir, I ask, what is the good of this general airy and dusty sympathy that is scattered over and practically blinds our eyes, and our intellect, and then we discuss an important matter like this for hours, and yet do nothing ? (Hear, hear.) Well, it reminds me of another thing. Two doctors disagree,—and the patient dies. The doctors are trying to find out the formulæ, to find out what formulæ would suit this particular patient,—and the patient dies. That is the situation in which we find ourselves, day after day, when an important proposition is put forward. Theoretically, it is all very well to raise objections to the suggestion made by Sir Vithaldas Thackersey about a guarantee. Well, I leave that matter to Sir Vithaldas to answer. Is it, after all, a great sin, a political sin, a Government sin, if you give a guarantee to some chosen firm to undertake a new industry and thereby allow a substantial portion of the money which you are going to borrow, and on which you are going to pay interest, to be spent in this

country for the benefit of the labourers and artisans and workmen in this country? Why all this beating about the bush and off the direct issue before the House?

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta : Non-Muhammadan Urban) :

Sir, I confess I had some difficulty in following the Honourable Mr. Innes. A difficulty that I do not always feel, because his presentment of a case is always so clear. I am afraid the present difficulty may, to some extent, be due to his having spoken from what he himself described as a sense of being hurt, for when one quotes way like that one is apt to lose one's bearing. I am not sure that what he has been telling us this morning has not been somewhat of a circle, a circle of not a very virtuous kind. 'What do you want for the promotion of these industries, these key industries? One of the most essential things is railway facilities. Therefore, do exactly in the first instance what Sir Vithaldas says you ought to provide facilities for, only do it in another way.' It is the provision of railway facilities that we all want; and if we are to wait for the development of our industries till all possible railway facilities, at all events all the requisite railway facilities, have been provided as Mr. Innes by implication suggests, there will be very little left indeed to provide in the way of development of resources for improvement of railway facilities in the way that Sir Vithaldas suggests. Sir, the whole of Mr. Innes' speech is a strong plea in favour of Sir Vithaldas Thackersey's proposition and he really accepts it when he says: 'I am going to look into the matter, and I shall be glad to have the assistance of a Select Committee of Members of the Legislature for a much smaller but very necessary purpose.' The Committee of the Legislature that Sir Vithaldas suggests, I take it, will also be a select one; only it will be a Committee of the Legislature, and not an associated or advisory Committee of Members of the Legislature and of the kind that Mr. Innes suggests. Sir, if one reads Mr. Innes' speech aright, there can be very little to do for the proposed Stores Department for so far as Stores in India are concerned it is nearly a perfect blank. 'You have got to go abroad for most of your things, and there is really no good in a Committee sitting and telling us what should be done here, for there is nearly nothing doing here; we know the difficulties; we know that in this country we cannot get a fraction of what is required for meeting the requirements of the case; and there is really nothing that the Committee can advise.' If that was so, it would be an intelligible proposition but in itself it would be a stronger plea than ever for the Committee. In the same breath, Sir, however, a very strong plea is put in for the creation of a Stores Department, a purchasing Stores Department where no stores are to be had; a purchaser of stores where no stores are produced; at least they are negligible in quantity and probably poor in quality. Why then is this strong plea for putting the cart before the horse? When the stores come, there will be time enough for a Stores Superintendent or stores purchaser to go into the country and select stores. Sir Vithaldas' plea is for the creation of something out of which the Stores Superintendent may in time select. Therefore, the Stores Department should follow and not precede the stores. We have heard of the danger of dumping of wagons. Mr. Innes doubts whether the information is correct, so far at all events as British makers are concerned. He is very much afraid that Belgians and Germans may be having a cut where they ought not. It makes very little difference to us whether the dumping is British or Belgian. We want neither. Sir, it is not so very long ago

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

that we heard about the great difficulty of getting the necessary number of wagons; we heard a long tale of woe about it. The moment, however, that we are setting about to have our own wagons, people who see difficulties where none existed before are hastening to bring in their wagons. The same will be bound to happen when we nearly complete our arrangements for the locomotives about which we have been hearing for a long time and about which I have reasons to believe that a very strong plea came from the Secretary of State in recent times on account of pressure. The moment that you begin to set about making your arrangements for getting your locomotives, the situation will probably be easy as in the case of wagons. That I think will also hold good with regard to various other things for the helplessness of India, more or less artificial, is much traded on. The moment that one hears that India is going to take steps in any given direction, her own difficulties will gradually disappear. And that stands to reason, for India has her own raw materials, her own coal, her own labour, her own market. And she can save in freight, insurance and exchange by taking her own slips if she is permitted and encouraged. Well, Sir, regarding the question of guarantees, they do not arise on the present question. I perfectly appreciate what Mr. Innes says about revision of stores rules but that it will be and must be one of the matters that the proposed Committee will go into. It is not enough to have a Stores Superintendent where no stores or only negligible stores exist, or to lay down rules and formulæ which will have very little scope for application. The great thing now is to review the situation and see how the position can be strengthened, how we can undertake constructive work. The great thing now is to revise the situation and see how the position

12 Noon. can be strengthened and how we can undertake constructive work. That there are serious handicaps and great difficulties in the way is undoubtedly true. But those difficulties will have to be got over, and if we do not begin to make our arrangements now, it will be very long indeed before we can seriously tackle the situation. I am myself not a great believer in Committees being multiplied. We have had the Industrial Commission; we have had the Stores Committee; and we are going to have either this Committee or the Departmental Committee that Mr. Innes suggests. But no amount of Committees will achieve, unless we make a good and prompt beginning, what we have in view. Real constructive work has to be begun and at some sacrifice if need be. That it will take long is the greater reason for early beginning. Those who followed the debate in the House of Commons regarding the Key Industries Bill, know that tremendous sacrifices were undertaken by the nation in order that their own industries and their own labour might be safeguarded; although in the name of efficiency and cheapness the argument on the other side was very strong that it was a mistake to save the key industries in the way that Great Britain did, because you could get better articles at a cheaper rate elsewhere. If that is still to be the rule in India, as it has been in the past, you do not want any Committee at all. The Stores Superintendent will be able to advise the Government of India as to what is available locally and what must be obtained from elsewhere. That is a very intelligent proposition and the railways will be provided for without India being troubled at all as to the sources of supply. But that is not the idea that is now before us. We are waiting to get away from it, to upset it although, for the present, it may cost us extra. There must be a change in the angle of vision here.

as everywhere else. We are beginning to realize why the Railway and other Commercial Departments are costing us so much more and are being run at a loss. We want to change it by going to the roots of the evil though it may cost us more to begin with.

While fully appreciating all that Mr. Innes' Department has been doing in recent times—and we cannot appreciate it too highly—there is room for a very strong plea that another chapter should be opened in the industrial history of India; and that chapter can only be opened by going into the details of the situation and finding out what can and cannot be done. That no Stores Superintendent or Chief Supervisor or Departmental Committee can do by formulating rules and fixing prices and laying down procedure of guarantee, which I have no desire to deprecate. All that is undoubtedly very necessary, but I have not the slightest doubt that the Committee proposed in this Resolution will take care of all that and see what can be done in these directions and on what terms. But a great deal more is necessary.

Sir, if the difficulty about guarantee that has been indicated was real, if ten firms worth considering should come forward and ask for a guarantee and if the Stores Department requiring 5,000 wagons was unable to split up the order amongst the ten firms because that would not allow any one of them a margin of profit,—if, I say, such a thing was likely to happen, why then it would be a veritable industrial millennium and there would be no necessity for Committees attempting constructive work of the kind that we have in view. The difficulty would solve itself. It is exactly because such a state of things does not exist that it is necessary to go into the question of further facilities for constructive work. There are firms, Sir, like Burn and Company, Martin and Company, Bird and Company, and others that might be named, that if proper facilities were given, would be able to take up a great deal of the railway work. They would work in India, largely or partially, for the good of Indian labour, which would in itself be a gain; and, in the case of firms, where it is clear that they cannot possibly undertake the work except at a very great disadvantage, I have not the slightest doubt that the Committee will not countenance the placing of an order with them. These are details that need not engage us now.

Sir, it seems to me that Sir Vithaldas' is entirely a business proposition. We have the recommendations of the Industrial Commission; we have the recommendations of the Stores Committee; very much has not yet come in the shape of practical work though a deferred beginning has been made. The net outcome of the last named Committee is the proposal for the appointment of an officer in a Department which will practically have very little work to do till the creation of the diversity of stores that we have in view is achieved. With great respect to the Stores Committee, there is no case yet for this expensive new department. In order that the state of things which will warrant its creation may be achieved, it is necessary to go into the matter very fully and in a detached and non-departmental way. That is exactly what Sir Vithaldas proposes and I think the Assembly ought to accept that proposition.

Munshi Iswar Saran (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhamadan Urban): Sir, in response to the Resolution of my Honourable friend, Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, the Honourable Mr. Innes has been good enough to give him the Stores Department. We are told that a Stores Department is necessary in order to settle the formulæ and when the formulæ

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

and the principles and the rules and regulations are settled, most of the difficulties that Sir Vithaldas complains of will disappear. I must confess, Sir, that I have not such supreme faith in Departments and in their formulæ and rules and regulations. Be that as it may, I venture to submit that, after the Budget that was presented yesterday, a very very strong case indeed will have to be made out before this Assembly will give its assent to the formation of other Departments and to fresh expenditure. What Sir Vithaldas Thackersey says in his Resolution is this: 'That you should appoint a Committee in order to encourage the establishment of necessary industries so that as large an amount as possible of the 150 crores of rupees proposed to be set aside for the rehabilitation of the railways during the next five years be spent in India.'

As regards the question of guarantee, the Resolution says nothing. I submit that these are matters of detail. The passing of this Resolution means that you accept the principle of giving encouragement to Indian industries; and that, in order to give practical effect to that principle, you wish to form a Committee. On the other hand, it is proposed by the Honourable Mr. Innes that Sir Vithaldas Thackersey should be content with the formation of a small Committee which will assist him, or the Stores Department, I do not know which, in making rules and regulations. Sir, I was rather impatient to hear what answer Government had to give to the question of Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, very pointedly put, as to what action had been taken on the report of the Stores Committee and the Industrial Commission. Perhaps, Sir, the Government of India is giving its very calm, mature and careful consideration to those reports, and the questions raised by them are so difficult and of such a far-reaching character that the Government of India has not as yet been able to make up its mind as to what action it should take. Sometimes, it is surprising, even a man like Sir Vithaldas shows a great deal of impatience; he wants things to be done in a hurry, forgetting that, if things are done in a hurry, they will really damage the very cause that he wishes to advance.

Further, it is amazing that an experienced, successful, and very well-known business man like Sir Vithaldas Thackersey should make an indirect attempt to hustle Government. Government is engaged in the consideration of these problems, and in the fulness of time the results and conclusions will be made known to the public. There may be a few more Departments which may be needed in order to give encouragement to the Indian industries. Till then, I very earnestly request impatient men like Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, and still more impatient men like my Honourable friend, Rao Bahadur Subrahmanayam, to possess their souls in patience.

In these democratic days you show so much impatience. You must have faith, abundant and supreme faith, in the action that is being taken behind the scenes. There are some very difficult problems connected with the encouragement of the industries of India. I present to you some of the difficulties. In the first place, India has no industries of any great consequence; then, India is an agricultural country; people have the joint family system; they are caste-ridden. All these difficulties and intricacies have to be considered before you can arrive at any satisfactory conclusions.

Sir, we have been told that it is possible that some firms may have to come out from England. I quite understand that, but, even at the risk of being misunderstood and perhaps very severely criticised, I wish to say that the

Government of India should see that preference is given to Indian firms, and by Indian firms here I mean firms formed by Hindus or Muhammadans or Christians or Europeans who are settled in this country. I do say, and say most clearly, that it is necessary that Government should finally settle, and should make a declaration once for all that, as far as industrial and other kindred matters are concerned, preference will always be given, as far as circumstances permit, to firms that are composed of people residing in the country. (Hear, hear.) It is very necessary, I submit, that this principle should be thoroughly accepted and acted upon, because if it is not, then it is very possible that a good deal of the good result that one expects to flow from the encouragement of industries will not really remain in India, but will flow out of the country.

Sir, what I suggest to this House is this, I dare not offer a suggestion to Government. Let us not have our attention distracted by questions of detail. All those matters of detail will come up before the Committee which Sir Vithaldas Thackersey suggests. The one main idea about which we have got to make up our minds is that there ought to be a Committee with the sole and avowed object of giving encouragement to industries for a specific purpose. If Government thinks—and I hope it will think—that other questions should also be referred to it, it might very well ask the Assembly, if the rules so require, that its scope of work should be extended; so that other questions might also be brought within the purview of its operations. But, as far as this Resolution is concerned, I venture to think that the Assembly can adopt only one attitude, and it is that it should wholeheartedly accept it. May I venture to express a hope that Government, and more particularly the Industries Department, will just make an effort to emerge out of the region of thought and contemplation, and will try to do something real and substantial, so that even we misguided people may be able to realise that something is, after all, being done?

Mr. Manmohandas Ramji (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau : Indian Commerce) : Sir, the Honourable Mr. Innes began his speech by saying that the Resolution proposed by Sir Vithaldas Thackersey deals with one aspect of the question, and that it was one side of the question. It is perfectly true that it is so, and I think, Sir, Sir Vithaldas Thackersey has brought this side-issue into prominence for a definite object. He laid stress later on the fact that he is contemplating the appointment of a Committee to deal with the matter of Stores Purchase rules, and, when that is done, this question will be covered by the findings of that Committee. Stores Purchase is quite a different thing. Here, up till now, we have been buying Railway stores and Railway requirements, probably after the budget grants were given annually, and nobody knew what was going to be assigned for the next year, and, therefore, there was not a definite policy. Here, we have settled a certain programme for a certain number of years. We shall have to take very good care to see that this programme is properly carried out and carried out for the benefit of the country. We have a large amount of money to spend during the coming ten years, and if we begin now and make up our minds what we have to do for the future, it would be best. We have been working these Railways for so many years. Have we done anything for them? Nothing of the kind. It is said, from time to time, that we cannot get axles, we cannot get wheels, we cannot get bolts, we cannot get nuts, we cannot get pins. Are we to continue in this fashion, and for how long? For centuries more to

[Mr. Manmohandas Ramji.]

come? We must take some action, and this is the proper time for taking action. Appoint a Committee and see what can be done. If it has been possible for other nations, and other countries to build their own Railway with their own workshops, why cannot India do it? If there is a mind, if there is a will, it can be done. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey suggests finding out the way, and, if there is no will, make a will and find out the way. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. A. C. Chatterjee (Industries Secretary) : Sir, I think there has been a certain amount of misunderstanding in the minds of Honourable Members of the exact proposal which the Honourable Mr. Innes made to the Assembly. My Honourable friend opposite has talked about 'Fabian tactics'. I do not want to cross swords with him with reference to the expression 'Fabian tactics' as relating to industries; but what Mr. Innes actually suggested was that a Committee should assemble during this month to go into the question of revising the Stores rules.

On behalf of the Department that I represent here I would like to explain that there has really been no delay on the part of the Government of India in dealing with the report of the Stores Purchase Committee. We issued letters asking for the opinions of Local Governments and of the general public, as far back as a year ago, and even now have not received all the opinions that we asked for. It was, therefore, really impossible for the Government of India to take action without receiving public opinion in this matter. (*A Voice* : 'Expedite'.)

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam : As I said, the matter was not in the hands of the Government of India. If we had taken action, then you would have blamed us for acting without obtaining public opinion. I was not referring to the Stores Purchase Committee; I was referring to this Resolution, which it is attempted to baulk.

Mr. A. C. Chatterjee : Well, Sir, as regards this Resolution, the Honourable Mr. Innes suggested that a Committee should be appointed to go into this matter during the course of this month. Does that imply Fabian tactics? I wish the House to consider the matter fairly and then come to a decision.

Also, Sir, the Honourable Mr. Subrahmanayam suggested, or, at least repeated, the insinuation, that the Government of India did not look with favour on the development of Indian industries, because there was this large unemployment in England.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam : Disprove it by action.

Mr. A. C. Chatterjee : On behalf of the Government of India, Sir, I repudiate that suggestion very strongly.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam : Disprove it by action.

Mr. A. C. Chatterjee : We have never considered the question of unemployment in England, Sir. Two years ago, Parliament decided that industries in India should be a transferred provincial subject. If it was the intention of the Government of India always to look to the position in England, would it have made the development of industries a transferred subject, subject to the autonomy of Local Governments? It is left entirely to the discretion of

Ministers and of the elected provincial Councils in the provinces to develop industries. At least, that is the main item, and would that have been done, if the interests of British labour or of British capital were in the minds of the British Parliament or of the Government of India? I think, Sir, a certain amount of fairness should be displayed by the Assembly in this matter. As a result of the Industrial Commission's Report, Departments of Industries have been established in every province. You have to allow time to the Ministers as well as to the Directors of these Departments to develop their policies. Industries cannot be built up in a day.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam: Salaries are drawn quickly.

Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Sir Vithaldas Thackersey himself has referred to the organisation of the Tata Works. I had some knowledge of the manner in which that organisation was begun. It took years, Sir, for the great man Jamsetji Tata to develop his scheme before it could be even placed before the public. Naturally, you cannot expect Ministers in the provinces to develop the industries in their provinces within a few months. You must give them time. It is only fair that, even in the interests of Self-Government, Ministers and the elected Legislative Councils in the provinces should be given time in the matter. We are always comparing ourselves with European countries, but even industries in England were not developed in two years, nor were the industries in Germany developed in two years, nor were the industries in Japan developed in two years.

Coming back to the subject of the Resolution, Sir, what the Honourable Sir Vithaldas Thackersey wanted was a Committee to go into the question of seeing to what extent the stores that would be necessary for the rehabilitation of the railways should be purchased in India. I think that is really the substance of his Resolution. What the Honourable Mr. Innes pointed out was that the difficulty was with regard to the Stores Rules. Whether we have a Stores Department or not, we are bound by the Stores Rules. These Rules were made with the sanction of the Secretary of State; that is down even in the Devolution Rules. If we are going to purchase in India the stores that will be necessary for the rehabilitation of the Railways, we must revise those rules. A year ago, as I said, we circularised the Local Governments with the object of eliciting public opinion regarding the revision of those rules. We have not yet received all the replies; but it is necessary to revise those rules and what the Honourable Mr. Innes suggested was that we might have a Committee of this House in order to assist Government to revise those rules at once. If those rules are revised, then we would be able really to help firms desirous of establishing industries in India which will supply stores required for the Railways. Unless we revise those rules, we, in the Department at any rate, have come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to assist any firms.

Therefore, Sir, if the House will permit me, and if you will permit me, I should like to move an amendment to the Resolution. My amendment will run:

• 'That a Committee should be appointed to advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules with special reference to the question as to what steps can usefully be taken to establish the manufacture of railway material and railway stock in India'.

(Cries of 'No, No'.)

Mr. President: Order, order.

Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: I think, Sir, that a Committee of this sort, if it assembles during this month and frames definite recommendations for the revision of the Stores Rules, would do extremely useful work. I am sure Sir Vithaldas Thackersey will admit that the chief difficulty at present is the Stores Rules, and, if the Stores Rules can be revised, the other difficulties will practically disappear, and, if we can come to any definite conclusions within the next few weeks, we will be able to obtain the approval of the Secretary of State to a change in the rules. Then, the firms anxious or desirous of establishing industries in this country would be able to go ahead.

Munshi Iswar Saran asked for a declaration that Indians and Indian firms will be encouraged to start industries. There is no difficulty, Sir, in making that declaration. The settled policy of the Government of India, as I think we have mentioned more than once in this Assembly, is that no concession should be given to any firms in regard to industries in India, unless such firms have a rupee capital, unless such firms have a proportion, at any rate, of Indian Directors, and unless such firms allow facilities for Indian apprentices to be trained in their works. This has been mentioned more than once, and I can only repeat this declaration. I hope that will satisfy the House.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir; I regret to say that I do not feel convinced by the speech that has just been delivered by Mr. Chatterjee and that I do not think any sufficient reply has been given to Sir Vithaldas Thackersey and those who have spoken in support of his Resolution. I cannot possibly understand the mentality of the Government in refusing to accept the Resolution and putting forward that kind of amendment, because the Resolution is comprehensive enough. If a Committee is appointed in terms of the Resolution, it will do the work that is proposed by the amendment and something more. This shibboleth of rules and principles has, I think, been sufficiently demolished by Munshi Iswar Saran. But, if it be a question that this difficulty cannot be solved without, first of all, laying down the principles and rules which should guide the purchase of stores, that is a matter also which can be gone into very easily by the Committee proposed by Sir Vithaldas Thackersey. I will not traverse the ground which has been already traversed by other speakers, although I agree with all that fell from Sir Vithaldas Thackersey. I will only touch on one or two points.

Mr. Chatterjee has said that Rome was not built in a day, and that industries cannot be built up in one day. Japan, Germany and other countries have taken years, and probably centuries; but they did start once. As Mr. Subrahmanayam said, you always say you will get this or that thing soon, but when is that 'soon' going to come? We say you must make a start. Once a start is made, all grounds of complaint will be removed.

Sir, this purchasing-in-the-cheapest-market is rather an obsession with the Englishman. It is a branch of that family of which another branch is Free Trade. Now we have had this battle fought between free traders and protectionists before the Fiscal Commission, and I think I am correct in saying that most of the British witnesses supported free-trade on the same principles on which purchasing in the cheapest market has been supported by the Government Members to-day. My reply to that is that what you consider to be cheap now is dear in the long run, and what you consider to be dear now is cheap in the long run. Take, for example, the case of Japan and Germany. Now, I daresay, Japan would not have been.

able to build up all her industries up to now if she had adopted this principle of purchasing in the cheapest market. So also Germany. Before the war you found that German goods were the cheapest; although they did not start the building up of their industries before England but much later than other countries. And, therefore, I say that, if you start building up our own industries, even if you have at the beginning to undergo the sacrifice of purchasing things produced in this country dearer than they are procurable elsewhere, you will find that you have acted on the best business principles in the long run. You will in that way build up those industries and be able to compete with other markets, and eventually be able to purchase all those articles much cheaper here than elsewhere. Therefore I submit that the principle that has guided the Government in this matter, that it is in the interests of the tax-payer that we should purchase in the cheapest market, is wrong. I say it is in the interests of the tax-payer in the long run that we should build up our industries even if you have to purchase at higher prices at the start.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to support the Resolution. I have with great attention listened to my Honourable friend, the proposer of this Resolution, and at the same time heard the Honourable Mr. Innes speaking from the opposition Bench. I have also listened to my Honourable friend, Mr. Chatterjee, in support of his amendment, and to the contention that has been submitted by him. Sir, I do not really find much force in the argument of my Honourable friend. It is the sort of argument that might be used in a debating society, but my Honourable friend has really nothing to say on behalf of Government. It seems to me what we hear in the every day walk of our life outside this Assembly,—Counsel, arguing a losing case. That being so, I think, without making any further comments, I shall vote for the Resolution.

Mr. President, I am sure you are aware that I have myself tried my best to put questions after questions on the subject, and have given notice of a Resolution also that this Department of the Government of India should be handed over to the people who feel for the country, and not any longer be vested in the hands of the bureaucracy. Sir, how long are we going to suffer this neglect of the country's interests and to put up with this spirit of extraordinary confidence on the part of Government? Sir, we are no longer going to have any more patience in this matter, when my Honourable friends, Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey and Mr. Subrahmanayam, who, I believe, are the first persons to make allowance for Government, both consider that the time is ripe for action. I also heard my friend from Allahabad who is no longer in this Assembly Chamber. But without making any further attack on the observations that he made, I do not require to find any further material to argue about on the subject. I, therefore, support the Resolution.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala (Burma: Non-European): Sir, some Honourable gentlemen who have spoken before me have been surprised at the difficulties presented to them by my Honourable friends upon the opposite side of the House. One of them (Mr. Harchandrai) just now complained of the mentality of the Government. Now, what other mentality does the Honourable Member expect from any Government and why is any other Honourable Member surprised at the difficulties put forward by Government? What is the principal function of any Government now-a-days? To create difficulties sometimes, and nearly always to propound them—very seldom to get over

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala]

them. Then it has been suggested by one Honourable gentleman that my Honourable friend opposite (the Honourable Mr. Innes talk'd in a circle. Now is not that also the principal function of speakers on behalf of Government? They a ways must talk in a circle—circumlocution is their profession, and, therefore, there is no reason whatever for any Honourable Member of this House to be surprised either at the difficulties or the circumlocution which we are born to receive from the Benches opposite.

Mr. Chatterjee said that there has been no delay on the part of Government in dealing with the Report of the Stores Purchase Committee. A matter of a year appears to the Government no delay at all for he said that for a year he had been writing letters to the Local Governments, but he had not received any reply. That is just the point, — the delay in a Government Department counts by years, sometimes by decades, sometimes even by centuries, and, unless at least a life time passes, they do not think that sufficient time has been given to them for the solution of any question at all.

Then he said that Industries had been made a transferred subject in the Provinces. Is that so? Why then is he here? And why is my Honourable friend, Mr. Innes, here? If the subject is a transferred subject in the proper sense of the term, my Honourable friends ought to be in the provinces and not here on the Benches opposite. The most important aspect of the industries is not transferred and everybody knows, because the question of large policies is still in the hands of the Government of India and that is where the trouble really arises. The Government of India never have sufficient time, sufficient opportunity and sufficient discussion on any subject in order to come to any conclusions. Coming to the subject now under discussion, I will only mention one aspect of Railway materials and industries. I do not know much about wagons and other things. I shall deal only with sleepers. I am not in possession of the exact figures; but I believe I am right in stating that every year nearly a million sleepers are required for the use of the various Railways in India. Now if you take the cost of one sleeper to the Railway at Rs. 10, or Rs. 12 sometimes, it represents Rs. 12 million. Of these sleepers, about 30 or 40 per cent. only, I understand are bought in India. The others are imported either from the United States, Canada or Australia: and the irony of fate here is that those countries themselves from which we get steel and other sleepers very often get their timber from India for the very purpose of using it for making sleepers for themselves. My Honourable friend shakes his head: I have not got my book here; but I would point out to him that it is a fact that, though we get sleepers from Australia, in Australia they actually use our timber for the same purpose. We are going to spend nearly Rs. 10 crores on sleepers. For the purpose of manufacturing sleepers I do not think so much circumlocution or so much inquiry is necessary. There is abundance of timber in Burma and in other parts of India, and it is merely a question of giving encouragement to persons engaged in the forest industries. I understand, Sir, that sometimes the difficulty is that all kinds of timber cannot be used for sleepers unless they are treated. The treating of these sleepers is not at all a difficult question. The machinery is very simple and can be easily procured and there will be no trouble at all if a serious attempt was made to use all kinds of suitable timber that is produced throughout India in order that it may

be used for sleepers. That is only an instance in which Government can do a great deal without going outside this country. Very little machinery would be required and not very much capital either; and these sleepers if manufactured in this country would save the country at least 50 or 60 per cent. if not more of the 10 crores. Therefore, Sir, I do not agree to the amendment proposed by my Honourable friend opposite. We have already many Departments and he is going to suggest the creation of another Department. I would agree to the creation of this Department if our difficulties ended by the creation of that Department, but that Department in its turn will come to the House again and talk of fresh difficulties. We are sick and tired of listening to these difficulties. We want something done and we want something done forthwith and it is the duty of this House, therefore, to insist upon the original Resolution being carried.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars: Landholders) Sir I beg to propose that the following words be added to the Resolution of Sir Vithaldas Thackersey, namely:

'That this Committee be appointed not only to consider and report but also to frame fresh rules necessary for the Indian Stores Department.'

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: That is exactly my amendment, or rather Mr Chatterjee's amendment.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: That amendment provides that this Committee be appointed primarily to frame the necessary rules and with special reference to something else; whereas my amendment is that the Committee be appointed to consider and report as to what steps should be taken primarily to bring about the establishment of those industries that are needed for spending the amount allotted to the rehabilitation of railways and collaterally to frame the necessary rules. That is the difference between my amendment and the amendment that has been proposed

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: Would Mr. Shahani substitute the word 'revise' for 'frame,' because we have got the rules already? It is a question of revision.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: I would then take away the word 'frame' and use the word 'revise'—and also to revise the rules'

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: To advise as to the revision of the rules.

Mr. S. C. Shahani: 'As also to advise as to the revision of the rules necessary for the Indian Stores Department.'

This will reconcile the two views.

Mr. President: Does the Honourable Member wish to add that to the Resolution? Mr. Chatterjee's original proposal was to substitute his amendment for the Resolution. Does the Honourable Member want to put the two together?

Mr. S. C. Shahani: I propose to put the two together.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes: I must confess, Sir, that I have been very much surprised by the turn which this debate has taken. I am afraid that it was my own fault: I am afraid that the speech I first made must have been very obscure; because I must confess that I cannot see what it was in

[Mr. C. A. Innes.]

my speech which has led to this somewhat heated debate. What is the difference between us? Sir Vithaldas Thackersey proposes a Committee to consider what steps should be taken to encourage the establishment of the necessary industries with special reference to Railway. I have pointed out that the very first thing that the Committee will have to do will be to examine these Indian Stores Rules. It is the very first thing it will have to do; and, if you are going to have a Committee, it will have to examine those rules. Why not say so in your Resolution? That is all the difference between us. Mr. Shahani's amendment quite covered my point. If you like, take this and simply add that this Committee should also advise the Government of India as to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules; it perfectly well meets my point; and that was the only point between us. It seems to me that the House would be very unreasonable if it did not accept this solution of the difficulty, because the House must understand that, if you have a Committee, if that Committee is going to consider how you are going to encourage private industries in India for the manufacture of Railway materials and Railway stores the first thing it has got to do is to advise as to the revision of these Indian Stores Rules. Our rules are there and they will have to be revised. That is the whole difference between us.

I do not propose to go over all the points that have been raised in this debate. Mr. Subrahmanayam accused me of Fabian tactics, creating difficulties, doing nothing. Well, Sir, if I may be permitted to say so, Mr. Subrahmanayam is a lawyer. I do not think Mr. Subrahmanayam has ever had any connection with industries or with business. He is one of those gentlemen who periodically comes out into the open, beats the tub and says: 'What is the Government doing?' That is all his contribution to this extraordinarily difficult question of industrial development. Mr. Ginwala accuses us of creating difficulties. Are not the difficulties there? Did Government create them? The question is how to surmount them. Everybody in this Assembly has been talking about India's backwardness in industrial development. It is true that India is backward; but the progress that India has made in the last few years is remarkable, and I firmly believe that she is likely to make much more progress in the next few years. I referred the House in a previous speech to the evidence given by the metallurgical industries for the Acworth Committee. Just let me read out a list of the Companies which were then considering starting at Jamshedpur.

- A Company for the manufacture of Jute Mill Machinery;
- A Company for the manufacture of Wire and Pressed Metal products;
- A Company for the manufacture of Concrete re-inforcing material;
- A Company for the manufacture of Enamelled hollow ware;
- A Company for the manufacture of Electric cables;
- A Company for the manufacture of Tin plates; and
- A Company for the manufacture of Hand agricultural tools.

The Fiscal Commission is going into questions of the tariff, and I for one am not despondent. Any one can see that India is in the next few years bound to go ahead industrially. Government can help, but the real impetus must come from private enterprise. It is up to us to help this private enterprise, and the best way to help the industries is as I have suggested. I accept the amendment moved by Mr. Shahani for adding to the Resolution moved by Sir

Vithaldas the simple words, in addition to the other words, 'this Committee should advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules.' That is what the whole business comes down to. I cannot see there is any difference at all between us.

Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey : Mr. President, with regard to the remarks made by my Honourable friend, Mr. Innes, that he is not less patriotic than any of the officials in the self-governing countries, I may at once say that I did not intend and my remarks did not apply to the officials of our Government at all. I only pointed out that, because of their patriotism, more than a direct action was taken by the officials in other countries. I know the work of my Honourable friend, Mr. Innes, for many years, he used to come to Bombay and visit our committees of the Mill-owners Association and the Indian Merchants' Chambers more than once. We know his keen desire to encourage Indian industries. (Hear, hear.) From the experience we have on the Bombay side, there is one characteristic which we notice among Englishmen more than any other, and that is, if he is once convinced that he has to do a certain thing, he carries out conscientiously the duties imposed upon him. (Hear, hear.) We have experience in the Bombay Corporation, where the Municipal Commissioner who is the chief executive officer of the Corporation, is an Indian Civil Servant. We are thankful to Government for always giving us one of their best men as Commissioner of the Corporation. But what do we find? As soon as he is transferred to the Corporation, he feels he is a servant of the Corporation, and, in any difference of opinion that may arise between the Government and the Corporation, he fights for the Corporation in spite of his being originally a servant of the Government. (Hear, hear.) Sir, I am quite sure if my Honourable friend, Mr. Innes, were made responsible for his position and made to feel that he is a servant of this House and is not to be controlled by somebody from outside, he will do more than any of us or any of the other officials can do for the development of our industries. It is not a personal matter at all about which I am speaking now. It is a question of policy. I have already pointed out that the Stores Purchase Committee's Report was published one year and nine months ago. It has to go back to the Secretary of State and come back from him. It has to go back again to the Local Governments and come back from them. If you do not get the replies from the Local Governments for 12 months, you have to tell them 'we cannot wait for the replies we will take action'. I am merely complaining about the dilatory method, the circuitous procedure and the short-sighted policy that is being adopted.

Then, again, Sir, we have been told that industries could not be started in two years. But the British Government has been in India for more than a hundred years. My first mill was started in Bombay 50 years ago. Are we to believe that the Government of India came into existence only last year after the inauguration of the Reforms, that they will now think of starting industries and that we have to wait for another 50 years for industrial development.

Sir, with regard to the main point raised by my Honourable friend Mr. Innes, I express my feeling on this matter very candidly. The Honourable Mr. Innes wants to give us much more than what I am asking in my Resolution, but I fear the delay. It took seven months for the Stores Purchase Committee to make a Report. It is a long and elaborate Report. I put it to this House and to the Honourable Mr. Innes whether it

[Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey.]

will be possible for a Committee of the character he has suggested to go through the whole of that Report, devise means and frame rules for the purchase of a thousand and one kinds of articles on our Stores Book in a short time, in a manner acceptable both to the Government of India as well as to the Secretary of State? On the contrary, if we confine ourselves to two or three industries, —really it is one metallurgical industry, we can do considerably more solid work. Should we go on considering at length the framing of rules and delay matters while crores of rupees are being sent out of India? I do not want to say how much time it will take, but surely it must take a considerably longer time to consider the rules for one thousand and one items than to frame rules in regard to one metallurgical industry. However, if the Honourable Mr. Innes assures us that there will be no unnecessary delay on the part of this Committee to consider and frame rules and to send in their *ad interim* Report, at least so far as the railway materials are concerned so that this House can deal with its recommendations in regard to the starting of the metallurgical industry, I have no objection. The Committee can afterwards consider gradually and leisurely, if necessary, the details of the rules with regard to other industries. Anyhow, what I say in short is, we must go ahead. In our haste we may make mistakes, in our haste we may lose, but it will pay India a thousand times to begin, to lose and be successful than not to begin at all.

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes : Sir, the Honourable Sir Vithaldas Thackersey is under a misapprehension. I never suggested that the Committee should examine the whole of the Stores Purchase Committee's Report or all the recommendations made by that Committee. I explained that the Committee in any case, whether we have referred to it or not in the Resolution, would have to examine these rules. There are, I think, 16 of these rules, but certainly not more than 20. Some of the rules are purely formal rules. The actual rules which will have to be considered are probably not more than half a dozen. It will not take a long time. Sir Vithaldas Thackersey suggests that, if we add the words suggested by Mr. Shahani to the Resolution and if the Committee wishes to send in an *ad interim* Report, it should do so. I have no objection. I think that will satisfy Sir Vithaldas Thackersey.

Sir Vithaldas D. Thackersey : I accept it, Sir.

Mr. President : The Resolution is :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee consisting of Members of the Indian Legislature be appointed to consider and report at an early date as to what steps should be taken by the Government of India to encourage the establishment of the necessary industries, so that as large an amount as possible of the Rs. 150 crores proposed to be set aside for the rehabilitation of the railways during the next five years be spent in India, and especially to advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules with special reference to the question what steps can usefully be taken to establish the manufacture of railway material and railway stock in India.'

The Honourable Mr. C. A. Innes : I think Mr. Shahani's amendment was to add the words 'to advise as to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules' at the end of the main part of the Resolution and drop the rest. I think that would suffice us. His amendment was simply to add the words 'especially to advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules.'

1 P.M.

' **Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar** (Madras City : Non-Muhammadian Urban) : ' And further to advise.'

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadian) : ' And further to advise'; or ' and also to advise'.

Mr. S. C. Shahani : I said ' also'.

Mr. President : The question is :

' That the amendment moved be withdrawn.'

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

Mr. President : Amendment moved :

' At the end of the Resolution add the words ' and further to advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules'.

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President : The question is :

' That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee consisting of Members of the Indian Legislature be appointed to consider and report at an early date as to what steps should be taken by the Government of India to encourage the establishment of the necessary industries, so that as large an amount as possible of the Rs. 150 crores proposed to be set aside for the rehabilitation of the railways during the next five years be spent in India, and further to advise the Government of India in regard to the revision of the Indian Stores Rules.'

The motion was adopted.

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

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Two of the Clock; Dr. H. S. Gour was in the Chair.

RESOLUTION *RE* RELIEF FOR DISTRESSED PARTS OF MALABAR.

Mr. K. Muppil Nayar (West Coast and Nilgiris : Non-Muhammadian Rural) : Mr. President, the Resolution that stands in my name reads as follows :

' This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a mixed agency of officials and non-officials be appointed to report on the distressed condition in the parts affected by the Moplah outbreak in Malabar and to suggest such relief as is necessary.'

I have a sorry tale to tell, and I crave the indulgence of this Assembly in the performance of the difficult task before me. I stand before you to plead on behalf of the distressed in the area until lately under Martial Law which has now taken another form. This matter is so important and urgent that it ought to have been brought before the Assembly at the very commencement of this Session; but I am sorry, circumstances at home did not permit my presence here earlier.

Though I think I am already late in this appeal, yet, I consider this an opportune time to appeal to this Assembly to see, that, along with the above mentioned change of hands and methods, the necessary arrangements for the betterment of the conditions in the area are also made. In answer to some of the interpellations on this subject from me and from my Honourable friends,

[Mr. K. Muppil Nayar.]

Mr. Raghurib Sinha, and Mr. Mudaliar, it was said on behalf of the Government that the matter is a Provincial one. While I agree to a good portion of this argument, I submit there are three important considerations which I desire to place before this Assembly in this connection. Firstly, we must realise the altogether exceptiona and prolonged nature of the outbreak and bear in mind that what we had in Malabar was no case of mere rioting but an actual state of war and that our present trouble there is an aftermath of such a war: secondly, we must not forget the gigantic nature of the work that there is to be done and our special obligation to Madras whose contribution to our coffers is by no means small or mean: and lastly, we must remember that our help and co-operation is essential in some matters, if effective work is to be done. If therefore, I have deemed it necessary to move this Resolution in this Assembly, it is because the work of reconstruction, to which it refers, is so important and so difficult, and involves also vital considerations exclusively within the province of the Supreme Government in India, such as the location and disposition of the military, the opening up of the tracts in question by suitable Railways, the remission of income-tax, and kindred matters. That help is necessary there is no doubt, and it really matters little to me how that help is given. I can only repeat, 'Of method this may be said—if we make it our slave, it is well; but it is bad if we are slaves to method.' Though it is for me immaterial if the help comes from this Government or from the Local Government, I think our duty must not end, in this case at least, with the mere administration of Martial Law. I think this Government must interest themselves a little more, and I do desire we may be less strangers with the Local Government in putting matters right. I move this Resolution therefore in this Assembly to afford the Government an opportunity to tell us what they have done and what they propose to do as well as with the object of suggesting what has struck me as essential if maximum good is to be done in the most effective manner.

Well, Sir, at the very outset, let me explain that I make this appeal on no personal grounds. However much of an anxious time I might have had (and I assure you I had some very anxious days) and however near the rebels might have come to my place, yet due to the precautions of my ancestors (for no Moplah houses have existed from time immemorial in Kavalappara) and due to the timely arrival of troops, the nearest the rebels got to my place was 6 miles away. Though not therefore in the rebel area, yet I come from the midst of distress. In my place I had over 1,600 refugees—many of them victims of rebel attack—sent through the Relief Committee; and, these were excluding what I had on my private account. So I am able to let this Assembly have some idea of the trouble in Malabar.

Among the refugees with me were many respectable persons who though then penniless, were rich before the tragic events. I propose to give an instance of one whose family, according to my information, put up all the soldiers and many refugees during the outbreak on a previous occasion (1893, I believe) and who refused any compensation when offered, though quite a big sum was spent on that account. To him and to the women of his tharawad, when my brother distributed cloths (for all of them came almost without a second cloth), is there any wonder if tears rolled down their cheeks, and a sigh of 'has it come to this', escaped? The immense loss and damages, and the various atrocities and violence, to the loyal population

during the outbreak, and the distress that has followed in their wake, are unprecedented in the history of Malabar or perhaps of any part of India. What were the Punjab troubles before what Malabar suffered? Gorakhpur tragedies were merely an item in the day's programme in Malabar. In the whole of Ernad, in the major portion of Walluvanad, and parts of Ponnani, all well-to-do Hindu houses were looted and anything the rebels could lay their hands on, was either removed or destroyed. At the rush of rebels, the inmates of houses, including men, women, and children, fled, and took shelter in hills and forests; and, those, who escaped detection, murder, or conversion by rebels, reached places of safety, after continued starvation and misery. The Zamorin Rajh in presiding over a sufferers' conference in Calicut said:

'Hindus suffered in the largest measure in life, honour and property. I know in what a state of wretchedness and sorrow Nambudiri refugees and their Gosha women, some almost naked some far advanced in pregnancy, some with new born babies came to my palace seeking shelter there.'

That, Sir, is his experience and the same can be said by very many others. In fact, the whole loyal population in the disturbed area left their homes, and sought refuge in Taluk head-quarters, in towns and other places where there was military protection or some safety. It is impossible at present to form even a rough estimate of persons who left for shelter from their homes. The figures in the several refugee camps, opened by the Malabar Central Relief Committee, do not give any correct idea of the number of refugees, for these figures do not include refugees who fled to Native States and other districts, who lived at their own expense, or who depended on their relations or friends, or on the Congress Relief Committee. A pamphlet, however, issued by the Honorary Secretary of the Malabar Relief Fund, Bombay, on the 28th November last, shows that more than 22,600 refugees were then being given relief. The real number of refugees may perhaps be double that or more. It was about the time when the first crop was to be harvested that the rebellion broke out, and the same having continued to the time of the second crop, the loyal inhabitants of the disturbed area have, perhaps with rare exception, lost their both crops. All movables, seed, stored paddy, live stock, records, jewels and all valuables (the rebels even dug up rooms in houses for treasure) having been looted or destroyed, even the rich inhabitants in the disturbed area are without the means of subsistence till the next harvest in October 1922. The ordinary tenant is without the wherewithal for subsistence and for raising the next crop. Thus, both the rich jenmi and the common tenant are now on equal footing. A census of refugees, in the several relief camps, has been taken, showing their losses, and the amount necessary to start life on return to what remain of their homes. Numerous petitions, by landlords and tenants who have suffered, showing the description and value of property lost, and the names of rebels who took part in looting and plunder, etc., have been sent up to the authorities, but no satisfactory progress in their disposal has yet, to my knowledge, been made. In addition to those who have suffered immense losses, there are many temples burned, there are many families, who have lost their earning members from murder or mutilation by rebels and many, who have suffered considerably by conversion and other atrocities. All these sufferers must be adequately compensated.

(At this stage Mr. President took the Chair.)

It was partly for payment of compensation on such occasions, and for making good the loss and expense to Government, that the Moplah Outrages

[Mr. K. Muppil Nayar.]

Acts were passed and brought into operation. Though their use, I believe, had been partly given up, yet, during this outbreak, the Collector had notified that taxes would be collected. I understand, during a previous outbreak, Mrs. Conolly, the wife of a murdered Collector, was paid as compensation every pie of the special tax then collected. Yet the Special Commissioner, I think it was in a reply to a deputation from the planters of the district, is reported to have said that no compensation can be paid, for, that will mean the Government have accepted the responsibility for the outbreak. If that, Sir, was intended to be a general feeler, I must say, I cannot understand this dispensation of justice. I consider this no time for close-fisted pattings on the back.

'Preach to the storm, and reason with despair,

But tell not Misery's son that life is fair.'

Distress there is, and there can be no organisation, more fit than the Government, to come to their help effectively. If the tax now collected be not enough, the Government must find funds some other way and go to the help of the distressed and see that the sufferers are adequately compensated. I also understand that a great quantity of paddy and things were recovered from the rebels. Where exact ownership is not proved, these can also be utilized for distribution. The agricultural department must be directed to pay special attention to the affected parts, and to help the people with supply of seed, implements, and cattle. Some amount of relief can be given in the way of agricultural loans also. A non-official reconstruction Committee has been formed, but they are working at their head-quarters, in towns chiefly, and doing what little they can along with their usual avocations. A visit to the interior villages by a properly constituted Committee to gauge the acute distress, and to examine carefully the loss suffered, is urgent and very necessary. I must also mention that there are many Moplah families who require relief now, and these cases can also be inquired into by a Committee.

I learn that revenue officers in the disturbed area have set about collection of assessment and taxes are pressing both landlords and tenants to pay up. I understand that Moplah tenants, in possession of lands under Hindu jenmis, are promptly meeting the demands on behalf of their landlords to gain the favour of the authorities; but, Hindu tenants and landlords are without any means to pay. In cases they pay, they do so for fear of the officers by raising loans at considerable loss and sacrifice. I may give one instance that occurred some time back of a big jenmi and banker, a refugee who had to leave, what he did not lose, at the mercy of the rebels, and run for life. He was threatened with penalty, in case of non-payment of income-tax in time, and had to run up for a loan, to meet the demand. I have no doubt, that, if strict enforcement of collection, in the disturbed tracts, is insisted on, many of the big jenmis will have their jenmam lands lost by sale for arrears of revenue, and the rebels, or those who were so until lately, who have enriched themselves by looting and plunder will become owners of such lands. Under the present hard and straitened circumstances, the people would naturally have expected more forbearance and leniency, from their benign Government. The Government in my opinion have a clear duty to perform. In their prosperity, the affected areas were made to and did uncomplainingly contribute to the general coffers (and it was with a view most importantly to protection of life and property which in this case it was impossible to afford them). Now, in their adversity,

would the Government like it to be known, that they deserted them? In this matter of remission as well as compensation we can expect valuable decisions from the inquiries of the Committee.

Now, Sir, jenmis and respectable gentlemen are found fault with for not returning to their homes. But I ask, how can they? Instances are not wanting, where non-Muslims are butchered on their return, and on resumption of their normal duties in life. I may specially mention the case of individuals who have helped the Government, and who are regarded by rebels, and those who were rebels until lately, as partisans of their enemy. No wonder, people are reluctant to return, and especially those who have something to lose when attacked. Such of them as have lost much of their property, and many of them who have lost their dear ones, ask, and very justly too, how can we return? No doubt, the greater part of the rebellion has been quelled, but there is trouble yet. Then again, what about the return of the forcibly converted, many of whom have given up the religion forced upon them? It is a well known fact that the rebels and their religious leaders will not easily forgive them for what they consider a desertion of their new faith. Two things are, in my opinion, essential. Firstly, Civil Officers must be sent, and assurances taken from leaders and religious heads that no harm will be done to those non-Muslims—converts or no—who return to their homes. Secondly, a sufficient number of troops must be stationed within easy reach places where trouble is likely. There may be other very useful suggestions that a Committee can give us after making an inquiry.

There is yet another matter where a Committee can give great help, and that is in finding out some way by which to make up for the loss of records and documents. An inquiry must be instituted into this, and some just and proper arrangement made. The Committee can also satisfy themselves on the urgency of opening up the Moplah taluks by a railway which has been for years past urged as a sure remedy, to check these outbreaks. I believe the scheme is ready, and work can be begun as soon as this Assembly is pleased to sanction the necessary expenditure. Yet another important matter on which the Committee may advise is the better education of the Moplahs. In short, a Committee can go into all these and like matters and where they cannot themselves work out the details, they can suggest what action is to be taken.

I do not wish to add anything further, but I must say, Sir, I am afraid, the seriousness of the situation is hardly realised here. No doubt, distance has in a way mitigated a due conception of the actual conditions. I therefore insist on a Committee going and seeing for themselves, and getting themselves convinced of the real necessity for help. I cannot emphasise too strongly the dangers of leaving the country hungry and helpless. In the interests of peace and contentment, and to avoid lawlessness, and to restore confidence, something must be done, and that urgently too. I may here add that I understand that Mr. Devadhar, for whose work on behalf of weeping Malabar no praise can be too much, has been forced to advise the Central Relief Committee not to enter into financial liabilities or to enhance the sphere of work but to leave further relief work to the Government. Money will no doubt be required, but that is so in all such cases, and money simply has to be found. If you can't find it for this noble purpose, with what voice can the Finance Member ask for it, in this or the Provincial Chamber, at any time? 'The greatest object in the Universe,' says a certain philosopher, 'is a good

[Mr. K. Muppil Nayar.]

man struggling with adversity ;' yet there is a still greater, which is the good man who comes to relieve it.

Before I conclude, I must not fail to add a word of thanks to our friends. Jenmis and the rich among the middle class have done splendid work, and given much help by maintaining refugees, by way of donations, and by feeding many families, though we find very little of all that in newspapers, for they are not done for advertisement. Then again, I cannot sufficiently express Malabar's indebtedness to the philanthropists of the other parts of India, especially of Bombay (of whom some well-known names I see before me adorning this Assembly: who have come to her help. Nor, can I sufficiently express our gratitude to the Servants of India Society, and to the Arya Samaj, and to such institutions, for the noble and most timely help and work they have done. I know these and other private sources have been fully tapped, but there is a limit to private charity. What, may I ask, have the Government done in this line? I am sorry to say, very little so far as I know, and it is to make up for this failure, due, no doubt, to their other multifarious duties in connection with the rebellion, that I ask for this Committee. I am fully aware of the fact that there is a Special Commissioner appointed and I do not want to be bamboozled by the fact that he was so high an official as an acting Executive Councillor (who had to vacate when the permanent incumbent returned). But the fact remains he represents largely only one side—the official, and as such is governed largely by the dictates and interests of the Government. There is no non-official element with him and unless the representatives of the people—the sufferers—are given a voice in the decisions, there can neither be an adequate reading of the needs of the situation nor any popular satisfaction in the administration of just relief.

From what I have said, it must not be understood, that I have failed to recognize the great difficulties the Government have had to face in the quelling of the rebellion, or the brave and noble part played by their officers. It is true I cannot sufficiently praise the courage and the high sense of duty with which officials of the Government like Mr Thomas, Mr. Hitchcock, Mr. Tottenham, Mr. Amu and dozens of other officials, both European and Indian, have performed their duty, regardless of danger even to their lives. I must also mention our indebtedness to Mr. Knapp, our Special Commissioner, and I must convey to Colonel Humphreys and his noble soldiers the gratitude of the whole district for the unpleasant but essential part they have been called upon to play, during these troublous days. Lastly, but first in importance, I must mention the hero of the situation, Mr. Evans, who, at imminent risk of his life and not caring for his health, has continuously been going about with the military to help them with his wide knowledge of the district, and to dilute any individual case of harshness on their part. He has gone almost alone into risky tracts for the purpose of inspiring confidence and of bringing round the rebellions. I wish to take this opportunity to mention how sorry I am (and I know I am speaking for the district) to see him blamed for that regrettable incident, the train tragedy. Injustice and ingratitude, in my opinion, can go no further. Placed in a new situation, under very difficult circumstances, with novel duties and responsibilities which vied with each other in their respective importance and urgency, he did all a human being could be expected to do for my district. Admittedly, there was no intention on anybody's part, for, if that was the case the same could

have happened dozens and dozens of times before. I, for one, do not see, how he can be blamed and I cannot deplore it too strongly if he is to retire on this account, for I understand that he intends to do this after submitting his report.

Now, Sir, I have attempted to give the Assembly some idea of the trouble we had in Malabar and of the present situation there. I have attempted to prove the necessity for the appointment of a Committee, and, if appointed, to show the scope for work. Much more could have been said on this subject; but, even if time permitted, I doubt, if I could stand the test of repeating to you the innumerable cases of individual hardship. Remember, the task of undoing the wicked work of, not one or two days, but, of six or seven months, is not easy. I ask for this Committee, and into their hands, I ask the Government to entrust the important task of finding out the methods and means of rebuilding the affected area in Malabar. On their love of justice, on their generosity will depend the deathbed of many a lie and many a suspicion of insincerity of the British Government in India, cast abroad by the enemies of India and of all law and order. In conclusion, Sir, may I quote the words of our illustrious and beloved Royal Visitor, 'In life it is the kind personal touch that counts.' With these words, I move the Resolution for the acceptance of this Assembly.

Mr. President : Resolution moved :

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a mixed agency of officials and non-officials be appointed to report on the distressed condition in the parts affected by the Moplah outbreak in Malabar and to suggest such relief as is necessary.'

Haji Wajih-ud-din (Cities of the United Provinces: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I rise to give my support to the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Mr. Nayar.

Since the first outbreak of the disturbances in Malabar, the same question has several times and in different shapes been brought before the House, but in my humble opinion, it has never been brought with a sense of more urgency than at present. It is known that the Martial Law for the affected area is already abrogated. We are told that the normal condition is not yet attained. We know for certain, that something must be done to restore peace and order, to give protection and relief to the unfortunate sufferers, and to atone for the wrongs. Of course, one of the primary duties of a Government is to maintain order in the country and to protect the person and property of its people. As a legislative body, I think, it is *our* duty to assist the Government to follow the right course towards the welfare of our Motherland. What I mean to say is that this is the critical moment when no helping hand should be wanting, when all of us must be up and doing, when prejudices should be set aside, when we should make it a common cause.

Malabar is a bleeding part of our own body. We must not leave it at the mercy of the eating worms. We must do everything to apply the balm of life. The horrible news which are every day reaching our ears, inspire us with sympathy, and the emergency calls our immediate attention. It is of the utmost importance to ascertain exactly the present condition of the situation, to know the nature of those detestable causes which are every day hurrying the unfortunate province towards destruction, and to find what can be done towards reconstruction, and what reforms should be introduced to check the current of the present disorder, and the possibility of any future

[Haji Wajib-ud-din.]

repetition of the catastrophe, which has struck such a heavy blow upon the people that they will not be able to make up the losses for a century.

However the first step which can wisely be taken towards bringing about all this, is to adopt this motion.

Before concluding my remarks I may add that if we shall neglect to do our duty at this critical moment, if we shall continue to exhaust our energies by aiming shafts of irony against each other, and by heaping blames over the heads of others, and if we shall not extend our sympathy to the distressed, our names will be held in detestation by the future generations for ages and ages to come.

With these few words, I strongly support the Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member): Sir, I quite agree that this question of reconstruction work in Malabar is one of the greatest importance, and I think that everyone who heard Mr. Nayar speak to-day, and heard him speak on the last occasion when he addressed the House, in connection with Malabar, must have been touched by his account of the sufferings of his unfortunate fellow countrymen in that district. Further I believe that on this occasion when I tender the sympathy of the House to those sufferers, I shall not be misunderstood. I may say that the personal knowledge of the Mover adds great force to all his observations, and indeed it is obvious from the manner in which he spoke that he feels very deeply on this subject. When I say our sympathy goes out to these people in Malabar, it goes out not only to Nayers, it goes out equally I think to many unfortunate Moplahs. After all, a great many of them have lost their lives; there are many families the bread winners of which have been lost, and there are others that are in great distress. They have been guilty of wicked and cruel acts,—at least many of them have,—but they have been misled by religious and other leaders and I think we must feel great sympathy with the families of those who have been killed or imprisoned, for they have suffered greatly. Such suffering is inevitable in cases of this kind, the death-roll must be long, but this rising ought to be a terrible warning, I think, to those who mislead fanatical, ignorant people by agitation of a religious character. I think that is the great note of warning that this rebellion sounds. Sir, as I have said, there is a great deal of distress in Malabar. At the same time, while I do not seek in any way to minimise it, I think it would be a mistake to make any over-statement of it, and the condition is not entirely so black as the Honourable Members have thought.

For instance, in the last communiqué that I have seen, dated the 24th February, I see that the sales of markets, liquor shops, etc., were fetching good prices. There was a lot of traffic for the conveyance of agricultural produce which was evident in many villages. Fair progress had been made in agricultural operations, and prices were not unduly high. Similarly, I should deprecate any over-statements in regard to the Moplah distress. Special relief camps for Moplah women and children have been opened, but they have not been patronized to any great extent. Many Moplah women in the martial law area have not left their homes, and from inquiries made by the Government there is no evidence to prove that Moplah women are still in want of food; indeed in some places there is an impression that the great amount of grain looted by the Moplahs precludes the idea of any great scarcity amongst

them at present. The Special Commissioner has placed on Moplah leaders a special obligation to look after the women, and to report to the authorities any cases of real want. Up to the 31st January no such cases were reported, and there is no foundation in the rumours that there has been a large concentration of starving Moplah women. To make sure of the facts, the Special Commissioner thought it advisable to ask a Committee of Muhammadan gentlemen to go into the disturbed taluks and ascertain for themselves whether distress existed, or was expected, to a serious extent, and to suggest measures for dealing with it. Three Moplabs were invited to join this Committee and two others from outside Malabar, one of whom, I understand, is a Member of the Legislative Council.

Mr. K. Muppil Nayar : Does the Special Commissioner say that there is no necessity for the Moplabs to be helped ?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : If the Honourable Member will kindly let me finish my speech, I will answer any questions afterwards.

I was saying that the Special Commissioner had appointed a Committee to investigate this question, and I believe he has received their report. I suggest that in these circumstances it is not necessary for the Government of India to appoint a Committee to go down to Malabar. That would not tend to accelerate but rather to delay operations.

I made a reference to the Local Government to see what they thought of this idea and they entirely deprecate any such suggestion, being of the opinion that they were quite able to deal with their own business, and I think it would be a little unfair to force their hands in this matter. I believe and it was evident from what the speaker said— that the Local Government realises its responsibilities fully. As I have already said, I saw Lord Willingdon here recently, and was much impressed with his anxiety to do what was possible to relieve the situation and with the strenuous efforts which his Government is really making to relieve distress, to restore normal conditions and to allay the bitterness in Malabar. To those who have any previous knowledge of the services of Lord Willingdon, either in Bombay or Madras, I think such an attitude will be almost a foregone conclusion, and it is hardly necessary for the Government of India to interfere in a situation with which the Government of Madras and Mr. Knapp, the Special Commissioner, are dealing with the utmost vigour and energy.

Sir, there was a meeting the other day held in Calicut. I am told that it was a very influential meeting, and those who attended, made certain recommendations to the Special Commissioner. These included the remission of revenue advances and various other methods by which the restoration of peace in this area could be effected. I think the question of railway was mentioned among them, and also the question of posting troops and military police in convenient centres. But the significant fact is that that Conference, which was composed of local people who might be supposed to know what was wanted, did not suggest any further Committee either from the Government of Madras or from the Government of India and the conclusion I come to is that the local people have no desire whatever for the Government of India to interfere in this matter; unless, therefore, this Assembly has some reason to believe that Lord Willingdon's Government is not going to do its duty, then I suggest that it would be well to leave them to perform that duty undisturbed. Various suggestions have been

[Sir William Vincent]

made to them by this Conference, which will no doubt be considered by the Special Commissioner.

I have said there was a non-official Committee which toured through the interior and made recommendations to the Government also, so that taking the various sources of information available, the Local Government have abundant material on which to act. I am also informed that Government have introduced a scheme of loans on very easy terms to those in distress, in order to enable them to make a fresh start in life; and I think that a special staff has been put on to take up the work of reconstruction, including the distribution of these loans, and arrangements to supply seed grain. Indeed I am told that at the moment the relief camps are nearly empty, owing to the return of many families to their homes.

While I am on this question of relief, it would be ungenerous if I failed to pay a great tribute to the work being done by private organisations. (Hear, hear, and in particular to the work done by Mr. Devadhar. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Devadhar wrote to me some time ago and asked me if I could do anything to induce the people in Delhi to take an interest in his charitable work, and I hoped that Members would have been able to welcome him and that he would have been able to address the Members of the Legislative Assembly on the subject. Unfortunately I have not heard whether he will be able to come up or not, but I still hope that he may have that opportunity. If that does happen, Sir, then the Members of this Assembly will have an opportunity of showing their sympathy with this distressed area, not in words but in deeds. I myself have contributed a very small sum to the relief fund but I shall be happy to join the Members of this Assembly in taking up that work. (Hear, hear.)

In referring to Mr. Devadhar I intended to mention another point, that is, his letter that has been summarized lately in the 'Leader'. Anyone who reads that will, I think, come to the conclusion that distress is much less acute than it was, and that the number of persons in the camps was much fewer.

Now I come to another point. I have tried to explain to this Assembly that in my judgment it has in no way been made out that there is a case for the appointment of a Committee by the Government of India unless this Assembly wish deliberately to say that the Government of Madras is failing in its duty. But there is another aspect to the question, and that is, that if this Assembly is going to appoint a Committee, it will be necessary to find the money to give effect to its recommendation. The Assembly must, therefore, make up its mind as to whether any case has been made out for diverting the revenues of the Government of India to the relief of those in distress in Malabar.

If they seek to show their sympathy with these distressed persons, I suggest that they might do so from their private purses rather than from the purse of Government. Our present position in regard to the matter of finances is, as the Assembly is aware, one which demands the greatest economy. Now, the position in regard to Malabar and these disturbances is not very different from the distress caused, let us say, by floods or by acute famine. In such cases the provinces have to bear the brunt of the expenditure of relieving distress and not the Government of India; and, if this Assembly now admits our liability to contribute a grant of money to compensate these

unfortunate people in Malabar, they will be creating a very dangerous precedent. I may add, further, that the Government of Madras have not themselves asked for such a contribution. Nor, so far as I am aware, has the Legislative Council in Madras made any demand for such assistance, but here I speak subject to correction. I do not think that the Madras Legislative Council has made any additional demand on the Local Government for pecuniary assistance to relieve distress in Malabar at present. In these circumstances, would it be right for this Assembly to ask the Government of India to undertake a liability of this character; because once the Government of India appoints a Committee, then it is obvious and indeed from the way the Honourable Member spoke it is clear his intention is, that the Government should also make a money grant to assist the local authorities in relieving distress. Has any one here any idea what amount that compensation would be, what amount would be demanded? I have not. And it seems to me that it would be very dangerous indeed for the Government to accept any kind of pecuniary liability in these circumstances. I admit there may be a case made out if the Madras Government have to apply to us for a loan later on, but that also will have to be considered on its merits. At present, however, it seems to me to be premature for the Government of India to take action on the lines suggested. I have reason to believe that the prices in Malabar are not unduly high and recent inquiry made there, as I have said, indicates that the condition of the country is improving and that things are not so bad as they were.

Sir, if, in conclusion, this Assembly does think fit to indulge in generosity, as regards the revenues of the Government of India in this matter, I may say that I put the question to the Honourable the Finance Member and he said he would leave it to me to point out the facts and the danger of creating a very dangerous precedent and leave the matter to the vote of the Assembly. He said, if the proposals were within reasonable limits, he would not object, but that it was a clear case for putting the responsibility for this on to the Assembly. And I submit, that in my own view no case has as yet been made out either for the appointment of a Committee of this Chamber or for the payment of compensation from the Government of India's revenues, much as we may sympathise with the Honourable Member and the sufferings of the people in Malabar.

Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur (West Coast and Nilgiris : Muhammadan) : Sir, I have not much to say on the subject. There is no gain saying the fact that there is great distress in Malabar. The Honourable Member, however, I am sorry to say, has not reviewed the situation impartially. He spoke only about the distress caused by the Moplah rebels but said nothing about the distress caused by the non-Moplah rebels. And in describing the distress caused by the Moplahs he has, of course, overdrawn the picture. Does he mean to say that there are no rebels among the non-Moplahs? What about those non-Moplahs who have been and are still being prosecuted and convicted for waging war against the King-Emperor? We are here not to defend the evil-doers. As has been pointed out by a certain sympathiser, we have to isolate the evil-doers to whatever community they might belong and dissociate ourselves from their misdeeds. Denials, concealment or justification of their misdeeds will only widen the gulf of estrangement and bitterness and will not help to solve the problem.

Although the number of Moplahs implicated in the disturbance is comparatively large on account of various causes well-known to all those who

[Mr. Mahmood Schamnad Sahib Bahadur.]

dare to look facts in the face, yet both the communities are equally responsible for the distress. A Nair gentleman in a letter to the press, while describing the situation, said that in the latter stages of the rebellion a section of the Hindus has been guilty in some places of various kinds of barbarities on the Moplahs. Well, Sir, even Mr. Thomas, the Collector of Malabar, had to issue a communiqué in November last threatening with severe punishments those non-Moplahs who commit such atrocities upon the Moplahs.

There are also other causes of distress among the Moplahs. It has been admitted that Military operations required burning of houses. This also must cause great distress. We are not, however, now concerned with the cause of the distress, but I had to advert to it only as a reply to my Honourable friend, Mr. Kavalappara. That there is great distress among all classes, owing to various causes, has to be admitted. Therefore, I believe, my amendment will not meet with any opposition from any quarter. It is only an amplification of the Resolution. I neither wish to add nor take away anything from it. I have put forward this amendment only as there is, however, a proposal to appoint a Committee to inquire into the distress. I wish, therefore, that, if the motion is to be accepted, it may be done so with this modification or amplification.

Now, I hear also that the Local Government is moving in the right direction in this matter and taking proper steps to relieve the distress. In that case perhaps this Committee may not be necessary, if it is only for the purpose of inquiring into the distress. An acute and appalling state of distress among the Moplahs has been brought to light. It seems the Malabar Central Relief Committee under the advice of the Local Government has made up its mind to help the Moplah sufferers also. At a meeting of the Malabar Central Relief Committee, Calicut, held a few days back, the letter of Mr. Knapp, the Special Commissioner, on the question of Moplah relief, was considered. It was found that there are about thirty-five thousand destitute Moplah women and children who are in need of immediate help and that this help should be continued for a period of about three months. The Committee, after considerable discussion, resolved that they could only select for relief from among Moplahs such widows, orphans and old, infirm and decrepit men and women as are destitute. If, however, additional funds are procured, the question of Moplah relief on a large scale would be seriously considered.

Moreover, the disturbance has now subsided and the refugees have returned to their homes and the relief camps have been closed from the first of this month. Except for some rebels, who are said to be in the east of the Calicut taluka, and are not yet accounted for, the rebellion may be said to be at an end. The chief thing the Government ought to take into their hands now is the work of reconciliation and reconstruction, of which the most important item is relief. I am glad to learn also that some broad-minded Hindu and Muhammadan gentlemen have determined to set about the work of reconciliation immediately and see Malabar once again united, prosperous and contented.

With these words, Sir, I move my amendment, which runs as follows :

'That after the word 'outbreak' and before the words 'in Malabar' the words 'and the military operations' be inserted and the words 'to all sufferers' be added at the end of the Resolution.'

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, may I rise to a point of order? Is the Honourable Member moving an amendment to an amendment which has not yet been moved?

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has moved an amendment to insert the words 'and the military operations' after the word 'outbreak' and before the words 'in Malabar, the effect being to make sure that, if relief is given, it shall be given not only for the depredations of the rebels but also for the operations of the military forces of the Crown; and to add the words 'to all sufferers' at the end of the Resolution.

Before I put any amendments, I wish to ask the Honourable Member who moved the Resolution whether his position is affected by what
 3 P.M. the Honourable the Home Member has said. It would be a pity to spend time discussing a series of amendments, and then perhaps to find that the difference between the Government and the Mover is very small.

Mr. K. Muppil Nayar: I am afraid that unless a Committee is appointed—a Committee formed of representatives and goes into the whole matter, we shall not be able to do anything. I therefore still press the Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, may I explain with reference to the amendment of Mr. Schammad that I am in agreement with him on many points. In the first place, I agree that any relief given should be shared by Hindus and Muhammadans wherever there is distress and not confined to any one class. I do not think any one will refuse to accept this principle. In fact Mr. Devadhar and other people who have gone to Malabar have been relieving all in distress, and Government has also rendered assistance to all. Secondly, I am very glad that the speaker has brought out another point, and that is what one of the great aims of the work of reconstruction should be. I think great efforts should be made to re-create friendly feelings and goodwill and in no circumstances to embitter feeling by such recriminations as we heard lately in this Assembly. There is, there must be, great bitterness and passion. When men have suffered, as those in Malabar have, they naturally feel deeply. Those indeed who have lost relatives must entertain feelings of great resentment; but I am sure that the wiser and long-sighted course is to do nothing to accentuate the feeling but make every effort to restore peaceful and friendly conditions. I had a conversation with His Excellency Lord Willingdon on this subject—particularly in regard to the very large number of Moplahs against whom various accusations are brought, and without going into details or breaking confidence in any way, I think I can assure the Assembly that he is fully alive to the requirements of the situation in this respect, as fully alive as either the Honourable Member who last spoke or any of us here—we are all really satisfied that the real object in view is to attempt to reconstruct, and to obliterate the unhappy feeling which have been left by this unfortunate rising. Sir, I still believe that the Honourable Member, I mean the Mover of the original Resolution, would be well-advised if, in the circumstances I have described, he does not press this Resolution.

Mr. K. Muppil Nayar: Money may be required for this purpose, and I fear that unless a Committee is appointed to go into the whole matter and convince Government of the necessity of money—which is the first step—nothing will be done. I am putting it quite plainly.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : I think the Honourable Member has at last let the cat out of the bag. He really does not want a Committee at all. What he wants is Government of India money. I suggest that the demand is premature—when the Madras Government has not ascertained what the loss is or asked us for money—that this Assembly should be asked to pay out Government of India money.

Mr. K. Muppil Nayar : But if the Madras Government come up to you, can I expect a favourable decision? On that condition I will withdraw my Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : It must be quite clear that I make no admission, and give no undertaking whatever binding the Government of India to make any grant of money, that point must be quite clear.

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

RESOLUTION *RE* PRIVY COUNCIL IN INDIA.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I have Mr. Bajpai's permission to move his Resolution.

Mr. President : Has the Honourable Member the written authority of Mr. Bajpai to move this Resolution?

Dr. H. S. Gour : I have his authority.

Mr. President : His written authority?

Dr. H. S. Gour : The written authority was, I understand, sent to Mr. Reddiar.

M. K. Reddi Garu (South Arcot *cum* Chingleput : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Mr. Bajpai wrote to me about it asking that Dr. Gour might move his Resolution.

Mr. President : It sounds a little irregular, and in view of the recent amendment of the Standing Orders, I think I had better read the amended sub-order (2) of Standing Order 61. A proviso has been added. It runs as follows now :

‘ . . . any other Member authorised by him in writing in this behalf may, with the permission of the President, move the Resolution standing in his name. But if no Member has been so authorised or such permission is not granted, the Resolution shall be deemed to have been withdrawn.’

In spite of the somewhat irregular procedure, I call upon Dr. Gour to move the Resolution standing in Mr. Bajpai's name.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Sir, the Resolution I wish to move reads as follows :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to take early steps to establish a Privy Council in India as recommended in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.’

* *Vide* page 2719 *ante*.

Sir, when the illustrious authors of the documents known as the Montagu-Chelmsford Report drew up their report, in paragraph 287 they wrote as follows :

'We have a further recommendation to make. We were asked that His Majesty may be graciously pleased to approve the institution of a Privy Council in India. From time to time projects of this kind have been mooted and laid aside, but with the changed conditions we believe that such a body would serve a valuable purpose and do useful work. India, for all its changing ideals, is still ready to 'look up with pride and affection to any authority clothed with attributes that it can respect and admire. Appointments to the Privy Council should be made by the King-Emperor and for life. It should ensure that they will be valued as a high personal distinction. Officials and non-officials, both from British India and the Native State would be eligible, but it would be necessary to confine appointments to those who had won real distinction or held or were holding the highest offices such as Members of the Government, Ruling Princes, Members of the Council of State and High Court Judges, Indian Privy Councillors, should enjoy the title of 'Honourable' for life. The Privy Council's office would be to advise the Governor General when he saw fit to consult it on questions of policy and administration. It is our hope that for one purpose or another Committees of the Council comparable to those of the Privy Council in England which has done such valuable work in connection with industrial and scientific, research and education will be appointed.'

This recommendation in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report was supported by the Government of India in their first despatch, paragraph 119.

It was there pointed out that though this proposal in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report for the constitution of a Privy Council in India had received lukewarm support from the officials, and the non-official criticisms were mostly adverse, nevertheless the Government of India were of opinion that a Privy Council in India should be constituted. In the Simla Session, Sir, of this House, I interpellated the Government on this subject and Sir William Vincent in his reply said that the facts stated by me in my question were correct, but that the Government of India did not take any action and did not propose to take any action as the proposal was supported by the Secretary of State somewhat hesitatingly. Now, Sir, the necessity for the constitution of a Privy Council in India has grown with the growth of time. Vast and numerous problems have appeared in the forefront which call for the assistance of such a Council. Only the other day we had a very strong and insistent desire expressed by all classes and communities in this country for holding what they called a Round Table Conference the underlying principle of which was that the Viceroy and Governor General of this country should take counsel with the representative leaders of the public and devise some scheme for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the people. Occasions like these are sure to arise in future ; on questions of policy and administration the Viceroy may find it not only convenient but at times useful to call in the assistance of a non official body of Privy Councillors so as to advise him upon matters with which he is directly concerned. In England, the Privy Council in its inception was a purely advisory body called into service at the instance of the King. In modern times, the Privy Council as such consists mostly of members of the Cabinet and also a few outsiders appointed by His Majesty. In India, we have no Cabinet, but it is permissible to ask whether the Government should not constitute a non-official Cabinet of representatives of the two Houses to advise the Governor General from time to time upon the matters of administration and policy.

I submit, it will be a step forward in the direction of responsibility, and as no Act of the Legislature is necessary and no Parliamentary intervention called for, the work, I submit, is a much simpler one because the Viceroy

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

with the concurrence of the Secretary of State can advise the King to bring such a body into existence. When, Sir, the Government of India spoke of the hostility which the public evinced towards the proposals of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, the real fact was that the public were not opposed to the principle of constituting a Privy Council in this country, but what they were opposed to is the personnel of the Privy Council as delineated in that Report. I feel, Sir, that the objection which the public then had to the proposed personnel of the Privy Council is also the objection which Members here would feel to its constitution. It seems to me that a Privy Council to be of any use must consist of a few representatives of the two Houses who are elected for their ability and capacity to thrash out questions of high administration and policy and not merely representatives of Ruling Princes or representatives of Native States or persons who represent wealth and privileges in the country. There is a feeling that residents of Feudatory India are not likely to give us useful advice in the administration of British India, and there is a feeling that if they are taken into counsel the advice is not likely to be of such a character as would lead to improve the progressive realisation of Self-Government which is the keynote of the Declaration of August 1917.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Is it open to the Honourable Mover to speak against the Resolution? The Resolution says 'as recommended in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report'. My Honourable friend is advancing a very sound argument against his own proposition.

Dr. H. S. Gour: I think my Honourable friend wanted to interject for the sake of making a short speech which he may have no chance of making after I have finished. But he is perfectly aware that the recommendation is not as to the personnel and character of the Privy Council, but the recommendation is in favour of the creation of a Privy Council, otherwise everything else is a matter of detail.

Now, Sir, as I was going to say to this House before I was interrupted by my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, the sole objection which the public then had, and I believe the public still have, is to the constitution of a Privy Council as formulated in that Report, but to the Privy Council itself there can be no objection provided it is constituted on the principles I have stated. Some Honourable Members seem to be under the impression that the constitution of a Privy Council would entail additional cost. Let me disillusion them by saying that the office of the Privy Council is one of honour and dignity and does not carry with it the payment of any emoluments. Some other Members questioned me and said we have already a Privy Council in England, and so what is the good of transferring the English Privy Council to India, evidently assuming that the Privy Council I have in view is the creation of some judicial committee which will sit in judgment over the High Courts in India. I have no such intention in moving this Resolution. My intention in asking this House to accept this Resolution is merely to constitute a Privy Council on the colonial lines.

As they have a Privy Council of their own, we want to have also a Privy Council here.

Mr. J. Chandhuri (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Except in Canada nowhere else.

Dr. H. S. Gour : In Canada a Privy Council was constituted under the Canadian Act of 1867.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : Only in Canada.

Dr. H. S. Gour : Yes : Section 11.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : Will the Honourable Member read out the section ?

Dr. H. S. Gour : It says :

'There shall be a Council to aid and advise in the government of Canada, to be styled the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, and the persons who are to be Members of that Council shall be from time to time chosen and summoned by the Governor General and sworn in as Privy Councillors, and Members thereof may be from time to time removed by the Governor General.'

That is the bare skeleton of the Privy Council in Canada. and Honourable Members of the House will know that that was exactly how the Privy Council came into existence in England. In its inception the Privy Council was nothing but a small body of men who advised the King from time to time as the occasion arose. In the Encyclopædia of the Laws of England, under the head 'Privy Council,' we have the history of this Privy Council in the following words :

'In the middle ages it was an accepted rule of English constitutional practice that the King ought to act in matters of importance with the advice of the magnates or great men of the realm and so he called the magnates or great men of the realm to advise him from time to time.'

I submit, that a similar institution might be inaugurated in this country for the purpose of advising the Viceroy from time to time upon matters of policy and administration. Sir, I move this Resolution.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : Sir, I have no hesitation whatever in opposing this Resolution. (Hear. hear.) I am surprised that such a Resolution is moved by my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, who belongs to the party of democrats. Sir, I have now and then seen complaints in the Anglo-Indian press that this Assembly wants to govern the country by Resolutions. This Resolution, Sir, I am afraid, justifies that reproach. Sir, we are just beginning to put our constitution in order, so that we may get real power in the hands of the representatives of the people. We have made recommendations as to modifications in the constitution. We have made recommendations to get real power over the finances of the country. And those two important recommendations still await solution at the hands of the Government. My Honourable friend suggested, a Privy Council as is recommended in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report should be appointed. And all the while, I am glad to see, he has given arguments—weighty arguments—that the constitution should not be such as is recommended there. If he wants a Committee of both the Chambers, what are we here for? Are we going to surrender our functions as Members of this Assembly to make recommendations to the Viceroy or to the Government of India to a handful of Committee Members, who will be dubbed, I suppose, Right Honourable ?

Is it another instrument in the hands of the Executive Government to bribe the non-official public with titles and distinctions? Is that the object of

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

the Democratic Party? (Cries of 'No'.) (*A Voice*: 'It is not a party.') My Honourable friend suggested that this Council would be of use for the Round Table Conference to which we are all so anxiously looking forward notwithstanding the frown that I see in the Honourable the Home Member's face. I hope, Sir, that the solution of the troubles in the country will soon be arrived at in that direction. But a Privy Council composed of all the Ruling Chiefs, and the elders of the Council of State,—they to advise in a Round Table Conference to solve the problems of the country,—I do not know whether many of us would have faith in such a Round Table Conference. I think the very arguments put forward by the Honourable Mover are against accepting this Resolution. The other alternative which he has suggested stands self-condemned. He merely suggests a Committee of both Chambers. When the full considered opinion of either Chamber is not going to be of weight with the Government of India, is the opinion of this Committee going to be of any use? Will it be any effective substitute, and would it not be a dangerous precedent? Would it not deprive the weight which is due to the opinions of this Assembly if you merely ask a Committee of both Chambers to be called the Privy Council to have the dignified function of advising His Excellency the Viceroy? We are here to advise His Excellency the Viceroy. (Hear, hear.) We shall speak as the spokesmen of the people. We shall not be afraid to give the advice which we think ought to be given. Let us not do so in the hole-and-corner fashion by a Privy Council. Sir, I strongly oppose the Resolution.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri: I rise to oppose this Resolution. My Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, has already said that it has been condemned by public opinion in India. I wish to correct him with regard to certain statements he has made. The Privy Council in England has its own history and not a very creditable history in the past. I am not going to recite its past record from English constitutional history, but I am going to tell the House that responsible government in England had its growth in spite of the Privy Council. It is not true that the Privy Council is the Cabinet or that it promoted the growth of responsible government in England. Students of constitutional history will remember that the Cabinet had its origin at the time of the elder Pitt Chatham and that it met in secret and without the sovereign. It was first of all viewed with suspicion and jealousy by the other members of the King's Council, the Privy Council. The members of the Cabinet were regarded as a caucus, given a bad name, and were called a Cabal. But gradually, by support of the Parliament, they and their leader established the position of being responsible Ministers of the Crown, responsible to the people, to the electorate and to the House of Commons. Now, where my friend, Dr. Gour, has gone wrong is when he says that the Ministers in England, the Cabinet, owed its origin to the Privy Council. The Privy Council was the Council of the King and its function was to carry out the Royal will and not the people's will. The Ministers in England have no statutory *locus standi* yet, now they have become the *de facto* Executive is a matter of constitutional history. It is by means of convention that they have acquired their present power and position, and when the Leader of the House chooses his colleagues of the Cabinet, none of them need be Privy Councillors at all. It is, no doubt, true that the Crown confers on every Cabinet Minister the rank of a Privy Councillor. It is not that the Cabinet Ministers are chosen *qua* Privy Councillors, but it is because the Cabinet Ministers

enjoy the confidence of the House, that they are sworn in as Privy Councillors. When the Leader of the House is asked to form his own Government he chooses as Ministers those who command his confidence and also the confidence of the House, and after the Ministers have been accepted by the Crown, as a matter of course, the title of a Privy Councillor is conferred on them.

So, that settles the constitutional point which I wish to make. We wish to work up our constitution on the same lines. Our deal is to have responsibility in this House and gradually replace Government Members of the Executive Council by Ministers who would command the confidence of this House. So we do not wish to go back upon the obsolete and effete constitution of the Privy Council in England. I should also remind Dr. Gour that the Privy Council has not a very creditable record behind it. It attempted to arrogate the functions of legislation by ordinances to supersede and supplant the Legislature as also the law courts of the land. The Star Chamber, of English historic notoriety, arose out of the Privy Council and that is enough for me to say that we do not want to try to introduce any Privy Council here. Dr. Gour has referred to the Canadian constitution. Of course he has sprung this subject upon us, and we have not had time to look into the provision of the Statute he has cited, but from my recollection I would say, and I challenge Dr. Gour to controvert, that according to the Canadian constitution the Privy Council there occupies the identical position of the British Cabinet. In theory, the Governor General nominates the Privy Council, which is his Cabinet, but in practice it is the leader of the party in power in the House of Representatives, which is also called the House of Commons, who chooses his colleagues and the Governor General has to accept them as responsible Ministers. There are besides some honorary Privy Councillors, but they are not members of the Cabinet and are not entitled to attend the Cabinet meetings. We are not prepared to be misled by the Canadian analogy. Canadian constitution has its own history and its drawbacks also. That is the only Self-Governing Colony in the British Dominions where they have a nominated Senate and the later Self-Governing Dominions, such as Australia and South Africa, have not adopted the Canadian constitution. One of the greatest drawbacks of the Canadian constitution is that the Canadian constitution provides for a Senate, the members of which are not only nominated but are ordinarily immoveable during life. So it is too late in the day now to introduce any similar constitution in any other Self-Governing country. We would prefer to follow the lines of the more recent constitutions which have been adopted, in Australia and South Africa, rather than go back to Canada. Another vital objection to Mr. Gour's Resolution is that the Privy Council in Canada has been given legal existence by Statute and developed into a Cabinet by convention. The Government of India Act does not say a word about the Privy Council and it must be presumed that the idea of fastening on us an ornamental body, which has been condemned by public opinion and which may do us more harm than good, was advisedly omitted from the Act. So we are not going to add anything to the statutory provision which instead of accelerating may retard the attainment of responsible Government by us in this House. For these reasons, I would ask this Assembly to oppose to a man the Resolution proposed by my friend, Dr. Gour.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind : Non-Muhammadian Rural) : I join my feeble voice and humble voice to that of the previous speakers.

[Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas.]

namely, Mr. Rangachariar and Mr. Chaudhuri. The learned Mover of the Resolution has attempted to dangle before the eyes of the Assembly the alluring bait of the title of Honourable. Voices: 'Right Honourable.' It is 'Right Honourable' in England but in India it will be only Honourable. But I warn Members against swallowing that bait, because if they do, it will hurt them very much. If you look at paragraph 9 which was referred to by Dr. Gour, you will not find that it is at all complementary to Indians.

. What does that paragraph say?

'India, for all its changing ideas, is still ready (*that means, is still in a backward state*) to look up with pride and affection to any authority clothed with attributes that it can respect and admire. Appointments to the Privy Council should be made by the King-Emperor and for life, which would ensure that they would be valued as a high personal distinction.'

It means that we should create a Chamber of glorified sycophants and title-hunters. Now, I submit for the consideration of this House one or two points. The only reason that has been adduced by the Mover in support of the Resolution is that there should be created a body who should act as the advisers of Government in matters of administration and policy. Well, that has been sufficiently demolished by Mr. Rangachariar. I will not repeat those words. We do not want any such advisers. If the Legislative Assembly and the other Chamber are not sufficient advisers, then God save us from such a Chamber, which will consist only of place-hunters, people who are merely ornaments, figure-heads. I say that Dr. Gour has put himself entirely out of court by the motion saying that 'we want such a Chamber, as is recommended by the Montagu-Chelmsford Report' for in his speech he said, 'we do not want that, but a different kind of Chamber'. I say, so far as the Montagu-Chelmsford Report is concerned, Dr. Gour himself has condemned it, but I would go further, I would say that, even if there be any suggestion on the part of any body that a more improved Chamber of that kind be constituted, I would be against that too. Why? Because what would be the function of that Chamber? Dr. Gour did not enlighten us much as to the history of the Privy Council in England, or, for the matter of that, the history of the Privy Council in Canada, but Mr. Chaudhuri has informed us, and very rightly informed us, that there is nothing creditable behind the record of the Privy Council in England. So far as the judicial portion of the Privy Council is concerned, that is another question which is being mooted in this Assembly of which we are perfectly aware. Do not, therefore, be misled by the supposition that, by rejecting this motion, you are rejecting the other proposition, namely, the creation of the highest tribunal, the highest Appellate Court in this country. As I said, that is the subject-matter of a separate Resolution which is under circulation amongst the various Bar Associations and Local Governments, and that you can separately deal with, when it comes in its proper shape, but, so far as this Resolution is concerned, we have not had any facts from Dr. Gour except the one already answered. But I say this. If you have a Chamber of that kind, instead of doing any good, it will do a lot of harm, because it will be the creation of this Legislative Assembly. Remember, if you pass the Resolution, and the Government accept it and it is carried by a majority, and the Privy Council is created, what would be the result? You, the Legislative Assembly, have created this Chamber,—a Chamber of title-hunters, sycophants and flatterers, and you find that you

- will be abdicating some of your functions. At any time, Government will get hold of this Chamber and say to them: 'We want this advice, please give us this advice'. It would then be your own creation, your own Chamber, and you will be debarred from criticizing it. So, I say, if you swallow this bait which Dr. Gour has held out, the bait of Right Honourable, it will hurt your stomach very much. Beware of that, and reject this Resolution.

Rai D. C. Barua Bahadur (Assam Valley: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I beg also to raise my feeble voice against this Resolution. Surely, in the furtherance of a democratic movement we want to establish democratic institutions; and, of course, a Privy Council would not be a representative body. It will be created by nomination and selection and will not, therefore, be a body of the people's representatives, but a body the members of which have been selected at random or by favouritism. What we want is a constitutional monarchy. Our monarch resides in a different country and he does not rule us directly. In his place we have a Viceroy; that Viceroy should be constitutional monarch, his office in the nature of a limited monarchy. If we introduce now such a body as a Privy Council, then it will be a retrograde movement and not an advance. We will at the same time be surrendering our rights and privileges in favour of that body. Our aim is to have representative institutions and nothing else administering the country at large. As therefore the recommendation contained in this Resolution is not a move in the right direction, I beg to oppose it.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I confess that I heard the speech of the Honourable Mover with some surprise, because, when I read the notice of this Resolution, I naturally thought that he was going to move the Resolution as originally proposed, that is, that he was going to propose a Privy Council appointed in accordance with the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. From that Report we learn that appointments to the Privy Council were to be made by the King-Emperor and for life. Therefore, it was not to be a Privy Council such as he now mentions, but, if the Assembly adopts the Resolution, it will be adopting the motion of which we have received notice. At the same time, I venture to deprecate the attacks that have been made on persons merely because they are nominated by His Majesty. It is not necessary, and indeed it is unjust to suggest, that every person nominated to an honour or office is either a sycophant or a title-hunter. I know that that is a very common and cheap form of attack, but it is unworthy of this House to make such a charge in this Assembly. Nor is it really in the best taste to do it. There are many Members here who have been nominated both to titles and to office, who are neither sycophants nor title-hunters. I could name one or two—indeed, as I have just been reminded—the Honourable Member himself is the recipient of one of these titles. No one would ever suggest that he was a sycophant? I am only using his name as an argument in support of my contention. Why, there is no more independent person than the Honourable Member. Why should he suggest that every other person nominated to office is necessarily a sycophant?

- **Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas**: I did not say 'necessarily.'

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Well, Sir, this question of the creation of a Privy Council was examined very carefully when the Reforms were inaugurated, and it was then found that there was a considerable feeling against it. Anyone who goes through the papers of that time

[Sir William Vincent.]

can verify the facts very shortly. I have notes of some of the more important opinions recorded. The Government said that official opinions were lukewarm, and non-official opinions, both European and Indian, was adverse. The National Congress—in those days it was a more sensible body than it is now—were entirely against it. The United Provinces Moslem League said that the proposal was of no utility. Sir Maneckjee Dadabhoj, who examined this proposal with greater detail than anyone else, said that the idea of a Privy Council did not commend itself to many Indians and went on to quote many arguments for and against it, ending up by saying that the proposal should not be accepted without the clearest justification.

Now the basis of the arguments in favour of such a body is that we should follow the system that prevails in England of having a Privy Council, and that we really have functions which it could usefully perform. Sir, the Privy Council in England is a peculiar institution, the result of peculiar historical conditions: Moreover, as an executive body, it has now lost very nearly all its original functions. The Council was originally a Council of the Crown, a body to advise the Crown, when the authority of the King was supreme, but I believe that the chief real power which it exercises now, is the judicial authority, which is exercised by the Judicial Committee. In the sixteenth century, it was of course a very powerful body: in the Stuarts' time, it became less powerful and more unwieldy, so unwieldy that it was divided into Committees and those who have studied the subject will have found that its funeral oration as a corporate body for all practical purposes was pronounced in 1679. Of late years, it has had very few functions of real importance. The functions which a Committee of the Council performed in connection with trade have been taken over by the Board of Trade, those performed by another Committee of Council in connection with education by the Board of Education and I cannot find that the Privy Council has any very definite executive functions of importance at all now. It has in fact been replaced by the Cabinet. It does not consist of Members of the Cabinet alone as was suggested, but of some three hundred persons. (*A Voice*: 'Quite right.') Sir, I notice that in the Joint Report the fact is mentioned that Committees of the Privy Council have been of great use. I think, however, that there is some ground for suggesting that they could not have been of as much use as the illustrious authors of that Report thought, because we find many occasions on which they have not met for long periods together, when the machinery of the State went on quite satisfactorily without them.

At the same time, I was going to say that the Government are quite prepared to reconsider the proposal if it commends itself to the Assembly. But I wish to make it clear that, if this Assembly is going to recommend the appointment of a Privy Council, there is one thing they must also do: they must be quite clear what functions that body is to perform. If there are no definite functions proposed, it will be difficult for us to support such a proposal. I have not heard what the functions are; but, if the Assembly think that functions could be assigned to it, and that such a body would perform a useful duty in this country, then the Government are quite prepared to reconsider the question on its merits.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban):
Sir, the adoption of a founding is sometimes attended with very grave difficulties, especially when its putative author chooses to remain in the background.

The difficulty becomes all the greater when there is an attempt at *camouflage*, presenting the babe in a guise in which it did not first appear. Dr. Gour is a gallant and chivalrous man and he has admitted part authorship, for in reply to a question put by him the Honourable Sir William Vincent in the Simla Session had told the House what is now the basis of this Resolution. As one of the offending people referred to by the Honourable Sir William Vincent and my friend behind me, himself another offending man, I do not want to condemn this proposal as another grave danger to the purity of public life as another premium on snobbery; snobs and the congenitally impure need no provocation. The condemnation need not be on that ground. I have not the least doubt that, if there was a room for a properly constituted Privy Council, with proper functions, and if we were not handicapped by the Montagu-Chelmsford proposals under this head, the objections that have been raised on that branch of the case would not hold water. We object to it more on functional grounds. The Government of India were lukewarm in their support, because public opinion was clearly hostile. It is still so. My friend cannot get away from the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme and he cannot improve on it as he has attempted to do.

That scheme lays it down :

'The Privy Council's office would be to advise the Governor General, when he saw fit to consult it, on questions of policy and administration. It is our hope that for one purpose or another Committees of the Council comparable to those of the Privy Council in England, which have done valuable work in connection with industrial and scientific research and education, will be appointed.'

Is not the Governor General in Council free to consult any officials and non-officials and to form them into Committees for these and any other purposes now? How would the creation of a Privy Council as recommended by the Montford scheme help matters better? And why should such consultation be limited to certain selected gentlemen, who for life would be the custodians, as it were, of the confidence of the Governor General? That would be graver danger to the purity of public life than apprehensions regarding the personnel. If there was a clear case for it, I have not the least doubt that the Assembly would support this proposal and it might well support it, particularly because of the possibility of exercising self-denying ordinance such as is indicated in this paragraph of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. If Honourable Members will look at the paragraph, they will see that Members of the Indian Legislative Assembly are not within the purview of this appointment. The paragraph says :

'Officials and non-officials, both from British India and the Native States, would be eligible; but it would be necessary to confine appointment to those who had won real distinction, or had held or were holding the highest offices, such as Members of the Governments, Ruling Princes, Members of the Council of State and High Court Judges.'

Members of the Legislative Assembly have no place there, and well might they press for appointment in the Privy Council, for they would not and could not be appointed. My Honourable friend would, however, invite himself there if he had his way, though he is not now on the list. That is not the sort of thing that the Assembly is going to lend itself to.

Sir, one reason why this provision was put in was probably because the authors of the scheme wanted to appeal to the imagination of the people, and it is right and proper that the imagination of the people should be appealed to in a proper, effective and becoming fashion. I am afraid we have suffered

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

too much from legislation by analogy. In England they have two Houses. Whether they are really wanted or can do any good or not, we have them here. A variety of other things have come in on British analogy that would have no salutary effect here. On the other hand, the effect may, in some cases, as here, be of a prejudicial character. Introduction of the idea of a Privy Council, also by analogy without any substance to support it, would be another danger to public life, and it is striking that the idea should be now persisted in. Reference has been made to Dr. Gour making himself responsible for this not very democratic Resolution. There is almost an irony of fate about it. Nemesis has been at work. Only last night some of us were startled by a flaming press communiqué on behalf of the Democratic Party regarding a dozen Members who habitually support the Government, as if the Government must not be supported even when it ought to be; and now, before we are twenty-four hours older, a prominent member of that Party brings forward a Resolution which can certainly not claim to be democratic!

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: May I offer an explanation on one point? Reference was made by the last speaker to a question asked by Mr. Samarth—it was a supplementary question—during the last Session. I think that was the reference?

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: No, Dr. Gour's question.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Mr. Samarth's was a supplementary question to Dr. Gour's. I stated then that as the Privy Council was not referred to in the Government of India Act of 1919, I concluded that the Joint Committee had not accepted the idea of constituting such a body. I now want to explain to the Assembly—I should have done it before that I have since ascertained from the India Office that, so far as the Secretary of State's recollection goes, this question was not considered at all by the Joint Committee.

Khan Bahadur Maulvi Amjad Ali (Assam: Muhammadan): Sir, while opposing this Resolution on some technical grounds I may be permitted to make certain remarks about the speech of my learned friend sitting there, whose remarks have proved to my mind most distressful. Sir, this Resolution was entrusted to Dr. Gour, who in giving his reasons read out to us passages from the Montagu-Chelmsford Report in support of the establishment of a Privy Council, and he then asked the House to accept his Resolution for a Privy Council, not as recommended by the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, but in the way in which the matter has been placed by him. He does not approve of the lines laid down in that Report in connection with that matter. He has given his own suggestions for the acceptance of the House. I therefore submit that this Resolution as moved by my Honourable friend is not technically in order.

On that ground it must fail. Then, in opposing the Resolution I would point out that the other Honourable Member made certain observations which signified a good deal of bad taste. Everybody here is at liberty, perfect liberty to have his say, to support or oppose a Resolution or a Bill. But in my humble opinion he is not at all justified in making uncharitable remarks or descending to personalities in the fashion in which my learned friend has done to-day. The other day my Honourable

friend, Dr. Gour, similarly descended to personalities in opposing a Bill. I did not spare him then. I thought it my very pious duty to bring the matter to his notice because the uncalled for and unjustifiable remarks came from a gentleman of his position. Of course, to-day some sort of punishment has been inflicted upon him; it is a divine punishment I should say. I find that directly or indirectly some remarks which are most uncharitable have been hurled against him. Now, Sir, in this world every one is more or less a sycophant, a flatterer. To some the opportunity for offering this sycophancy presents itself; to some it does not present itself and for these the grapes are sour. Everybody is after something, after an opportunity. Everybody is more or less a title-hunter. I say more or less; yes, more or less. Now, Sir, somebody gets his title by his merit, or by his public work; and some people, incapable of doing any public work, but still very anxious to get a title, go after a high official, *sabnam* him, poke their nose into everything, as if asking the official to ask them, 'Well, who are you? What do you want?' 'Salaam, Sahib, I have done this; I have done that for you.' Sahib says: 'Very good; well, you may go now. I know you.' In this way I find those people are hunting for titles, hunting for things to serve their own purposes. Those who get them are all right and become friends of the Government; those who do not get anything after some attempts turn hostile. (Laughter.) What they do generally is to try to form some Committee, giving it a name, that is, 'Democratic Committee,' or this Committee or that, to bring the Government officials to their knees, so that they may get that influence for which they have been longing.

We are demanding Swaraj, but we have not learnt as yet how to respect the feelings of our brethren (Hear, hear.) Up till now education has not dispelled darkness from this country, and, though we are brothers, we are still calling each other names. By this we lose a good deal; it creates bad blood and ill-feeling instead of feelings of brotherhood. I submit to this Honourable House that such a thing should not occur in future, as far as possible, and we should not descend to personalities. I oppose the Resolution.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, it has been a very refreshing debate, because while my friend, Mr. Chaudhuri, has frankly confessed that the Resolution has been sprung upon him by surprise and, therefore, he was constrained to betray his ignorance, there are other Members less outspoken than himself, and they have betrayed their supreme ignorance of the subject without confessing the fact which Mr. Chaudhuri has frankly admitted. If they had only turned to their Legislative Manual and to the history of the Privy Council and if they had adverted to the remarks which I made at the opening of this Resolution, I am perfectly certain that they would have been heart and soul with me instead of being in opposition to me. The Honourable Mr. Rangachariar, — or to give him his proper designation, the Honourable Rao Bahadur Rangachariar, without casting upon him, Sir, any sinister imputation by reason of his being a title-holder of the character mentioned by my friend, Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas, who is himself a title-bearer, — seems to oppose this Resolution on the ground that, if a Privy Council is established in this country, it must be literally and entirely on the lines adumbrated in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. I think I have made it abundantly clear that, if any Privy Council is to be established upon those lines, I should emphatically and stoutly resist it.

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

(Hear, hear.) When I took upon myself, Sir, the foster fatherhood of this Resolution, I did it in the belief, and I still hold it, that the Resolution merely drew the attention of the Government to the desirability of constituting an Advisory Chamber, a Chamber in the nature of a non-official Cabinet, which might be used on occasions of great national importance and emergency for the purpose of advising the Viceroy against embarking upon policies which the best judgment of the nation may after mature consideration condemn. Having stated this much, I fail to see what reason there could be in the minds of any Member of this House, be he an autocrat or a democrat. (*Mr. N. M. Samarth* : 'Or a hypocrite').—whoever he may be against the constitution of a Privy Council. I can well understand a natural, apprehension in the minds of certain Members of this House that if a rival body like the Privy Council is brought into existence, their own power may be curtailed. But they seem entirely to forget that on matters of foreign policy, on matters in which the Viceroy has authority and over which this House has no control, upon those matters the Privy Council could give an assistance which at present is denied

Mr. S. C. Shahani (Sind Jagirdars and Zamindars : Landholders) : By means of nomination ?

Dr. H. S. Gour : My friend ejaculates 'by means of nomination'. You have entirely misunderstood, Sir, that the question as to the nature and method of its constitution are matters of procedure and detail. (Hear, hear.) They cannot in any way destroy the utility, the beneficence, of the principle of a Privy Council, which, I submit, is necessary, if only for the purpose of curbing autocratic power over which this Assembly has got no control. Can any Member of this House deny that such a body, if brought into existence, would be an asset of national value ? And yet we are told that it is not likely that such a body would possess the independence, and some suspect even the integrity, to advise in the best interest of the nation. What I think is looming large in the minds of Honourable Members are the details which the Montagu-Chelmsford Report unnecessarily placed in the forefront of their scheme. (*A Voice* : 'Elective principle'.) If my friends desire that the Privy Council should be constituted upon an elective basis, there is nothing in law to prevent them from urging it. But when my friends say : 'We do not want this Privy Council. It is a body suspect. It is a body which will consist of glorified nonentities and title-hunters and sycophants,' then I join issue with them, and I say that if a Privy Council of that character is to be constituted, I have not the slightest doubt that, instead of doing good, it will do incalculable mischief. But I think Members of this House are aware of the fact that when I opened my speech, I made it abundantly clear that the Privy Council that I commend for the favourable attention of this House is not the Privy Council defined and delineated in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. What I want, and what I wanted, is a Privy Council, the functions of which might be defined and limited, and the character of which might be laid down by this House. I did not go into those details for the very obvious reason that, when once the principle is accepted by this House, it would be open for a Committee of this House to recommend on the two points, namely, on the question of functions and that of its constitution. Well, Sir, I do not think I can bring all these facts into the baldly worded Resolution which I have moved. I am glad that this discussion has enlivened my friends' attention, and that hereafter they will come better prepared to tackle this

question of the Privy Council, and in this view, Sir, I beg leave to withdraw this Resolution.

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

READING OF NEWSPAPERS IN THE CHAMBER.

Mr. President: I have observed both to-day and on previous days that the habit of reading newspapers in the House has grown amongst certain Members. It is an improper habit, because this is not the place for reading newspapers. There are other places provided for that purpose. (Hear, hear.)

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 6th March, 1922.

* This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to take early steps to establish a Privy Council in India as recommended in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.