

3rd February, 1922

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

SECOND SESSION

OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1922



SIMLA
SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT CENTRAL PRESS
1922

CONTENTS.

	Page
TUESDAY, 10TH JANUARY, 1922	1333-1487
New Year's Greetings.	
Oath.	
Statements laid on the Table.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Address of Welcome to H. B. H. the Prince of Wales.	
Statement of Government Business.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : the Abandonment of the Policy of Repression.	
Congratulation of Honours.	
Panel of Chairman.	
Committee on the Functions of the Deputy President.	
Ruling on Standing Order No. 38.	
Notice of Motion under Rule 11.	
Motion for Adjournment.	
The Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Factories (Amendment) Bill.	
WEDNESDAY, 11TH JANUARY, 1922	1489-1512
Statements laid on the Table.	
Amendment of Standing Orders.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Policy of Repression.	
THURSDAY, 12TH JANUARY, 1922	1513-1560
Oath.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indigenous Systems of Medicine.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indian Mercantile Marine.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Prevention of Overcrowding in Railways.	
MONDAY, 16TH JANUARY, 1922	1561-1612
Oaths.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Statement laid on the Table.	
Address of Welcome to H. R. H. the Prince of Wales.	
Select Committee on Standing Orders.	
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Delhi University Bill.	
Vol. II—Pt. II.	

TUESDAY, 17TH JANUARY, 1922 1613-1656

Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Select Committee on Standing Orders.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.
 Message from the Council of State.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.
 The Mussalman Waqfs Registration Bill.
 The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Interest Act 1839 Amendment Bill.

WEDNESDAY, 18TH JANUARY, 1922 1657-1736

Oaths.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.
 The Indian Emigration Bill.
 The Indian Income-tax Bill.
 Resolution *re* : abandonment of the Policy of Repression.

THURSDAY, 19TH JANUARY, 1922 1737-1789

Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Ballot for Bills.
 Statement of Government Business.
 Resolution *re* : Committee on certain sections of the I. P. C. and C. P. C.
 Resolution *re* : Elected Standing Committees with the Government of India.

FRIDAY, 20TH JANUARY, 1922 1791-1813

Governor General's Assent to Bills passed by the Legislature.
 The Civil Marriage (Amendment) Bill.

TUESDAY, 24TH JANUARY, 1922 1815-1889

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Messages from the Council of State.
 Resolution *re* : Committees on Currency and Exchange.
 Resolution *re* : the abolition of Impressed Labour, Conveyance and Provision.

WEDNESDAY, 25TH JANUARY, 1922 1891-1941

Statement laid on the Table.
 The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Delhi University Bill.
 The Indian Income-tax Bill.

THURSDAY, 23TH JANUARY, 1922

Situation in Guntur.
Statement laid on the Table.
Questions and Answers.
Situation in Guntur.
Statement of Government Business.
Governor General's Assent to Bills passed by the Legislature.
Resolution *re* : Votable and Non-votable items in the Budget.
Resolution *re* : Export of Manures and Oil Seeds.
Message from the Council of State.

SATURDAY, 28TH JANUARY, 1922 1991-2050

The Delhi University Bill.
The Indian Income-tax Bill.
Amendment of Standing Orders.
The Police (Incitement to Disaffection) Bill.
The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
The Indian Emigration Bill.

TUESDAY, 31ST JANUARY, 1922 2051-2073

Questions and Answers.
Unstarred Questions and Answers.
Arrangement of Government Business.
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
The Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill.
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill.

WEDNESDAY, 1ST FEBRUARY, 1922 2075-2102

Bills passed by the Council of State.
The Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill.
Resolution *re* : Women's Franchise.

FRIDAY, 3RD FEBRUARY, 1922 2103-2151

Questions and Answers.
Statement of Business.
Resolution *re* : Examination of the Indian Penal Code.
Resolution *re* : Reduction of Madras Contribution to Central Government.
Resolutions withdrawn.
Resolution *re* : Separation of the Andhra Districts from the Madras Presidency.
Resolution *re* : Committee of Inquiry on Expulsion from Cantonments.
Presentation of Report of Select Committee on Standing Orders.
Resolution *re* : Committee on Retrenchment.

	PAGE
MONDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2153-2220
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Motion for Adjournment.	
The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.	
The Indian Emigration Bill.	
TUESDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2221-2243
The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children.	
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
Discussions in Select Committee.	
WEDNESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2245-2282
Presentation Ceremony and Royal Durbar.	
The Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Committee on New Arms Rules, 1920.	
Disturbances in the United Provinces.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Withdrawal of Martial Law in Malabar.	
Disturbances in the United Provinces.	
THURSDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2283-2312
Oath.	
Question and Answer.	
Unstarred Question and Answer.	
Statement of Business.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Improvement of Medical Education in India.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Equality of Status for Indians in Africa.	
SATURDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2343-2355
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Governor General's Assent to the Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.	
Resolution <i>re</i> : Indianisation of the Services.	
MONDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1922	2393-2428
Oath.	
Questions and Answers.	
Unstarred Questions and Answers.	
Motions for Adjournment.	
The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.	
The Delhi University Bill.	
The Special Laws Repeal Bill.	
The Indian Criminal Law Amendment Repealing Bill.	
Amendment of Standing Orders.	
Time for Balloting.	

WEDNESDAY, 22ND FEBRUARY, 1922 2499-2498

Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Message from the Secretary of State.
 The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.
 The Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
 The Delhi University Bill.

THURSDAY, 23RD FEBRUARY, 1922 2499-2558

Questions and Answers.
 Government Policy in regard to Non-co-operation Movement.
 Governor General's Assent to Bills.
 Statement of Legislative Business.
 Resolution *re*: Technical Training of Indian and Anglo-Indian
 Youths.
 Resolution *re*: E. and P. Service and Military Officers in Judicial or
 Administrative Posts.
 Messages from the Council of State.

MONDAY, 27TH FEBRUARY, 1922 2559-2615

Statements laid on the Table.
 Questions and Answers.
 Unstarred Questions and Answers.
 Amendment of Standing Order.
 The Indian Income-tax Bill.
 The Indian Ports (Amendment) Bill.
 Resolution *re*: India's participation in the British Empire Exhibi-
 tion.
 Resolution *re*: Prohibition of Traffic in Mipor Girls.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 3rd February, 1922.

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

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

DISABILITIES OF INDIANS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

133. * M. K. Reddi Garu : Will the Government be pleased to state :

- (1) Is it a fact that throughout a large part of South Africa under the Union, Indians are not permitted to exercise the political or municipal vote or to sit as members of the Legislatures or municipalities ?

If the answer is in the negative, are there any existing Indian members of the Legislatures or municipalities outside Cape Colony ?

- (2) Is it a fact that throughout a large part of the Union, Indians are :

(i) socially ostracised and subjected to personal indignities, and

(ii) prohibited from :

(a) entering public or semi-public places, such as hotels, refreshment rooms, places of amusement, etc. ?

(b) buying property or trading in the same way and to the same extent as Europeans ?

(c) moving freely between different provinces, and

(d) travelling in the same Railway compartment as Europeans or occupying the same seats in public conveyances ?

- (3) Are the Government of India aware of all these disabilities for a long time past ? Have they protested against them ? If so, from what date ?

- (4) Are the Government of India aware that the disabilities referred to in (1) and (2) create and have created great indignation in India ?

- (5) What steps do the Government of India propose to take in the immediate future for the removal of the above disabilities ?

Mr. J. Hullah : (1) Yes. Indians possess both the parliamentary and municipal franchise in the Cape Colony. and in Natal only the latter. In the Transvaal and Orange Free State, they possess neither. The Government of India have no information regarding the number of Indian members, if any, of municipalities in Natal. In one case, where the Asiatics were in a majority and could have elected an Indian Board, they refrained from doing so and no Indian was elected to the Board.

- (2) The facts are generally as stated by the Honourable Member.

(3) The Government of India have long been aware of the disabilities under which Indians labour in the Union. For a history of the Asiatic question and the action taken from time to time by the British Government and the Government of India in the interests of Indians, the Honourable Member is referred to Part I of Sir Benjamin Robertson's Statement before the Asiatic Inquiry Commission and to paragraphs 12 to 91 and 142 to 151 of the Asiatic Inquiry Commission's Report. Since 1900, the Government of India have constantly done their best to secure the removal of these disabilities by correspondence and negotiation, by sending deputations to South Africa, and by laying their case before the Imperial Conferences.

(4) Yes.

(5) The Government of India have recently addressed the Government of the Union of South Africa direct regarding the recommendations of the Asiatic Inquiry Commission. They do not know on what lines the Union Government propose to deal with the recommendations of that Commission. When the draft Bill, for which they have asked, reaches the Government of India, they will consider afresh what further steps, if any, the situation requires.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CALCUTTA HIGH COURT.

134. * Mr. S. C. Ghose : (1) Will the Government be pleased to state what was the number of Judges in the Sudder Dewany Adalat and what were the emoluments attached to their office ?

(2) What was the number of first, second, miscellaneous and other appeals filed and disposed of the year the Sudder Dewany Adalat was replaced by the High Court ?

(3) What was the number of Judges when the High Court was first established in Bengal, and what was the emolument attached then to the office of a High Court Judge ?

(4) What was the extent of jurisdiction of (1) the Sudder Dewany Adalat, (2) of the Calcutta High Court before the establishment of the Patna High Court, and (3) of the present Calcutta High Court ?

(5) Was there any addition to the number of Judges after the first establishment of the High Court in Bengal ? If so, when and how many times ? What were the reasons for such additional appointments ?

(6) What was the number of Judges of the Calcutta High Court in 1915 when a separate High Court was established for Bihar and Orissa and how many Judges were appointed for the Patna High Court ?

(7) What was the number of appeals, first, second, miscellaneous and others, then kept in the file of the Calcutta High Court and what was the number that was transferred to the Patna High Court ?

(8) What was the number of first, second, miscellaneous and other appeals filed and disposed of each year from 1915 to 1920 ? What was the number of criminal motions moved and either admitted or rejected and of appeals and references filed and either admitted or dismissed, during the same period ?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : The collection of the information required would entail great labour and Government do not think that

the advantages secured by the collection of this information will be commensurate with the expense involved.

CORRUPTION AND DISTRESS TO PASSENGERS ON RAILWAYS.

135. * Mr. S. C. Ghose : 1. Is the Government aware that corruption prevails to a large extent among Railway employees and that no reserved accommodation could be secured, especially during the last holidays, without having resort to extraordinary methods?

2. Is the Government also aware that during festive occasions, large numbers of third class passengers have to wait for want of accommodation for days together on the road-side stations after being booked? Do the Government propose to remove or mitigate such hardships of the passengers? If so, how?

3. Is the Government also aware that in many instances tickets of passengers get lapsed when they fail to get timely into the train for unusual rush and whether they get refund of their fares?

Colonel W. D. Waghorn : 1. The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the replies given to Questions Nos 104 and 105 asked by the Honourable Sir Zulfiqar Ali Khan on this subject during the last Session of the Council of State.

2. Government are aware that passengers are put to a certain amount of inconvenience in obtaining accommodation in trains during rushes of traffic on occasions of fairs and pilgrimages, and every endeavour is made to restrict bookings to the train capacity available. The remedy is the provision of extra passenger stock on railways generally and this, the Honourable Member will realise, is necessarily a question of time and money. I would refer the Honourable Member to the opinion expressed by the Indian Railway Committee on this matter in paragraph 169 of their Report.

3. Government are not aware of any instances in which passengers' tickets have 'lapsed'. The rules in force on railways provide for the refund of fares paid on tickets which are returned owing to the passengers concerned not having been able to commence their journey, due to want of room in the train or any other cause.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : Sir, I should like to make a short statement of the business that will come before the Assembly next week.

On the 6th February, the following Bills will probably be taken into consideration, and, if the Assembly accepts them, will be passed :

1. A Bill further to amend the Provincial Small Cause Courts Act, 1887 and the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, in order to provide for the award of costs by way of damages in respect of false and vexatious claims or defences in civil suits and proceedings.

[Sir William Vincent.]

2. A Bill to amend the Benares Hindu University Act, 1915, which was passed by the Council of State and laid on the table on the 24th January.

3. A Bill to amend the law relating to emigration.

On the same day, a Resolution on the suppression of traffic in women and children will be moved.

On Wednesday, the 8th February, the Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill will probably be taken into consideration, and, if the Assembly approves of it, will be passed. The Government also propose on this day to allow time for the discussion of a Resolution of which notice has been received from Baba Ujagar Singh Bedi suggesting an examination by a Committee of the Indian Arms Rules, 1920. I may say, that I have received a request, signed by many Members of this Assembly, asking me to allot a special day for the discussion of this Resolution.

It is probable, but it has not been definitely decided, that we may allot the 11th, Saturday, for the discussion of Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas's Resolution on the recruitment of the Imperial Services. This Resolution has been pending from last Session. This date has been provisionally fixed, provisionally I say, again, in consultation with Mr. Jamnadas, who, as Members are aware, is away on business connected with the Fiscal Commission.

RESOLUTION *RE*: EXAMINATION OF THE INDIAN PENAL CODE.

(Mr. P. P. Ginwala being absent when called, his Resolution

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council the appointment of a Committee to examine and report on the Indian Penal Code, with a view to bring its provisions, where necessary, into conformity with modern conditions' was declared withdrawn.)

RESOLUTION *RE*: REDUCTION OF MADRAS CONTRIBUTION TO CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. President: The Resolution :

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the contributions of 348 lakhs payable to the Government of India by the Government of Madras, under rules 17 and 18 of the Devolution Rules, framed under section 54-A of the Government of India Act, be reduced to one crore of rupees'

standing in the name of Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar on the List of Business for to-day cannot, under the provisions of the Standing Orders, be moved, because this Assembly has already given a decision on an amendment of a similar character moved to the Resolution of the Finance Member on the 30th September last in Simla.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City : Non-Muhammadian Urban) : May I draw your attention to Standing Order 70 (1) under which, I think, this ruling has been given ? It says :

'When a Resolution has been moved, no Resolution or amendment raising substantially the same question shall be moved within one year'.

I do not know if you consider that an obstacle to this Resolution. So far as I can see, that cannot apply to the present Resolution. The Standing Order says only 'When a Resolution has been moved', and so on. No Resolution was moved in Simla; it was only an amendment to a Resolution and, therefore, this Standing Order would not apply.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member has forgotten that Standing Order 31 says :

'That a *motion* must not raise a question substantially identical with one on which the Assembly has given a decision in the same Session.'

Now, the Assembly actually negatived an amendment to extend to Madras the same or a similar treatment as the Honourable Finance Member, with the concurrence of the Assembly, extended to Bengal in September. It is under Standing Order 31 that his colleague from Madras will not be able to move this motion.

Mr. Sambanda Mudaliar (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : I would also, with your permission, respectfully invite your attention, Sir, to the statement made by the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey, in the course of the discussion on a similar Resolution moved by him in the Simla Session, when he said :

'Other Members, not neglectful of the claims of their own provinces, have risen in their places and assured us that, should their provinces at any time be faced with difficulties such as those under which Bengal now labours, they will demand an equal concession for their own provinces.'

That is a sort of assurance given to us and it is on the strength of that assurance that I have ventured to bring forward this Resolution and I shall be nonplussed if it is rejected. In the circumstances, I would respectfully ask that I may be permitted to move my Resolution.

Mr. J. F. Bryant (Madras : Nominated Official) : I would like to point out that when the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey moved his Resolution at the last Simla Session of this Assembly, I received an express assurance from Mr. Sim, speaking, I believe, on behalf of the Honourable the Finance Minister, that the Resolution in favour of Bengal would not prejudice any claim that might subsequently be put forward on behalf of Madras.

Mr. President : The Honourable Member is taking the point on its merits. I have nothing to do with the merits of the question. Standing Order 31 is perfectly clear and definitely bars the Honourable Member behind him from moving the Resolution Standing in his name.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : As regards Standing Order 31, may I point out that the present motion is not substantially identical with the one on which the Assembly came to a decision in Simla. The present question before the Assembly is a definite recommendation that the provincial contribution of Madras be reduced to one crore, whereas that was an indefinite recommendation by Mr. Venkatapatiraju that, should circumstances arise, suitable help or similar concession be given to Madras and other provinces, where financial difficulties exist. I do not know whether you consider that the present question is the same or substantially the same. Here is a definite figure put forward indicating the amount to be reduced.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Finance Member) : With reference to what the Honourable Mover of this Resolution and Mr. Bryant have said, it is perfectly true that, during the Simla Session, when we discussed the case of Bengal, I said, on behalf of Government, that there would naturally be nothing to prevent other provinces bringing their case before the Assembly and it is perfectly true that we contemplated at the time, in fact we knew at the time, that other provinces were likely to represent their case before the Assembly. The interpretation of the rules, however, is not a question for Government but for the Chair. All I wish to assure the House, if I may say so, is, it did not occur to me in September last, when I gave that assurance, that the rejection of Mr. Raju's amendment might have this particular effect and indeed it was not until yesterday evening that I heard, and then unofficially, that it was not likely that this Resolution would be admitted.

Mr. N. M. Samarth (Bombay : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I think there is nothing to prevent a similar motion being brought up at the Simla Session and I really do not know what urgency there is to bring it now, in spite of the ruling which you have just given.

Mr. President : The suggestion made by the Honourable Member from Bombay may be considered by the Honourable Member from Madras on my left. Even though the Honourable the Finance Member is willing to allow the debate to proceed to-day, it would be a very bad precedent indeed if I were to break this rule and thereby show my sympathy with Madras.

RESOLUTIONS WITHDRAWN.

(Maung Maung Sin, Mr. K. Ahmed and Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan, whose Resolutions* were next on the List of Business, being absent, the President declared their Resolutions withdrawn.)

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : May I enter, on behalf of Government Officers, some protest against the manner in which they have been treated in regard to these Resolutions ? I also ask you, Sir, if you can, to afford us some protection. We received notice of a number of Resolutions, which have taken a great deal of time to prepare. There is one Resolution in particular over which officers in the Home Department have spent many hours of labour. We received notice at the last minute, last

(1) Maung Maung Sin to move the following Resolution :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to take early steps to make an inquiry by appointment of a Commission or otherwise to examine the question of the separation of Burma from the rest of the Indian Empire with a view to collection of information and opinion and in order to determine how the question would affect the Indian Empire as a whole and Burma separately.'

(2) Mr. K. Ahmed to move the following Resolution :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to move His Excellency the Viceroy of India to set Ali Brothers and others at liberty in exercise of the Royal prerogative at an early date.'

(3) Mr. Muhammad Yamin Khan to move the following Resolution :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps at once to stop export of wheat and wheat flour except for the consumption of Indian Hajis in Hedjaz for a period of at least three years.'

evening only, that the Honourable Member was not going to attend to-day. I ask, whether it is possible to secure, by any means, that Members of Government, who are much over-worked at the present time, should receive more consideration from Members of this Assembly.

Mr. President: The House will, I think, respond in a sympathetic spirit to the appeal of the Honourable the Home Member. It is not in the power of the Chair to compel the attendance of non-official Members in this House. The circumstances of to-day are peculiarly unfortunate, but, I may say, that the Standing Orders Committee hopes to provide some little amelioration of the situation by making certain proposals which will be brought forward for consideration at an early date. Honourable Members are aware that the Chair has no power to compel a Member to attend and move his Resolution, if he chooses to absent himself, but I may repeat that, I hope, Honourable Members will do their utmost to meet the convenience of Government, which is, after all, their own convenience as well, in the manner suggested by the Home Member.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I wish also to associate myself with the remarks made by the Home Member. At the same time, Sir, may I point out that the Resolution of Mr. Mudaliar* was expected to take a long time, and, if we had known that there was going to be this technical objection, there might have been a better attendance.

Mr. President: Honourable Members will, perhaps, be grateful to the Honourable Member from Madras for his kindness in trying to soften the just rebuke which the Honourable the Home Member has delivered.

RESOLUTION *RE*: SEPARATION OF THE ANDHRA DISTRICTS FROM THE MADRAS PRESIDENCY.

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantula (Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I beg to move the Resolution which stands in my name and which runs as follows:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that the Andhra Districts of the Madras Presidency should be constituted into a separate Province, and that he may be pleased to take early action in this respect.'

Sir, before I proceed to move the Resolution, I wish to express my regret that my Honourable friend, Mr. Sarma, is not in this House. I wish he had been in this House and sitting on this side of the House, so that he might plead the cause of his province with his well-known eloquence, and with the prestige of a hero of many battles. I must, Sir, admit my inability to plead the cause of my province with anything like the ability of my friend.

I do not think, Sir, that I will be able to do justice to the cause that I am going to place before the House. Nevertheless, I take comfort in the consideration that a good cause is not likely to suffer from bad advocacy before an Assembly of this kind. The House will remember, Sir, that, in the course of the debate on the Resolution of Mr. Latthe, proposing the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis, the Honourable the Home

[Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu.]

Member laid down two conditions which should be fulfilled before the Government could be asked to take action. These conditions are, first, that a specific case should be brought forward, and, secondly, that the Local Government and the local Legislature should take the initiative in the matter.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : I rise to a point of order. In consideration of the fact that this subject was debated on Mr. Latthe's Resolution, it strikes me that, for the same reason that you have overruled the second Resolution to-day, this should also be overruled.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member) : There has been no decision on this particular question within the last year. The general question was raised, but not the particular position of the Andhra country.

Mr. President : The amendment to the Finance Member's Resolution in Simla was definitely negatived by the House, but I am not aware that the same thing occurred in relation to the question raised by Mr. Latthe.

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu : Well, Sir, I think I am endeavouring to meet the Honourable the Home Member half-way by bringing a specific case before this House, and I think I am entitled to ask the Government to traverse the other half. This Resolution is brought forward under section 52-A of the Government of India Act, which runs as follows :

'The Governor General in Council may, after obtaining an expression of opinion from the Local Government and the local Legislature, affected by notification, with the sanction of His Majesty, previously signified by the Secretary of State in Council, constitute a new Governor's province, or place part of a Governor's province under the administration of a Deputy Governor to be appointed by the Governor General, and may in such cases apply, with such modifications as appear necessary or desirable, all or any of the provisions of this Act relating to Governors' provinces, or, provinces under a Lieutenant-Governor or Chief Commissioner, to any such new province or part of a province.'

Now, Sir, the House will please see that this section authorises the Governor General in Council to take action in the matter. It does not require the Government of India to wait till a motion is made, till a representation is made to it, by the Local Government, for the Governor General in Council may obtain an expression of opinion from the Local Government. Under the section, it is open to the Government of India, I think it is incumbent on the Government of India, to call for and obtain an opinion on the subject from the Local Government. Therefore, I say that it is not necessary that the Government of India should wait till the Local Government has made a recommendation on the subject, although I admit that it is quite open to the Local Government to make a representation first and to ask the Government of India to take action. I think, Sir, that I am in order in asking this House to pass this Resolution asking the Government of India to start an inquiry into the matter. Now, Sir, I proceed to state the reasons for which I want the Government of India to start an inquiry into the matter.

The question of an Andhra province is not one of to-day. It has been before the public in one form or another for the last ten years or more. It forms the chief items in the programme of what is known as Andhra movement which was started in 1911, about the time of the revision of the partition of Bengal and the formation of the new Province of Bihar and Orissa. At first, there was a difference of opinion among the Andhras themselves on the subject of a separate province and it is no wonder, therefore,

that some of our Tamil friends looked at it rather askance at that time. But, in the course of a very few years, the scheme recommended itself to all Andhras as well as, I believe, Tamilians. The feeling in favour of it was so strong even some years ago that the Indian National Congress (I mean the Congress under the old dispensation) recognised the Andhra country as a separate province and sanctioned a separate provincial Congress Committee for it.

The question of the redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis came up for discussion in the old Imperial Legislative Council in February, 1918, on a motion by my friend, the Honourable Mr. Sarma, then a private Member. The motion was thrown out on the double ground that it was impracticable to give effect to it in the very wide form in which it was put and that it was not advisable to prejudice the success of the coming reforms by undertaking, at the time, a general revision of the boundaries of the provinces. While speaking against the motion, the Honourable Dr. Sapru, also a private Member then, as well as the Honourable Mr. (now the Right Honourable) Srinivasa Sastri and the Honourable Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar spoke approvingly of an Andhra province being constituted. I shall refer to their speeches presently.

The subject of an Andhra province was placed prominently before the late Viceroy and the Secretary of State for India in the course of their investigation preliminary to the formation of the Reform proposals. These high authorities considered this and other similar proposals as parts of a general scheme of redistribution of the provinces on a linguistic or racial basis and favourably commented on it in paragraph 246 of their Report. The subject is provided for in section 52-A of the Government of India Act of 1919, which I have already read out to the Chamber.

I now beg the permission of the House to place before it briefly the principal considerations favouring the formation of provinces on a linguistic basis. Before doing so, however, let me point out that the formation of the existing provinces has not been logical, but is more or less arbitrary and due to historical events. The Madras Presidency is particularly so. The four Andhra coast districts, known as the Northern Sircars, which were acquired by grant from the Emperor of Delhi in 1765, formed the original nucleus of this province. In 1792, some more territory was acquired in consequence of the Mysore Wars, and still more, in 1799, owing to the abdication of the Raja of Tanjore. In 1800, the Nizam of Hyderabad ceded the Telugu districts since known as the ceded districts. The last and by no means the least acquisition of territory by the British in Southern India was that of the territory of the Nawab of the Carnatic who retired on pension in favour of the British Government in 1801. As each accretion came in, it was tacked on to the corpus of the territory already existing, and thus it is that the Presidency which started with four districts now comprises 24. The chief function of the Government in those days was the collection of revenue and the problem that appears to have presented itself to the officers of the East Indian Company was how to do this with the minimum cost. They had no problems to solve arising out of an elaborate system of administration such as we have now, nor could they have seen any need to provide for the political development of the people.

As for the reasons, which should weigh with the Government in considering the desirability or otherwise of a redistribution of provinces on a linguistic or racial basis, I cannot do better than refer the House to paragraph 246 of the Montford Report on Constitutional Reforms.

[Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu.]

The following propositions emerge out of that paragraph, *viz.* :

1. Some of the existing administrative areas are of an artificial and inconvenient character due to historical reasons.
2. Administration would be simplified if the administrative units were made smaller and more homogeneous.
3. The need for simplification of administration becomes all the greater as the administration is transferred to the elected Legislative Councils with little experience in that direction.
4. If provinces are constituted on a linguistic or racial basis, that would make it possible for the business of legislation being conducted in the vernacular and would thereby enable men unacquainted with English to enter the arena of public life.
5. Redistribution of provinces should not be imposed on the people but should be undertaken in response to the popular demand.

Let us see how far these considerations apply to the present case. We have already seen how history has contributed to the formation of the present Madras Presidency. That its constitution is artificial is clear from the fact that it comprises no less than five language areas—Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam, Canarese and Oriya—inhabited by five distinct communities, each having its own peculiar problems, administrative, social, educational and political, to solve. It goes without saying that a province so heterogeneous in composition cannot be a very convenient unit of administration. I have taken pains to analyse the work done in the Madras Legislative Council during the second Session comprising the first six days of August last. It comes to an average of 205 questions (including sub-questions), 9·5 Resolutions and 3·5 Bills per day. Look at the amount of work and time which the answering of so many questions entails. The work is bound to increase as time goes on. Before long, the elective franchise will have to be extended and, along with the extension of the franchise, there is bound to be an enhancement of the number of the Members of the Council. Even now, the general electorates, comprising whole districts, are heavy, and, with the extension of franchise, they will become unworkable. It will, therefore, be necessary to reduce the size of the electorates, thereby increasing the size of the Councils. Enlargements of Councils means enhancement of the work of the administrative officers, which is already heavy. It will, therefore, become necessary, before long, to reduce the size of the Madras Presidency, and what more convenient and practicable method is there of doing this than by taking away the Andhra district from it and constituting them into a separate province? This would be the best method of meeting the situation, considering also the probable constitution of the enlarged Provincial Council. For the enlarged Councils are very likely to contain many Members not acquainted with English. It will be inconsistent with the democratic character, which it is the policy of the Reform scheme to impart to these Councils, to insist on the Members speaking in English. The Montford Report expressly contemplates the business of the Council being conducted in the vernacular. What chance has a Member, speaking, say in Telugu, of making himself understood in a mixed assemblage consisting of Andhras, Tamilians, Malayalees, Canarese and Oriyas, not to speak of Englishmen? When the necessity for the formation of a new province or sub-province on administrative grounds

is recognised, reason suggests that the new province or sub-province should be homogeneous, as far as practicable, for it is only in a homogeneous province that the people take genuine interest and pride in the administration of their province and try to make it a success. The need for stimulating and encouraging popular interest in the administration becomes greater and greater as the sphere of responsible Government in the provinces becomes wider and wider. Unless such a province is homogeneous, the success of administration is endangered by mutual jealousies and mistrust among the people inhabiting it.

Nothing contributes to the homogeneity of a people more—for nothing binds people together better—than a common language. A common language not only serves as a common vehicle for the expression of the ideas of the people, but it also preserves their common literature and common traditions and the memories of their common heroes. Speaking about Shakespeare, Carlyle says that if you ask any Englishman : ‘ Would you have the Indian Empire or Shakespeare ?’, he would unhesitatingly reply : ‘ Indian Empire or no Indian Empire, we cannot do without Shakespeare.’ The Telegu man’s love of his literature is akin to this.

In the now famous despatch of the Government of India, dated 25th August, 1911, there is a passage which gives reasons for proposing the formation of the new province of Bihar and Orissa.

The following is a quotation from that passage :

‘ These people (the Biharis) have hitherto been unequally yoked with Bengalis and have never, therefore, had a fair opportunity for development. The cry of ‘ Bihar for the Biharis ’ has frequently been raised in connection with the conferment of appointments and excessive numbers of offices in Bihar having been held by the Bengalis’

There has, moreover, been a very marked awakening in Bihar in recent years and a strong belief has grown up among Biharis that Bihar will never develop until it is dissociated from Bengal. That belief will, unless a remedy be found, give rise to agitation in the near future and the present is an admirable opportunity to carry out, on our initiative, a thoroughly sound and much desired change.

I must say, Sir, that there has been a feeling akin to this among the bulk of the Andhras. It must be admitted, however, that there is less ground now for this feeling than a year ago, for all the three Ministers in Madras are Andhras and there are two Andhra gentlemen on the Madras High Court Bench. My country has also contributed a Minister to the United Provinces and a Member to the Executive Council of His Excellency the Governor General. Nevertheless, I should not be justified in saying that the feeling has ceased to exist. But I may claim for an Andhra Province less on this ground than on the administrative and political grounds already referred to. Taking one administrative department alone, let me quote figures showing the progress so far made by the Presidency as a whole and by the Andhra country separately, in the matter of education which will, I trust, show that there is much scope for the development of education in the Andhra districts.

	Whole Presidency.	Andhras.
1. Total number of boys in colleges . . .	3,732	500
2. Total number in secondary schools . . .	1,06,231	28,590
3. Total number in elementary schools . . .	10,000,447	280,142
4. Number of girls in secondary schools . . .	4,315	327
5. Number of girls in elementary schools . . .	85,574	27,056

[Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu.]

These figures were compiled in 1912. I have not been able to secure the latest figures, but I believe that the proportion between the two sets of figures is nearly the same now as in 1912 and, in order to perceive the full significance of these figures, it is necessary to bear in mind that the population of the Andhra districts is nearly equal to that of the Tamil districts.

I have thus far tried to show, and I hope, not without success, that the formation of a separate Andhra province is highly desirable, both in the interests of good administration and also to satisfy the legitimate demands of the Andhras for opportunities for full self-development. It remains for me to show that the Andhra country is compact and sufficiently large and important to be constituted into a province. That it is compact will be evident to anyone who glances at the map of the Madras Presidency. It extends along the east coast from Ganjam almost to Madras and is exclusively Telugu.

The extent of the Madras Presidency is 1,42,330 square miles, which is larger than that of any other province in India except Burma. Of this, the Telugu country alone occupies 83,410 square miles, *i.e.*, more than half the total area of the province and it also exceeds the area of the Assam and Bihar provinces and also that of the Hyderabad State.

The population of the Madras Presidency, according to the Census of 1911, is 4,14,05,404 which is less than the population of Bengal and of the United Provinces, but exceeds that of any other province. Of this, 1,57,35,835 are Andhras and 1,66,92,417 Tamilians, the rest being Malayalis, Canarese, etc. Thus, the population of the Andhra Province will exceed that of Assam (67,13,635), Burma (1,21,15,217), Central Provinces (1,39,16,308) and also of the Hyderabad State (1,33,74,676) and will not be very much below the population of the Bombay Presidency (1,96,72,642) and of the Punjab (1,99,74,956).

As regards revenue, the latest figures available are those contained in the Budget Estimate for 1921-22. According to this, the revenue of the Madras Presidency is Rs. 16,70,89,000. I am not in a position to apportion this correctly among the several districts in the Presidency but, considering the area and population, the share of the Andhra districts may, I think, be put down at half the total of the Presidency, or Rs. 8,35,45,000. This exceeds the revenue in 1920-21 of Assam (1,93,62,000), Central Provinces (3,40,16,000), Bihar and Orissa (3,82,61,000), Burma (7,31,39,000) (excluding rice profits) and the Punjab (6,80,18,000).

I hope, Sir, that the figures I have given will show to this Assembly and also to the Government that the Andhra province, if formed, can stand on its own legs financially as well as otherwise.

I shall now take the liberty to refer to a few opinions of eminent men on this question of the Andhra province. I might well begin with the Honourable Mr. Sarma. You might say that, being an Andhra himself, he must be for it and his Resolution dated 6th February, 1918 in the old Imperial Legislative Council certainly shows he is for it. But I can tell you that he took time to arrive at that conclusion, for, as President of the 1st Andhra Conference in 1913, he advised that the question of an Andhra province should, for the time being, be left as a moot question. If he has since come to a decision on the point, it must be for very good reasons. I would next refer to the opinion of

the Honourable Dr. Sapru. Speaking on Mr. Sarma's Resolution in 1918, he said :

'I was wondering, as to myself, as to what was the centre of gravity of the Honourable Mr. Sarma's argument, and then, at the end, I discovered that it was really a desire to separate his part of the Madras province from the rest of the Presidency and to constitute it into a separate province by itself. If that was the real object of the Honourable Mr. Sarma's Resolution, I can assure him that he would have had my sympathies in an unstinted measure, but my grievance against him is that he has dragged us along with him in a very comprehensive survey from China to Peru. I was not prepared for such an academic debate on a question affecting only a small part of India'.

Later on he says :

'If it (the Resolution) really does concern his part of the Presidency, let him bring up a concrete case before us and then we shall be better able to judge of that case on its merits. If he were to ask my candid opinion about Andhra, I would say that, while I was prepared to sympathise with him in his aspirations, I would like to have more material before me before he could expect me to vote, though, so far as sympathy was concerned, he could have plenty of it from me.'

Now that I have brought a concrete case before this Assembly and also supported it by facts and figures, may I not count—not merely on the Honourable Member's sympathy, which has been already vouchsafed, but also on his active support.

Speaking on the same occasion, the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri said :

'I am perfectly willing to grant that, in the case of the Andhra country there are circumstances which place it on a different footing and it might ultimately be advantageous to constitute it into a separate province. But the Honourable Mr. Sarma has not confined his Resolution to the Andhra province: he has travelled over a wider area and asked for the reconstitution of the whole country.'

The Honourable Mr. Rangaswami Aiyangar is even more emphatic in his support for the scheme of an Andhra province. I refrain from reading these remarks for fear of exceeding the limits of my time.

Speaking on Mr. Latthe's Resolution in September last year, with reference to the question of an Andhra province, the Honourable the Home Member said :

'A great deal has, from time to time, been said of the creation of an Andhra province. One of my Honourable colleagues at one time was very keen on this. I am not sure whether it was my unhappy duty on that occasion to oppose his proposal, but I am quite clear that, at any rate, on this occasion it is his to support me. Well, there is a great deal to be said for an Andhra province and (speaking without prejudice) the Honourable Member has converted me to some extent to his views. Indeed, I do not doubt at some time in the future some redistribution of territory will be necessary or some change in the arrangements'.

Having thus accorded his general support to the scheme, the Honourable gentleman proceeded to point out certain difficulties in the way of giving effect to it, such as finances and the location of the capital of the new province. These are certainly problems that should be considered and solved before the scheme is given effect to, but they ought not to scare us away or prevent an inquiry being made. How can these matters be gone into unless an inquiry is made? And I do not see why these matters should prove more formidable in the case of an Andhra province than in the case of Bihar and Orissa. I do not mean to ask Government forthwith to carve out the new province, but I should be satisfied if they will start an inquiry,

[Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu.]

of course by first making a reference to the Local Government and Legislature. If they start such an inquiry with a view to ascertaining how far the formation of an Andhra province is feasible, I shall be satisfied. I, therefore, ask this Honourable House to support me in that and to pass this Resolution.

Mr. J. F. Bryant (Madras : Nominated Official) : Sir, I think it is a most extraordinary fact that a Resolution of this character should have been moved in a House of this standing, unreinforced as it is, by any Resolution from the local Madras Council. It is not as if the Andhra province was unrepresented in the local Madras Council. The Andhra province is in a majority in that Council; the Ministers are, I believe, all Andhras. Two Andhra judges of the High Court have been appointed. We see the Andhra influence not only in Madras but all over India. We see it in this House; we see it even in the United Provinces, where one of the Ministers has the honour of being an Andhra. It is true, Sir, that there was some dissatisfaction in old times; it is true that the Andhras thought they were not given a proper share of the emoluments of office. That feeling, Sir, with the recent redistribution of seats, has entirely passed away. I might say that at the present moment, instead of Andhra being an adjunct of the Tamil country of Madras, the Tamil country of Madras is rather an adjunct of the Andhra province. (Hear, hear.)

Now, Sir, a great objection to this proposal at the present moment is its cost. I would be perfectly prepared at some future time, when our finances permit it, to support this proposal, if it first emanated from the Madras Council; but, whether it emanates from that Council or whether it does not, at the present moment it is entirely out of the question. Sir, might I draw your attention to some of these figures showing the incidence of taxation in the Madras Presidency? We have been told that Madras pays a revenue of Rs. 2-8-11 per acre of cultivated *raiyatwari* land as against an incidence of Rs. 1-12-8 in the next most highly-taxed province. We have also been told, in another connection, that the average taxation of a proof gallon of country spirits in Madras is Rs. 11-2-2, far higher than in any other province in India. Might I also draw attention to the local statistics of taxation per head of the population? Those local statistics have, I believe, been compiled at the instance of the Government of India itself. They are to be found on page 208 of the Statistics of British India, 1919, Volume IV. Those statistics show that Madras pays per head of the population '27 of a rupee. According to these statistics the incidence of taxation in Madras is far higher than in any other province of India. Not only is the incidence of taxation higher in Madras than elsewhere, but her finances are, I regret to say, in an absolutely deplorable condition; and owing largely to the activities of these very inhabitants of the Andhra province, she will sustain, I regret to say, a loss of probably 100 lakhs of rupees in Abkari alone. In the current year I have been authorised to say that the expected deficit is 64 lakhs; what it will be next year I tremble to think. Might I point out, Sir, that in every department of the Government of Madras retrenchment is in progress? And I might draw attention to a statement which appeared in one of the local papers the other day that, not only was retrenchment rife in every department, but that Executive Councillors would likewise be retrenched. That, Sir, indicates a very serious state of affairs. It indicates that something is radically wrong

with our finances, and, at a time when retrenchment should be the order of the day, I regret to see my Honourable friend on my left advocating a policy of outlay.

There is another aspect of the question, Sir, namely, that this deplorable state of affairs has been largely brought about by civil disobedience in an Andhra district,—I regret to say, the district of Guntur itself. Now, Sir, my position is this, that, if there is any real demand for Local Self-government in the Andhra province, I clearly call upon my Andhra friends in this section of the House to speak for themselves.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I regret I have to oppose this motion. I am afraid this motion is absolutely premature. I quite agree that, probably some 20 years hence, the country may be ready to take such action. We are now on the threshold of working the new Reform Scheme. Each province is trying to learn its lessons in Provincial Autonomy, and I can assure the House that Madras is not able to carry on its administration even as it is. The financial difficulties in the way of the Ministers are great. We have got a Development Minister, who cannot develop in any direction. We have got an Education Minister, who cannot even advance primary education.

We have got a Local Self-government Minister, who is unable to find the funds for drainage, water-works and sanitation. Sir, Madras has been most economically administered hitherto. Notwithstanding its vast area and its vast population, we have only got now 25 or 26 districts whereas Bombay, with a smaller population, has got a larger number of districts, a larger number of sub-divisions and a larger number of taluks. We have very large district establishments nearly 1,18,000 village officers, such as Munsifs and Kanungoes. Now, this is not a matter of urgency at all, and I deprecate the Government getting pre-occupied with all sorts of problems of this sort which appeal merely to sentiment, and not to the everyday work of administration which it is now necessary to carry on.

Sir, when there are so many administrative questions calling for attention, when there are so many questions connected with the industrial development of the province, which await speedy and urgent solution, what is the meaning of asking the Government to embark upon an inquiry in order to find out whether the Andhra province should be separated from the Madras Province or not. The cry will come up again, whether the West Coast should not also be separated. It has perhaps got a better case for separation than the Andhra province. And what about separating South Canara from Madras? There are questions and questions. This is certainly not a question of immediate importance, and, in spite of what our friends, who on account of sentiment or affection for their own language and for their own province—or rather for their own districts—may advise Government to do, I wish, Sir, that our energies should be exercised in a different direction altogether. The country is already pre-occupied with a number of difficulties which prevent the Government from taking the practical steps which are so urgently needed to ameliorate the condition of the masses. What with an expensive Police and with an expensive Army, which we had expected you would be able to reduce, the Government are faced with a number of difficulties at any rate, they fancy they are so faced with a number of difficulties which will keep the whole machinery of Government occupied for some time to come. Besides, I do not know whether it will be at all good for the Andhra province at the present

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

time to separate itself from Madras. The non-co-operation movement has taken root in the Andhra province. It is more in the districts of the Andhra province than in other districts that this movement is spreading and spreading with vigour. And if those districts have not the assistance of the other districts, I feel sure, the government of that portion of the country will become difficult of performance. Village officers have resigned in large numbers in the Andhra districts—I think mostly in the districts which my Honourable friend, Mr. Pantulu represents,—I mean Guntur

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu : I do not represent the Guntur district.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar : I am glad to hear that, Sir ; but there are the Godavari and Kistna districts which my friend represents. It is a most untimely proposition to bring forward at the present stage, and it is really tying the hands of Government with unnecessary burdens. I, therefore, ask my friend not to press this Resolution at this time.

Rai D. C. Barua Bahadur (Assam Valley : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I beg to oppose this Resolution also, although my province is not directly concerned. Sir, in times gone by, when there were no railways and there was great difficulty of communication, much larger areas were administered under the same Local Government. The Bengal Government, for example, had its jurisdiction extending as far as the eastern boundaries of India on the East, and on the West as far as the boundaries of the United Provinces, on the North it extended to the Himalayas and on the South to the Bay of Bengal. It included the present Bihar and Orissa, the present Assam and the present Bengal—three provinces ; and yet there was good government. Now that one province has been divided into three provinces, notwithstanding that there has been great improvement in communications. On the other hand, we find at the present time great financial stringency in all the different provinces : so our policy, if not our principle, should at this juncture be one of uniting and amalgamating provinces rather than dividing them or making a division of existing provinces. As far as my province is concerned, I would recommend to the Government, though I know there is no question of that at present before us, that my province be included in Bengal. The whole of it may go to Bengal without effecting the justice or efficiency of the administration, but, on the contrary, affecting a good deal of economy. Economy is the thing to be most sought after just now, because in these days we have got the advantage of railway communications, railways are multiplying, we have been raising more money for the extension of our railways, and our principle should be to amalgamate more provinces together instead of dividing the existing provinces. Of course, I have no authority or experience as regards Madras Presidency, but as regards any part of the country, I would suggest that Assam may be included in Bengal while Bihar and Orissa may be divided, Bihar going to the United Provinces, and Orissa to the Central Provinces.

Mr. President : Order, order. If I allow the Honourable Member to raise controversial issues of that kind, the debate will widen far beyond its proper frontiers.

Rai D. C. Barua Bahadur : I was only going to submit, for the consideration of the House, that, on grounds such as these, we should be rather for

the amalgamation of provinces than for their partition into smaller provinces, thus increasing the expense of maintaining them. My friend from Madras would not be benefited by the partition of the Andhra districts into a separate province because, by doing so, he can at the most expect a Chief Commissionership, whereas the people of the Andhra districts now enjoy the benefits of a Presidency Governorship. Considering all the circumstances, Sir, I beg to oppose the Resolution.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Sir, on the 21st September last we discussed a general proposition brought forward by an Honourable Member that there should be a complete redistribution of all the Provinces of India, and this Assembly very wisely, if I may say so, rejected that proposal on the ground that it meant undertaking a task which it was quite impossible to cope with effectively at the present juncture. The present proposal is a more modest one, namely, to create a separate province of the Andhra country on a linguistic basis. All the same, I am surprised that this motion should be brought forward in this Assembly, because, time after time, the principles that rightly guide the Government of India in this matter have been cited in this Assembly and its predecessor. They are contained in the Joint Committee's Report. The Joint Committee on the Government of India Bill, dealing with clause 15 (now section 52-A) of the Government of India Act, which the Honourable Member read, say :

'The Committee have two observations to make on the working of this clause. On the one hand, they do not think that any change in the boundaries of a province should be made without due consideration of the views of the Legislative Council of the province. On the other hand, they are of opinion that any clear request made by the majority of the Members of a Legislative Council, representing a distinctive racial or linguistic territorial unit, for its constitution under this clause as a sub-province or a separate province should be taken as a *prima facie* case, on the strength of which a commission of inquiry may be appointed by the Secretary of State, and that it should not be a bar to the appointment of such a commission of inquiry that the majority of the Legislative Council of the province in question is opposed to the request of the minority representing such a distinctive territorial unit.'

The position is therefore quite clear. The Honourable Mover suggests that the Government of India should take the initiative in this matter and that this Assembly should urge that course on the Government. May I put it to the Assembly that there are very few Members here representing Madras? The full number of Madras Members, I think, is about 14, and they are not all present here to-day. Are the other Members of this Assembly in a position to say whether this change would be advantageous or not? Have they any knowledge whatever of the conditions in the proposed Andhra province? Would it not have been a fairer, a wiser and a more proper course for anyone interested in this proposal to move it in the local Council, to see what treatment it received there, and then get the Local Government to approach the Government of India, as it would have been bound to do, if the motion had secured substantial support from the Andhra representatives of the Madras Presidency? In that event, we should have to consider what action ought to be taken, and whether a commission of inquiry should be appointed or not.

I do not want to suggest that I am entirely out of sympathy with this proposal, because I have from time to time been personally influenced by the argument of my Honourable Colleague (Mr. Sarma) regarding it; but in any case, I say, as was stated by Mr. Rangachariar,

[Sir William Vincent.]

that the present moment is a singularly inopportune moment for taking such a proposal up. I say further that this is not the forum before which that question can properly be brought, and I say it is quite uncertain, it must be quite uncertain to all Members of this Assembly, whether the change is required or not. Last year there was a discussion in the Madras Council on the question of an Andhra University, but not on the question of the separation of the Andhra province. I have looked up the debates; I have not been able to find any such discussion, though I find the debate regarding the University; and when, Sir, in the course of that debate it was suggested that that Resolution was intended to raise, as a side issue, the question of a separate Andhra province, there was a good deal of feeling against it. It is, of course, quite true that this redistribution of territories among different provinces is a central subject, and therefore the Honourable Mover is in order in bringing this Resolution here, because we are necessarily the persons who should make any representation that might be necessary to the Secretary of State, if further inquiry were necessary. But this is not the place where the discussion of such a proposal should be inaugurated.

Again, I do not know whether the Honourable Member has ever considered what the practical difficulties in regard to his proposal would be, difficulties, for instance, in regard to such a district as Ganjam which would apparently be separated from the rest of Madras and yet be a portion of the Madras Presidency

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu : Not the whole of Ganjam, only a portion !

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : Let us accept for the moment the view that a portion of Ganjam would be left out of it, though, as a matter of fact, the proportion of Telugu-speaking people in Ganjam is comparatively small. Then, there is the district of Bellary where 33 per cent. of the people, on my information, only speak Telugu.

I want also to emphasise another proposition which I have frequently placed before this Assembly, and that is, that it is unsafe to base one's conclusions in a matter of this kind purely on linguistic tests. There are many other considerations which must be of equal importance. There are industrial considerations, historical ones, sentimental ones, and commercial ones. None of these can be neglected. And lastly, at present, there are very powerful financial considerations involved. The Mover said that this was—if I took his words down correctly—an admirable opportunity for raising this question. Sir, I venture to suggest that a more inopportune time could not have been chosen. Here we have these reformed Provincial Governments, all struggling with grave financial difficulties. Even to-day we had a motion on the agenda before this Assembly asking that the Madras Province should be relieved of a portion of this contribution to the Government of India. And yet while this is suggested as necessary on the one hand, the Honourable Mover makes a proposal which, if carried into effect, must largely increase the expenditure now incurred in the administration of Madras. I have read the letter of the representatives of the Andhra Conference to the Joint Committee, and I find that what they really wanted was a new province; not a sub-province, not a Chief Commissioner, as was suggested by one Member, but a new province, apparently with a Governor, Members, Ministers,

Secretaries, High Court, University and all the paraphernalia of a Presidency Government, and I suppose a body-guard also for the Governor . . .

Mr J. Chaudhuri (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural) : And a band.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent : A band is not mentioned. Well, Sir, the cost of the University alone, I found, was Rs. 25 lakhs initial and Rs. 7 lakhs recurring. Is it likely that expenditure necessary for the constitution of a new province can be incurred by a province which, we have just been told, in spite of starting with a very large balance last year, is now faced with a heavy deficit? Is this the time for inaugurating a proposal of this kind?

Sir, though I have had to throw cold water on this proposal, which I hope the Assembly will not accept, I would not for one moment have it thought that the Government of India are devoid of sympathy or that they are necessarily opposed to this project, if it should emanate from the proper quarter at a suitable time and receive proper support. If a Resolution were to be moved in the Madras Council, and the Local Government can obtain an expression of opinion from the Members coming from the areas affected in favour of such a proposition, then and then only will the Government of India be prepared to consider what, if any, action should be taken by them. May I suggest that the present Mover might, in the circumstances, seeing that he has not received support even from the Members of his own province, withdraw his Resolution.

Mr. President : Does the Honourable Member wish to respond to the invitation of the Honourable the Home Member?

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu : Yes, Sir, I should like to make a few remarks in reply to some of the remarks made by the Honourable the Home Member and by some of the other Members who have spoken against my Resolution. One objection that was raised by all of them is that of finance. They said that the proposal to form a new province is likely to entail a large amount of expenditure which cannot be met. My reply to that is this. The formation of a new province necessitates, no doubt, the creation of some new offices and consequently some additional expenditure, but most of this will be only initial, and the recurring expenditure will not be very heavy. But that again is a question for the new province itself to decide. If the new province is prepared to bear that expenditure—and you cannot ascertain this unless you start an inquiry—I do not see why this Assembly should oppose my Resolution on the ground of finance. The expenditure that is to be incurred will be borne entirely by the new province itself and not by the Government of India. If the Andhras want a separate province for themselves, and if they are willing to pay for it, I submit that it is not for this Assembly or for the Government of India to say that it cannot afford to pay. So, I want an inquiry to be started so as to ascertain whether the new province will be able to bear the expenditure or not. That is my reply to that part of the criticism.

Then my Honourable friend, Mr. Bryant, referred to the non-co-operation movement in the Andhra districts and said that it has taken root there, and therefore it does not lie in the mouth of the Andhras to ask a favour from the Government in the form of the creation of a separate Andhra province. I would earnestly ask this House not to prejudice the issue of this Resolution by any references to the non-co-operation movement. This movement, I

[Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu.]

believe, is a passing phase. It is bound to go, and I do not think the consideration of such large issues as are involved in my Resolution should be prejudiced by any reference to the non-co-operation or other movements of that sort. I would request this House and also the Government not to allow their dislike of the non-co-operation movement, which I dislike as much as any other Member of this House, to interfere with the proper consideration of this question.

My Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, while admitting the propriety of the formation of an Andhra province, said that my proposal is somewhat premature now. He further said that some 25 or 30 years hence perhaps we might be in time in asking for the formation of an Andhra province. One reason why he considers that my proposition is premature is, if I have understood him correctly, that he wants time to be given for the Reforms to be worked. Well, I am really surprised to hear that from my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar. I believe, he was one of the Members of this Assembly who suggested a Round-Table Conference to which Mr. Gandhi—Mahatma Gandhi if you please—was to be invited for settling our differences and to obtain a further instalment of Reforms so as to satisfy all parties in the country. Now, Sir, I am not going to speak against any movement that may be started for getting a further instalment of Self-Government for India, but what I would say is this. We have all come here under the Reform Scheme that is embodied in the Government of India Act, 1919, and by which we are supposed to agree to work the Reforms for a period of ten years, at the end of which an inquiry will be made with a view to ascertaining whether a further instalment of Reforms should be granted or not. If after having come to this Assembly on that understanding, some of us ask for a further instalment of Self-Government, not in ten years but at the end of the very first year, and consider not that premature, I ask my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, how he can consider my modest request for the formation of an Andhra province premature now. I am really surprised at his attitude. I do not see what the working of the Reforms has got to do with the formation of a new province. These Reforms will be worked quite as well in two provinces as in one province. I do not think the formation of a new province makes the slightest difference at all, for, if a new province is formed, the same rules which exist in the other provinces will apply to it.

Then my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, said that my Resolution is based on mere sentiment, as if sentiment is a matter that should not be taken into consideration. I am glad that the Honourable the Home Member has taken a much broader view of the matter and said that sentiment should be respected. I admit that it is largely a matter of sentiment. We, the Andhras, feel that we should be given full opportunity, we should be given a full chance for development on our own lines. I admit that the movement is based upon a feeling that we have not had full opportunities for distinguishing ourselves in the past. I admit, Sir, that in the beginning, some of the statements made by Andhras on platforms were somewhat offensive to our Tamil friends, but that state of things has changed. If we do not get the Andhra province meanwhile, I should not be surprised if five or six years hence our Tamil friends should come forward and ask for the creation of a Tamil province, because we the Andhras have already commenced to encroach

upon their preserves. I should not be surprised if four or five years hence my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar, stands up in this Council and asks for a Tamil province.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: We will be only too glad if you would come up to such a state.

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu: Sir, I thank the Honourable the Home Member for the very sympathetic manner in which he has approached this subject. I am glad he has been good enough to call my proposal a very modest proposal. I understand that his chief objection to my Resolution is that I have brought it forward in this Assembly instead of allowing it to be brought forward in the Provincial Council. He has referred to some remarks made by the Joint Committee in regard

to this matter. I say it is not outside the province of this 12 Noon. Assembly, or outside the province of the Government of India to take the initiative in the matter, as the subject is a central one. What I ask is that the Government should start an inquiry, not necessarily an expensive one, and refer the matter to the Local Government and ascertain their views, with a view to seeing what further action, if any, should be taken in the matter.

The Honourable the Home Member has referred to the fact that there are very few Members from Madras in this Assembly to-day. That is not my fault. For one reason or other, the Members have had to be absent from the Assembly. I should have been glad if more Members were present, because I am sure that I would have received some support from some of them. I must say I am rather disappointed at my friend, Mr. Rangachariar, not supporting me. I fully expected him to support me.

The Honourable the Home Member said something about the Ganjam District. The question of the Ganjam District is not necessarily connected with the Andhra province. Whether you have the Andhra province or not, the Uriyas want that the Uriya portion of Ganjam should be added to the present province of Bihar and Orissa

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Does the Honourable Member admit that Ganjam is an Uriya District?

Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu: No; it is half and half. I resided in the Ganjam District, and in the most Uriya portion of that district, for five years. I have studied this question of the Uriya Province, and I claim to understand it. What the Uriyas wanted then is that the Uriya portion of the Ganjam District should be added on to Orissa, and I now see that they want a province or sub-province of their own. Practically the whole of the Uriya country is under one Government now, the Government of Bihar and Orissa; but the outlying portions are distributed among three other provinces. It is a question more or less of boundaries. There is one taluk which contains the bulk of the Uriya population in Ganjam, and that will have to be added to Orissa. There again it is a question of boundaries. It is impossible to draw a line, on one side of which you can put all Uriyas and on the other side all the Telegus. The fact is that the question of boundaries will always arise whatever may be the province. What I say is that the Uriya question is not at all directly concerned with the question of an Andhra province. Whether the Andhra districts form a new province or

[Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu.]

continue to be a part of the Madras Presidency, the question of adding the Uriya portion of the Ganjam District to Orissa is the same.

Then about Bellary and Anantapur. It is true that these two districts contain a large Canarese population; but I see no other province to which these portions can be added. They are now in the Madras Presidency, and, if the Andhra province is constituted, they will be in the Andhra province. They can never be in a Canarese province, because the only Canarese province to which they can be added is the Mysore country, and this is out of the question. Either they will be in the Madras Presidency or in the Andhra province. So this question ought not to prejudice the question of the Andhra province.

My object in bringing this Resolution before this Assembly is to elicit the sympathy of Government and ask them to start an inquiry by making a reference to the Local Government. That is the first step in starting the inquiry. I do not at all want them to commit themselves to the creation of a province all at once, but to start an inquiry to see how far that is feasible. But, since I see that my Resolution is not very likely to command support from this Assembly—because I see no signs of it—and in view of the very sympathetic reply given by the Home Member, I am willing, with the permission of the House, to withdraw my Resolution for the present, reserving to myself the right to take such action as may be considered necessary at some future time.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : I rise to a point of order, Sir. The Honourable the Home Member has stated what would be the policy of the Government of India with reference to this question

Mr. President : That is not a point of order. The Honourable Member may address his remarks to me and not to the Honourable the Home Member.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri : May I ask your permission to ask the Honourable the Home Member for certain information. His statement of policy presents some difficulties to my mind. We are aggrieved in Bengal

Mr. President : The Honourable Member is entering upon the merits of the question.

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

RESOLUTION *RE* : COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY ON EXPULSION FROM CANTONMENTS.

Haji Wajih-ud-Din (Cities of the United Provinces : Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, the Resolution which I have taken the liberty to move in this House runs thus :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council the desirability of appointing a Joint Committee of officials and non-officials to inquire into all cases of expulsion from cantonments under section 216 of the Indian Cantonment Code of 1912, and further recommends that the Committee should contain two-thirds non-officials, partly elected by this Assembly, and partly nominated by the All-India Cantonment Association.’

**Vide* page 2109 *ante*.

In moving the Resolution Sir, I would like to explain to this House that the Cantonment Code, 1912, under which the Cantonment Administration is carried on, has a section known as section 216 which authorises the Commanding Officer of a Cantonment to expel a person from the cantonment *with or without assigning reasons*. I may further state that the Cantonment Code, and therefore this section 216, is not a legislative enactment. The whole of the Code is the *manufacture* of the Governor General in Council and consists of rules framed by that illustrious Council headed by His Excellency in pursuance of the powers conferred upon them under section 24 of the Cantonment Act. I understand, Sir, that these rules are generally framed at the instance of the local military authorities and, in framing these, little or no consultation is held with the civil population of cantonments who are ultimately affected by these rules. It is no wonder, Sir, therefore, that the Cantonment Code gives a prominent place to section 216, the sinister working of which has given rise to the necessity of the Resolution I am now presenting to the House.

The All-India Cantonment Association has issued a pamphlet about the origin, history, and past application of this section. It appears that this section was first intended to be a measure necessary to exclude from cantonments persons of bad characters likely to spread venereal diseases among the troops. This section is really a reproduction of section 211 of the old Cantonment Code. To have an accurate idea of the purposes for which this section was originally framed, we should go back to the proceedings of the Legislative Council of India when the Cantonment Act of 1889 was passed. In presenting the Act to the Council, the then Commander-in-Chief assured the Council :

‘ That the rules which we shall have to frame under section 24 of the Act which gave the Governor General in Council powers to make rules consistent with the Act, will be directed mainly to the exclusion from the limited area to which the Act applied, of individuals known to be affected with contagious diseases.’

General Chesney spoke in the same strain when he observed :

‘ That the primary object of the rule to be framed under the Act, for the exclusion of bad characters from the cantonments, was to check the alarming increase among the soldiers of the Indian Army, both British and Native.’

Of course the word ‘ *native* ’ used here by General Chesney, means ‘ *Indian* ’.

For ten long years after the passing of the Cantonment Act, the Governor General in Council framed no rule, and it was in 1899, Sir, that the first rule about the expulsion of such persons was framed and embodied in the Cantonment Code as its section 211.

I have already said, Sir, that section 211 of the Cantonment Code of 1889 is the section 216 of the present Cantonment Code.

Having thus stated the main objects for which the Governor General in Council was given power to frame such a rule for expulsion of persons from cantonments, I shall now try to acquaint the House with the manner in which this section has been used in the past by local military authorities and with the persons to whom it was applied. The All-India Cantonment Association has stated in a very emphatic and pronounced form that instead of applying this section to bad characters, as was the original intention of the framers of the law, it has been applied to persons of public spirit, high education and

[Haji Wajih-ud-Din.]

eminent social position, for purposes entirely different from those for which the rule was said to be framed. The least assertion of civic rights on behalf of a civil resident of a cantonment or the slightest constitutional movement of protest against some official action has led the local cantonment authorities to have recourse to this terrible weapon in their armoury in order to silence the voice of protest or self-assertion once for all by expelling the man from the cantonment. Scores of instances can be cited to substantiate this statement. Mr. Jamal-ud-din Khan, a respectable citizen of Ferozpur, Mr. Mansa Ram, M.A., Pleader, Chief Court, Rawalpindi, Lala Payare Lall, Rais and Banker of Jullundar, Dr. Bhana Ram of Ambala, and Lala Narain Dass, B.A., LL.B., Vakil of Jullundar, are some of those to whom this section has been applied. Sir, only in recent years Hakim Allah Bakhsh and other respectable gentlemen were expelled from Multan simply for their entertaining at the Railway Station a group of 'Muhajirins' passing through that Station. The other day Hakim Sami-ullah, a well-known physician from Ambala, was expelled under this section for the alleged fault of his reciting some patriotic verses at public meetings.

I need not tire the House by mentioning other cases, in which this section has been freely applied for suppressing every form of constitutional agitation and legitimate expression of views in all these cases. The persons expelled have never been given an opportunity to defend themselves.

The fact is that this section makes no provision for giving the persons affected an opportunity for defence, and this is rightly regarded by the people of cantonments as something unrighteous and un-British in character.

The Chairman of the Reception Committees in their various Sessions have strongly condemned the section and urged its deletion from the Cantonment Code. Even the official members of the Cantonment Reform Committee consider it a great hardship to the civil population in its present form.

I am, however, not concerned with the section itself at present. The object of my Resolution is, that since the Government has thought it fit to reform the Cantonment administration by introducing an element of popular control into it, it is very desirable that the sufferers of the old autocratic system be dealt with in a spirit of *fair play, justice and liberality*. There is a strong resentment felt in cantonments against the application of section 216, and the popular belief is that all the persons expelled under this section are mere victims of official bureaucracy. The feeling is so strong that there is a danger of the cantonment people rejecting the Cantonment Reform Scheme if the cases of all these persons, now under orders of expulsion, are not reconsidered in the light of justice and a generous recognition of their civic rights.

I think, Sir, it will be a gracious act on the part of the Government if, on the eve of their inaugurating a new era in cantonments, a general amnesty is extended to all such persons. This will be a statesmanlike act of judicious conformity with the spirit of the Reforms. It will pave the way for the reception of the coming Reform Scheme and make the cantonment atmosphere calm and peaceful; but leaving this for the consideration of the Government, I move, Sir, the Resolution I have read.

It is, in my humble opinion, only fair and just that the cases of all such persons should be inquired into by a mixed Committee of officials and

non-officials conversant with cantonment affairs. This will be an act of real, though belated, justice; and I am sure that this House will agree with me that in making this demand for inquiry in this Resolution, I am only asking the House to extend to the people of cantonments merely the elementary right of British citizenship, namely, to have a trial before punishment.

With these words, Sir, I beg to move this Resolution, and hope the Honourable House will adopt it unanimously.

Mr. Pyari Lal (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, if I understand the Honourable Mover aright, the objects of the Resolution are two: one, the appointment of a Committee for the examination of all cases of expulsion under section 216 of the Cantonment Code and to invite the attention of this House to the fact that this section has been applied to uses other than those intended by its original framers, and, secondly, that the section is so worded that it is capable of abuse in the hands of any one and, as such, should be deleted from the Statute-book. The Government of India, I understand, just about a week or two ago, themselves have felt the necessity of amending this section. They have tried to amend it in a way which leaves the thing where it was. The way in which they propose to amend the section is, they make it applicable only to cases of tampering with the loyalty and discipline to troops.

Sir Godfrey Fell (Army Secretary): Sir, I should like a ruling from the Chair as to whether the Honourable Member is in order in discussing the draft revised section 216 which has recently been published in the Gazette of India. I beg to point out that the Resolution which we are discussing deals in terms with the appointment of a Committee to inquire into past cases of expulsion, and on to-day's agenda paper, No. 12, there is a specific Resolution dealing with the question of the amendment of section 216. I ask you, Sir, for a ruling whether it is in order to discuss the merits of section 216 in connection with the Resolution which has just been moved.

Mr. President: I was waiting to see how far the Honourable Member was going. The terms of the Resolution limit the debate to the question of the administrative action of Government in the matter of those persons expelled from cantonments, and, as Sir Godfrey Fell has pointed out, the Honourable Member is not in order.

Mr. Pyari Lal: The appointment of a Committee would be perfectly meaningless unless there is an object behind it, and that object is the deletion of the section, which is objectionable. If the modification or amendment of the Code, such as we are now attempting, is unsatisfactory and does not meet our objections, I submit there is no amendment at all, and therefore it is perfectly relevant to the subject of this Resolution.

Mr. President: I have just said that it is not relevant.

Mr. Pyari Lal: I submit, Sir, that this section has been most violently protested against by the people living in cantonments, and especially by the civil population and, as such, by the appointment of that Committee it would be shown that the words of this section have been construed to cover cases which are not intended by it and therefore I support this Resolution, if I cannot discuss further the section itself as being irrelevant.

Sir Godfrey Fell: Sir, I think that it will probably save the time of this Assembly if I state at once in a few words the Government's attitude towards the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Haji Wajih-ud-Din.

[Sir Godfrey Fell.]

The Government of India are not prepared to agree to the appointment of a Committee, as proposed, to inquire into past cases of expulsion from cantonments under section 216. They think that it would be difficult for such a Committee to examine the cases and to arrive at satisfactory conclusions. Many of the cases are old ones. In many cases the evidence on which action was taken may have disappeared or is not available. The cases would require local examination. The Committee would have to travel over a great part of India, and the expense to the State will be very considerable. But having said that the Government are not prepared to accept this Resolution as it stands, I do not wish it to be thought that the Government of India are entirely devoid of sympathy with the object of my Honourable friend's Resolution. The Government of India have recognised that the time has come to modify section 216. I do not propose to discuss the proposed modification now, as it has just been ruled out of order to do so in connection with this Resolution. I merely mention it, to show that Government are aware that objections have been taken, and perhaps rightly taken, to the existing section and the way in which it has been applied, in some cases, in the past. I hope that its past application has not been quite so objectionable as my Honourable friend stated in his speech, but there may have been cases in which the power has been, I will not say abused, but perhaps used without sufficient consideration; and Government are, therefore, prepared to re-examine all cases in which persons have been excluded from cantonments and are still so excluded under section 216, on account of what may be termed their political views. With this object, I have already called for the records of all cases of this sort for the past seven years, and I can give this Assembly a pledge that every case will be most carefully considered, with a view to seeing whether the time has not come to cancel the order of expulsion and to allow persons, who have been expelled, to return to the cantonment to which they belong. I hope, Sir, in view of this pledge, my Honourable friend may see his way to withdraw his Resolution.

Haji Wajih-ud-Din : I am perfectly satisfied with the answer given by my Honourable and esteemed friend, Sir Godfrey Fell, and, on the assurance given by him, I withdraw my Resolution.

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

Mr. President : As this is a Friday and we do not, as a rule, sit on Fridays, I think it may meet the convenience of our Mussalman colleagues if we adjourn for a longer period, from now till 2 O'clock. If that is inconvenient to Government, I am prepared to hear what they have to say.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Finance Member) : We are quite prepared to adjourn.

PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS.

Mr. President : I present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to deal with the amendment of the Standing Orders.

The Assembly then adjourned till Two of the Clock.

*Vide page 2124 ante.

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

RESOLUTION *RE*: COMMITTEE ON RETRENCHMENT.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, the Resolution that I have to move runs as follows :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to appoint a mixed Committee of officials and non-officials to inquire into the cost of the Central Government and report on the possibility of effecting economy therein.’

In moving this Resolution, Sir, I have had the advantage of perusing a similar debate raised in the other House in which the view of the Government and of the elected Members of that House was clearly expressed. In moving my Resolution in this House, I do not propose to traverse the same line of attack or to repeat what has been said by my Honourable colleague, the Mover of the Resolution, in the other House. I wish to tackle the problem of retrenchment of the expenditure of the Central Government on entirely different lines, and in doing so, I shall confine my remarks, for the benefit of the Departments concerned, first to the Military and then to the Civil Departments. If the Honourable Members of this House will turn to the memorandum which was supplied last year by the Military Department, they will find at page 13 that the expenditure on the Army in India was about Rs. 62½ crores, of which about Rs. 16,73,00,000 was spent on the upkeep of the British Army. It has been pointed out, and it is a fact which will be admitted by the spokesman of that Department, that the British soldier in this country costs as much as five times the Indian soldier. If, therefore, we were to replace the British soldier by the Indian soldier, there would be an immediate saving of 13 crores in the military estimates. I am aware, Sir, of the existence of the Military Retrenchment Committee that held its sittings in Simla during the last summer, but as its recommendations are confidential and are unknown to me, I am not in a position to divine as to what course that Committee has recommended. But I venture to hope that the Committee could not have overlooked this heavy drain on the resources of this country, and I invite the attention of the members of the Military Department to this possible line of retrenchment. Now I pass on to the Army Headquarters. Before the war, the Army Headquarters was manned by officers which could not have been considered as insufficient. During the last eight or nine months the Army in India has been sub-divided into four Commands, and yet we find that Army Headquarters is more populous than it was in the pre-war days. In this connection, you will find that many of the commissioned officers drawing high salaries are employed to do merely clerical work, which would have been more advantageously performed by clerks drawing Rs. 150 or Rs. 200 a month. It is, Sir, a well-known fact that the military requirements of this country must take into account the possibility of future danger here. Now I beg to suggest to the Honourable the Secretary, what necessity is there for the maintenance of an expensive and costly army for purposes of internal security? The reduction of the artillery will carry with it economy in lines, transport and training. One other source of retrenchment might be found in the Military Works Services. It is a well-known fact that the Military Works Services drain away from the Military Budget an important item of their revenue, and I venture to submit that if more business-like methods are pursued,

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

better than what they were during the war, then there will be room for further economy. I further suggest that there is a complete lack of policy in the Royal Air Force. Aerodromes are constructed, and, as soon as ready, they are scrapped, and a vast amount of this country's money is uselessly wasted upon this service.

In the condition of this country I venture to doubt the wisdom or utility of the aerial force. Protagonists of the army will defend the aerial service on the ground that it is useful for scouting, bombing, spotting and lending moral support to the army. I submit, Sir, that all this is very well ; but can we afford it and is it essentially necessary ? If we dispense with this service, a saving of about a crore and a quarter will be effected in the Military Budget. Of late there has been a considerable increase in the number of armoured cars. I do not deprecate the use of modern appliances for the purpose of preserving peace ; but I submit that there should have been a corresponding decrease of the cavalry and infantry units. As your weapons increase in effectiveness and precision, the number of people who are employed must necessarily be reduced. I venture, further, to submit that now we have a territorial force and an auxiliary force which in themselves cost a lot of money—I am informed that every territorial soldier upon enlistment means an expenditure of Rs. 250, which is the cost of his rifle and bayonet, besides other costs incurred on account of uniform, equipment, Lewis guns and the rest. Now, I submit, Sir, that as the line of defence is strengthened by the recruitment of the territorial force, there must be a corresponding decrease in the regular infantry. The Military Budget absorbs the major portion of our revenue. You will find that in pre-war days it cost us 19 to 20 crores of rupees, and now the cost has gone up to 62 odd crores of rupees. In other words, the cost has been doubled or trebled within the last few years

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Finance Member) : Was it not 29 you meant and not 19 crores ?

Dr. H. S. Gour : In the early years it was 19, and 29 in later years. Now, I suggest, Sir, that in this Department of the State drastic retrenchment is called for.

With the limited time at my disposal I do not propose to go into further details and I will pass on from the military to the civil ; and, on this side of the question, I draw the attention of those responsible for the administration of this country to the Foreign and Political Department. I submit that the higher Secretariat of this Department is over-manned. I should very much like to know how many Secretaries, how many Under Secretaries, how many Joint Secretaries, how many Registrars and how many other similarly highly paid officers are entertained in this Department, and what has been the strength before the war and since ? In order to facilitate my own task and the task of those responsible on behalf of the Government, I addressed a number of questions to the Secretary of the Legislative Department for information ; but, as no replies have been vouchsafed me, the only available material that I have to go upon are the Quarterly Returns and the Government of India list. From these I find that a very large number of officers are employed in the Foreign and Political Department whose utility I beg to doubt. In the Department of Commerce and Industry, Honourable Members will find that, though there is only one Member, there are two

Secretariats with two Secretaries and all the other official equipment, although the two Departments were merged into one something like two years ago. In the Intelligence Bureau, otherwise known as the Criminal Investigation Department, we similarly find a very large number of people employed under different designations. I am not sure that their presence is necessary for the due discharge of the duties assigned to that Department. A very large number of officers are told off on special duty. Now, Sir, Honourable Members will know what this means. An officer comes and says : 'I want to be in Delhi or Simla for the sake of my health,' and somebody tells him : 'You are on special duty.' (*The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey* : 'Shame ! Shame !') I beg to ask how many officers are on special duty and what is the nature of the duty they perform.

Then, Sir, I pass on to another question. Honourable Members will know that the Departments of Education and of Revenue and Agriculture are either provincialised or are transferred subjects. The Department of Education deals with Public Health, Medical, Sanitation, Local Self-government and Ecclesiastical. Now, with the exception of the last, all the other Departments are transferred Departments, and yet we have a Secretary, an Educational Commissioner and a very large staff exactly of the same kind as used to be employed before the transfer of this Department to the provinces. I am quite sure the Honourable the Finance Member intended to ejaculate 'shame' at this stage and that he cried it out a little too previously. We then pass on to the Revenue and Agriculture Department. Revenue is a provincial subject and yet we have got the usual complement of Secretaries, Under Secretaries and the rest. Agriculture is a transferred subject and yet we have a Director of Agriculture. (*Mr. J. Hullah* : 'No'.) We have an Irrigation Department and only major irrigation is looked after by this Department and the rest is transferred, and yet we have an Inspector General of Irrigation. The same remarks apply to Forests. I now pass on to a very interesting Department, the Munitions Board. The Munitions Board Branch is still going strong and I do not know for how many years this Board will continue to flourish. Then, Sir, we have the Public Works Department and the Post Offices. The Public Works Department is more or less a transferred subject. But, if Honourable Members will turn to pages 28 to 30 of the Government of India list, they will find that this Department employs 14 Europeans in the higher services and only 3 Indians. Now, turning from these departments to the Home Department, we have one Secretary, two Deputy Secretaries, two Under Secretaries and a very large number of other Secretaries. We have then the Staff Selection Board and other allied Boards. I submit that, in all these Departments, the members of the Indian Civil Service are very largely employed. I have the very greatest respect for members of the Indian Civil Service, but I venture to submit that, in the interests of economy and retrenchment, more Indians and more members of the Provincial Civil Service might be employed. I commend to the Honourable the Finance Member the recommendation which this House wishes to make upon this aspect of the question. Lastly, I turn to the Finance Department. We have in the Finance Department one Secretary—a member of the Indian Civil Service—two Joint Secretaries—also members of the Indian Civil Service—the Secretary drawing a salary of Rs. 4,000 per mensem, the Joint Secretaries drawing salaries of Rs. 3,000 per mensem each, and one Deputy Secretary, also an Indian Civil Servant,

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

who draws his grade pay and Rs. 400 as local allowance. Then we have three Assistant Secretaries and six Audit officers. This is only on the civil side. We have on the military side a Financial Adviser on Military Finance, a Military Accountant General of War Accounts and the regular paraphernalia of his office. I submit that both on the civil as well as on the military side there is great room for economy. Last December, when I was in Calcutta, I was going along the place called the Esplanade and I saw a huge palatial building very much out of repair, the doors and windows all shut, and I inquired of a friend who was going along with me what this large palatial building was, and I was told that it belonged to the Imperial Government; and, on further inquiry, I found that a very large number of Imperial buildings, which belong to the Central Government in Calcutta, are at the present moment unoccupied or occupied at a very low rent. Honourable Members may go to Raisina and Delhi and they will also find the same uneconomic use of the house accommodation provided by the Government. Now, I wish to ask whether there is not room for economy and retrenchment on these heads. Are the Imperial buildings in Calcutta fully utilised? If they are not utilised, why should not they be so utilised? Why are they kept in that condition, either vacant or rented out to people not at a fair and economic rent. These, Sir, are the salient points which call for an inquiry. The Honourable Mr. Cook, speaking in the other House, said that he had employed, or the Government of India had employed, an officer, and with him one or two non-officials might be associated for the purpose of effecting economy and retrenchment. Honourable Members of this House demand that they do not wish to associate themselves as mere lookers on or advisers, but that they should form themselves into a Committee for the purpose of effecting salutary retrenchment in the expenditure of this Central Government. I therefore submit, Sir, that the Resolution which I have the honour to move will not encounter serious opposition. I move it.

Sir Godfrey Fell (Army Secretary) : Sir, as my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, has done the Army the honour of making it the first object of his attack, perhaps the Assembly will kindly allow me to deal with the points raised in his speech, without prejudice to the general handling of the Resolution, which will be done later on by the Honourable the Finance Member. Before I attempt to answer the detailed criticisms and suggestions which he put before this Assembly, I should like to correct one rather serious mistake which I think the Honourable Member has made. In the early part of his speech, he quoted from the Memorandum on the growth of expenditure, which was laid before the Assembly during the Budget season last year. If he had read the first paragraph of that Memorandum, he would not have fallen into the error of comparing our pre-war military expenditure with that of the present time in the way which he did. He said that our pre-war expenditure was 18 or 19 crores, and that now it is nearly 60 crores. The actual facts are as stated in that Memorandum. Converting the Home expenditure at the rate of Rs. 10 to the £, our military expenditure in the year before the war was 26.11 crores, and the normal expenditure in this year's Budget was taken at 58.20. If we convert the Home expenditure for 1913-14 at the rate of exchange then prevailing, the actual figure for pre-war expenditure would have been rather higher than that which I have mentioned.

My Honourable friend, the Finance Member, also reminds me that it has not been below 24 crores since 1896.

Now, Sir, Dr. Gour has been good enough to offer certain suggestions as to the directions in which he thinks that our military expenditure might be reduced. The first point he made referred to the number of officers employed at Army Headquarters, and he argued, and I think very naturally argued, that, with the introduction of the four Commands scheme, there should not be the same necessity for employing a large staff at Army Headquarters as there had been before. I do not wish to detain the Assembly by explaining in detail the origin of the four Commands scheme, but I should like just to lay before them, in very brief outline, the reasons why that scheme was adopted, in order to show that it is really to a great extent independent of anything that may be done at Army Headquarters. Now, the reason why the four Commands scheme has been adopted is this. The experience of the war showed many defects in our military organisation, and one of those defects was that Divisional Commanders were overburdened by the large administrative responsibilities thrown upon them. Their staffs were insufficient to meet even the minimum requirements of administration, or to provide for continuity on mobilisation; and, owing to the dispersal of troops in their areas, they were unable to exercise any degree of close control or to devote their main attention to the primary duties of a Commander, namely, the training of troops for war. That is particularly necessary in this country, where we are always in danger of having to meet sudden attacks on the frontier. India, too, is a very large country; and it is difficult for officers to get about and get to know their troops and to superintend their training. It is for these reasons that the Government of India, with the approval of the Secretary of State, introduced the present four Commands system.

The functions of the General Officers Commanding-in-Chief of these Commands and again, below them of the General Officers Commanding Districts, are the responsibility for the command, administration, training and efficiency of the troops located in their areas, and also for the internal security of the areas. Now, Dr. Gour argues, and I may say very plausibly argues, that the creation of these Commands, with their necessary staffs, ought to be accompanied by reductions at Army Headquarters. I quite agree; but the difficulty is this, that it is impossible to compare the pre-war staff at Army Headquarters with the existing staff without taking into consideration a number of other factors. Those factors are that modern requirements have necessitated a great expansion of staff, far exceeding any possible reductions which might be made in consequence of the four Commands scheme. I will give you very briefly the reasons. Firstly, the introduction of new services, such as mechanical transport, armoured cars, tanks, aviation and machine guns; secondly, the great development of pre-war services, such as, signals—and the extraordinary importance of the signal service had not been appreciated in India before the war—medical and supply and transport; next, the multiplicity of new weapons, such as Lewis and Hotchkiss guns; next, as one of the lessons of the war, the value to the staff of specialists with an expert knowledge of the technique of the several arms of the service. Then again, comes another factor, the higher standard demanded as a result of the war for the training, equipment, housing, education, amusement, comfort and general welfare of the soldier. That has necessitated the creation of educational institutions, military schools, etc. Again, there have been other administrative

[Sir Godfrey Fell.]

changes, consequent on the grant of free rations and clothing to the Indian Army and the abolition of the Silladar system. However, to descend to details, I will take one branch in which the increase over the pre-war staff is most marked, that is the branch presided over by the Quartermaster General. Before the war, there were 22 officers employed in that branch; there are now 54. Now, the explanation of this is, that the liability of the Directorates has increased very greatly, partly owing to the causes I have just mentioned, and partly owing to other details of administration connected with equipment, clothing and stores. I will take another branch—the Military Secretary's Branch. Before the war there were two officers employed in that branch; at present there are, I believe, 11. The reason is, of course, that the war led to an enormous expansion of the Indian Army, and that led to a consequent increase in the number of officers. Now, every officer means a separate case; everything about that officer has to be recorded, when he obtains his first commission, his postings, his transfers, his promotions, his leave. All these have to be dealt with; and the Assembly will readily understand that it is simply a question of arithmetic; if you have so many thousand more officers, you have to have a larger staff to deal with them.

My Honourable friend then went on to suggest, with reference to Army Headquarters, that we employ there a number of officers whose work might equally well be done by clerks on a lower rate of pay. I do not think, Sir, that this is correct. Of course, it is impossible for me to stand up here and assert that every officer at every moment of the day is fully occupied. No one can tell whether an officer has a full day's work or not unless he has himself had experience of the work and knows what the work means; but this I do know, and I speak from very considerable personal experience, that the senior staff officers at Army Headquarters are very hard-worked indeed; and it is partly in order to relieve them that a certain number of relatively junior staff officers are employed, so to speak, to 'devil' their cases for them. It must be remembered, too, that every Army requires a staff, and a staff officer is not made in a day. We tried to improvise staff officers in the war, and it was not wholly successful. A staff officer requires very careful training; and consequently, it is the policy of Government to take graduates from the Staff College and put them for a time in Army Headquarters, in order not only that they should gain experience by dealing themselves with unimportant cases and disposing of them, but also in order that they may see how highly trained senior staff officers deal with their work and thereby gain experience. I cannot help feeling, Sir, that my Honourable friend imagines that the Commander-in-Chief, in spite of the fact that he does not know where to turn for money, keeps a large number of redundant junior staff officers at Army Headquarters, in the same way that other people might keep pets. I can assure the Honourable Member that that is not the case. If we thought that we could economise by getting rid of junior staff officers, we should do so.

At the same time, the Assembly will be interested to know that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has himself, within the course of the last month, directed that there shall be an arbitrary reduction of 5 per cent. in the strength of Army Headquarters; and that very shortly, within the next week or two, a very strong Committee is going to inquire into this question again with the object of seeing whether further reductions are practicable.

I would also mention that this is not the first time that the matter has been examined. In 1920, I think it was a very strong Committee, consisting of two civilians and one soldier, went into the question, branch by branch, and suggested reductions and economies; and those reductions were, I think without exception, carried out.

The next point that my Honourable friend made related to the employment of troops for internal security purposes. He said—I think I heard him aright—that surely there was no necessity for an expensive army for internal security purposes. Well, Sir, no one would rejoice more than the Military authorities if they could be relieved of the burden of arrangements for internal security; but I think it must be within the knowledge of every Member of this Assembly that troops have unfortunately had to be employed for this purpose not once, but many times in the course of the past year.

My Honourable friend then went on to speak of the possible reduction of artillery in connection with internal security. My reply to that is this Sir. There are no batteries of artillery earmarked for internal security purposes. It is true that, if the internal situation is so serious as to necessitate the use of a movable column, the movable column will have its normal complement of artillery; but that artillery will be found by detaching a section from a battery in the district, a battery existing primarily for field army purposes. No special transport is kept up in connection with the artillery which might on occasion be used for internal security purposes. If artillery were employed with a movable column in those circumstances, the transport would have to be improvised, by hiring or otherwise.

Then, Sir, Dr. Gour made a vigorous attack upon the Military Works Services. He pointed out that they constitute a very heavy drain on our resources. My complaint is, Sir, that they are not a sufficiently heavy drain on our resources—in other words, that we cannot afford to spend on essential military works nearly so much as we should like. I think the Assembly is aware how much leeway has to be made up in the matter of providing better accommodation for Indian troops, for hospitals, and to some extent for British troops also. But I gather that Dr. Gour's main criticism is levelled against the unbusinesslike methods and waste of money which prevailed during the war and which, he suggested, continues to the present time. Now, Sir, that is a matter which I need hardly say has not escaped the attention of the Government of India. So far back as 1919, a Sub-Committee of the Executive Council examined this very point. They devoted a great deal of time and attention to seeing whether money had been wasted by the Military Works Service, and how they were to prevent this waste in future. Two more Committees examined the matter in 1920; and, only a few months ago, the Government of India addressed the Secretary of State and communicated to him their considered opinion on the whole subject. There is no doubt that there was a great deal of money wasted during the war in connection with military works; but war is necessarily wasteful; and I do not think it is quite fair to place the blame upon the Military Works Services. If you recall the conditions which prevailed during the war, when India was straining every nerve to raise additional men for the service of the Empire—in 1918 alone, we endeavoured to raise an additional 500,000 men, and for every man we recruited some accommodation had to be found—when you think how our hospitals were full to overflowing with the sick and wounded from overseas, when you think how far below the requisite

[Sir Godfrey Fell.]

standard our hospitals were before the war, and what efforts had to be made to improve them during the war, I think you will realise that the officers of the Military Works Services had an exceptionally difficult task to perform. That task was rendered still more difficult by one or two other factors. One—the principal one—was this, that at the outbreak of war we had, in the interests of the Empire, to send overseas almost all our experienced Royal Engineer officers, and we had to replace them by temporary officers—I do not wish to decry them in the least—not possessing the same high qualifications, not knowing the country in the same way as our regular officers did. Then, again, speed was essential. We had to do things in a very great hurry, and that always means extravagance, because, instead of insisting upon full detailed estimates being prepared and sanctioned before the work was undertaken, we had to tell them to carry on, to get on with the building, etc. The plinth area estimates on which they worked were often prepared in a great hurry and often proved to have been too low. These are the reasons why there was undoubtedly waste during the war over the Military Works, but I deny that there is any appreciable waste now. At any rate, I feel sure that if my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour, knew the present Director of Military Works, he would realize that we have at the head of that service a man of very strong business instincts, a man who is just as much opposed to the waste of public money as any one in this Assembly, one of the most capable officers who has presided over the destinies of that service. I also know that, as the result of the examination of this question to which I have already referred, the financial control of Military Works has been tightened to such an extent that it is practically impossible for irregularities to occur.

Then Dr. Gour went on to criticise our lack of policy with reference to the Royal Air Force. Well, Sir, the Royal Air Force is a new service, is particularly new in India, and it surely does take time for a policy to be developed. Everything connected with the Royal Air Force is still somewhat fluid ; but a settled policy is gradually emerging, and I do not think that lack of policy is likely to lead in future to waste of money ; though if Dr. Gour's recommendation, that we should do away with the Royal Air Force altogether, were adopted, undoubtedly we should be involved in very serious loss, that is to say, the sacrifice of the money which we have already spent. Dr. Gour sketched briefly the purposes for which the Royal Air Force exists, and he asked, ' Can we afford an Air Force ? ' Well, Sir, that is as may be ; but I would say this, that we do owe it to our soldiers to give them the assistance and support which the Royal Air Force affords. We have had some little experience of the use of an Air Force in India both during the Afghan campaign and during the recent operations in Waziristan. One of the greatest difficulties about warfare of that sort is, as the Assembly knows, that in a hilly country you often cannot locate the enemy ; you cannot scout effectively, because if you try to scout you are almost certain to be shot. One great advantage the aeroplane gives us is that aviators can, by flying over the country occupied by the enemy, spot concentrations of men, lashkars, and warn the soldiers where they are ; and the soldiers can then either make their dispositions to meet them, or in some cases can train their guns on to them and disperse them. Then again the flying men themselves can bomb and break up these gatherings. That use of the Air Force was very clearly demonstrated only a very short time ago, in the direction of the Tochi Valley. Dr. Gour also mentioned—I do not think I am misquoting him—

that aerodromes have been built and then scrapped. I should be very much obliged if my Honourable friend would give me details of this alleged waste; because I have consulted the Air Officer commanding the Royal Air Force, and he assures me that it is not the case that every building erected for the Royal Air Force is not used and fully used, except certain buildings connected with the dépôt at Lahore which are not yet fully occupied; but the only reason why they are not fully occupied is because, owing to certain causes which are beyond our control, we have not yet been able to get the full establishment. The Air Commodore indeed says that, so far from having buildings which are not fully occupied, he has not got enough buildings.

Then, Sir, the next point that Dr. Gour made was with reference to armoured cars. He said that, with the introduction of these weapons, which I gather he approves of, we ought to find it possible to make reductions in the cavalry and the infantry. My answer to that is perfectly simple. It is that we have made these reductions. I think the Assembly is aware—for the Commander-in-Chief told them so in speaking on the Budget last March—that, as compared with the pre-war strength, the British troops and fighting units of this country have been reduced by some 6,000 men and the Indian troops by 7,500. These reductions were made with the concurrence of the late Commander-in-Chief; and further reductions were made by the present Commander-in-Chief. But both of them stipulated, at the time these reductions were made, that they would only be possible if they were allowed the full complement of armoured cars and other appliances which they considered necessary to make up the shortage of actual fighting units compared with the pre-war figures. These reductions would not have been possible without these armoured cars and so on; neither would they have been possible unless we had simultaneously made improvements in such services as the Signalling Service, and made our troops more mobile by the employment of mechanical transport and the like.

Lastly, Sir, Dr. Gour referred to the creation of the Territorial Force, and suggested that this would afford a justification for a reduction in the number of regular troops. Well, Sir, the Territorial Force is absolutely in its infancy. It is a very promising infant indeed, and I should like to take this opportunity to testify, on behalf of Government, to the very willing and patriotic response which has been made in many parts of India to the call for recruits for the Territorial Force. But the fact remains that the Force is in its infancy. Now, a regular soldier takes a very considerable time to train, and his training is intensive. You cannot expect the Territorial Force soldiers to become efficient in a far shorter time, especially as their training is merely carried on spasmodically and for short periods in the year. In fact, in many cases their training has not yet actually begun. I think I need only in this connection remind the Assembly of what His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief said to them last March. He said, with reference to the creation of the Territorial Force:

‘ . . . when the Territorial Army reaches the standard of efficiency which, I hope, it may before many years are past, I should be ready to contemplate a proportionate reduction in those troops which have already been allotted to internal security, but, at the present moment, the Territorial Force is in its infancy, and, though I am prepared to give it every possible encouragement, I am doubtful whether, for some years to come, it will reach the degree of efficiency which would justify us in looking on it as of potential military value.’

[Sir Godfrey Fell.]

Well, Sir, I have dealt to the best of my ability with the actual specific points made by my Honourable friend in his speech. I will only add, with reference to the general question, that, as I assured this Assembly last year, no one can be more anxious for retrenchment than the Government of India. I think, if His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief were here, he might be inclined to say that their insistence upon retrenchment has become almost an obsession and one which has caused him considerable inconvenience. Therefore, when the Assembly presses for retrenchment, it is preaching to the converted. The Government of India devote a very considerable portion of their time to the study of this question, and every possible economy that can be effected in reducing military expenditure is being effected and will be effected.

Mr. N. M. Samarth (Bombay : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I fully accept the assurances given by Sir Godfrey Fell that everything that is needed to effect retrenchment and economy in military expenditure is being done by His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the military authorities. The question is not whether the Government of India is anxious to do it. The question is that suitable machinery should be devised by which this House will be convinced that everything that the Government of India is doing is in the right direction and in the desired direction. No departmental inquiry will satisfy this House. The Resolution asks for a Committee to be appointed of officials and non-officials who will go into it and satisfy the House here. Speaking of the military expenditure, if I had to speak upon it, I would not have taken the line which Dr. Gour did in moving the Resolution. I am one of those who think that, so far as the fighting strength is concerned, necessary expert opinion has to be given effect to; and it is not for laymen here to say how many soldiers are needed and what the fighting strength should be to guard us from external aggression and to meet internal disorder. But I ask one question. Are we getting, in regard to this military expenditure, our money's worth in all respects? Take, for instance, the large amount of money which is spent in supplies and contracts and transport. There is a Controller of Contracts. I want a Committee of this House to inquire into the whole procedure of that officer. I want to know how many contracts he entered into in regard, for instance, to wheat, sugar, tea and every other thing, and whether, at the time the rates were sanctioned by him, they were higher or not than the rates which prevailed in the open market. Are we having our money's worth, or is our money being spent as if it were nobody's money in particular and could be spent anyhow? I want a Committee to be appointed, not merely a departmental inquiry, but a Committee of this House, which will have the power to cause any officer of that Department to produce files and produce orders passed, and to show what were the tenders, if any, whether any tenders were asked for at all or not, and thus see how many lakhs of rupees per month could have been or could be saved by a business-like procedure being adopted in that Department. If Government, whatever officer they may appoint, satisfy themselves that no further retrenchment is possible. I do not think they are going to come and convince us that all that need be done and could have been done has been done. Therefore, my first point is that no departmental inquiry, however efficient it may be, will be of any use, and I want a Committee of this House to be appointed, just the same sort of Committee of Retrenchment as has been appointed in England in the House of Commons

Dr. H. S. Gour : And in America.

Mr. N. M. Samarth : That Committee to have full power to call any officer before it and cross-examine him and get all the necessary information by eliciting from that officer all the facts in connection with that Department. I am sorry Sir Godfrey Fell is not here ; otherwise, I should have asked him some more questions, in regard to this Controller of Contracts and other matters, to show how much money is being wasted. As regards the Civil Departments, I have no doubt that an efficient officer, as far as I know, has been appointed to go into the matters and see how far retrenchment is possible. But economy is a question of policy. That officer has no power and cannot have any power to recommend a change of policy. He will only proceed on the policy which the Government of India has at present. I do not think any officer can be appointed, who may be told, ' Well, you may do what you like, you may change the policy of the Government if you like '. That is not constitutional and cannot be constitutional. Therefore, with the limitations and qualifications of that officer, so far as the proposed inquiry is concerned, he cannot go into the policy of the Government. And what is expenditure after all ? Upon what does economy and retrenchment depend except upon policy ? The Committee of this House will have power to examine the policy of Government in any particular matter and to say that we do not agree with a certain policy, it is that policy which is responsible for so much expenditure and extravagance on the part of Government, and we therefore come down upon Government and recommend to them to abandon that particular policy which results in waste. This a departmental officer cannot do, and therefore a Committee of this House is absolutely necessary. With these words, Sir, I support the Resolution.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : The course of the debate shows that it has been taken for granted that retrenchment is necessary. I agree that retrenchment is necessary. We in the Government of India have—I may claim, I think, with justice—for years been striving for economy in the administration. Since our financial position became difficult we have steadily resisted new items of expenditure. We have attempted to the best of our ability to see that where we had undertaken a service, we should administer it in the most economical manner possible. Early last year I placed before this House a proposal to appoint a Standing Finance Committee. The functions of that Committee were to deal with all fresh items of expenditure and report also on standing items of expenditure.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated : Labour Interests) : Votable items ?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey : It has dealt mainly with votable items, but, as the Honourable Member knows, very many non-votable items have been placed before it. I have already expressed to the House the obligations we owe to that Committee. One of my friends in Government speaking of it recently said that I had added a fresh tyranny to life ; for my part, I have been glad of the assistance of fellow inquisitors from this Assembly to aid in the application of the thumb screw. So much for the economy which we have attempted to enforce. But as an Honourable friend said elsewhere the other day, there arrives a stage in every nation's career when you have to look beyond economy. It is not enough, as one of my officers said in talking of the Standing Finance Committee lately, that you should stand behind the palisade and hit at every head that comes above it ;

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

you have to penetrate behind it. That goes beyond the sphere of economy; it is the process of retrenchment; in other words, we have to see whether the scale of our administration (which of course was initiated when salaries were lower, when the cost of all supplies was lower and when money was easier) is justified in all its details in the present state of our finances.

Now, I have said that we all take it for granted that this time has arrived; retrenchment is necessary; and I, on behalf of the Finance Department, am far from deprecating criticisms or suggestions that have been placed before us for effecting retrenchment. There seems to me to be two requisites. First of all, we should by retrenchment cut down our actual expenditure by reducing the scale of every service which is not vital to the community, or in itself remunerative. Secondly, there is a point on which Mr. Samarth rightly, if I may say so, laid great stress, namely, the machinery adopted should be such that people should be convinced that we have done everything in our power to bring our expenditure to the lowest possible limit. So that we have really a double aim in view; and the question before us is really one not of principle, but of the method by which we should attain our result. Dr. Gour did not deal with the question as a whole, but attacked particular points of detail. In dealing with our civil expenditure he put before us a number of suggestions regarding our various Secretariat offices, pointing out directions in which the scale of establishment could be criticised. I do not know that the House would desire that I should justify every item that he mentioned. For my own part, I am not prepared to say that I could justify every such item, because I claim, as I have always claimed, that retrenchment is possible and must be effected. Of course, when he remarks that the Commerce and Industry Department has two Secretaries and only one Member, I hope, in view of the fact that there are two separate departments which deal with two entirely different subjects, he will give us credit for having only one Member instead of two. As regards the Central Information Bureau Department, I may say the whole question of establishment is now under separate consideration. As regards officers on special duty, surely Dr. Gour has brought a charge against our officers and against the Finance Department which he could not easily sustain. I have never heard of an officer asking for special duty at Delhi for his own purposes and gaining his request. We know from Dr. Gour himself that nobody ever wants to come to Delhi.

Dr. H. S. Gour: May I rise to a point of order, Sir? The Honourable the Finance Member has entirely misunderstood me. My remarks were never directed against him. All I said was that a very large number of officers are shown on special duty.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Is that all Dr. Gour said, Sir? The House is my witness. But as I see him repentant, I leave the point. He obviously wishes to obliterate that portion of his remarks. Then as regards the departments which deal with transferred provincialised subjects, again I say that is a matter for inquiry and justification. I am not prepared myself to say that the matter is not one which ought not to be decided on the lines which Dr. Gour suggested. As regards the Munitions Board, which he said still exists, he is referring, I think, to the Disposals organization, and I am sure my Honourable friend will be glad to know that this Disposals organization is

paid almost entirely by the Home Government, and that we merely pay a percentage on account of transactions which it carries out for us. I am unable to trace those many Secretaries in the Home Department whom Dr. Gour referred to. I know, Sir, only of one Secretary in the Home Department, a particularly hard worked officer. As for my own department, I will justify here and now the number of officers we have. I am, I suppose, not unreasonable in claiming that there must be (as there is) one Secretary; as for the two Joint Secretaries, I may point out that one is engaged entirely on income-tax work and is constantly on tour for the greater part of the year; he is not really a Secretariat officer at all. As for the other, owing to the change in the law, the whole of our finance rules, particularly our service rules and the rules relating to provincial relations in financial matters, have been entirely changed, and we had to place an officer on temporary duty to readjust our rules. We could not possibly have done it ourselves. That, Sir, is the only exceptional feature in my department; the Deputy Secretary, whom the Finance Committee knows so well, is in charge of the expenditure side, and there is one Under Secretary. I have, it is true, one other officer on temporary special duty. He is concerned entirely with the Budget, and I maintain that Budget is a matter of such importance that I think the country can afford an officer, who is by the way an Indian officer, for a few months for that purpose.

Now, Sir, those are merely points which Dr. Gour raises, and to which I do not attach the very greatest importance, because what I am discussing now is the question of method by which we should reach retrenchment. Dr. Gour quoted something that was said by my Honourable friend Mr. Cook in another place. I must protest, Sir, that if the remarks of gentlemen in another place are quoted at all, they ought to be quoted correctly. It is not correct that Mr. Cook said that we were putting an officer on special duty who might be helped by some other officers. The statement that was made on behalf of Government was this, that, accepting the need for retrenchment, the Governor General in Council had decided to take a double course. It may or may not seem fully satisfactory to the Assembly, but I want at least to make clear what it is. There is to be a double line of attack. Departments are under an obligation to explore their own possibilities of retrenchment; at the same time an independent inquiry is to be made by an officer of the Finance Department, and his definite suggestions will be considered by the Executive Council. As Mr. Samarth pointed out, at every turn you come up against questions of policy, in connection with different branches of particular services, and these cases must come to the Council as a whole. They are to be presented by that double method. It was suggested in the Council of State that non-officials ought to be associated in this inquiry; and here also the point has been made both by Dr. Gour and Mr. Samarth, that the country at large will not be satisfied unless they obtain a certificate from non-officials or from Members of the Assembly that everything has been done in the way of retrenchment. Well, Sir, I may inform the House that it has been decided by the Governor General in Council to associate four non-officials with the official who is examining the case of every department. That then is the practical difference between the two methods suggested. There is not the further difference that Dr. Gour's speech would seem to indicate. For when he said that what he wanted was to appoint a Committee for the purpose of enforcing retrenchment, he could not really have meant this, because the terms of his Resolution run—and they are the only terms on which they

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

could run—that a Committee should be appointed to report on economies possible. No Committee of this House, nor indeed any Committee whether appointed by us or by this House, could take out of the hands of the Executive Government the actual responsibility for deciding on the expenditure to be curtailed. It could only advise.

Now, what is the best method of getting this advice? We claim that the best method is to have a highly experienced officer to examine the case of every department, and to associate with him four non-officials; incidentally I should mention that we should like to have two non-officials from this House and two from the other. We should like in addition to be able to consult with the members of the Houses before they are appointed, and appoint them after such consultation. Is it a good scheme, and will it secure what we want? (*Dr. Gour*: 'No.') I say that the scheme will secure retrenchment by the best agency we can command, for we have not here the class of *ex-Cabinet* Ministers such as have been placed on the Super-Axe Committee at Home.

What we all want is retrenchment. If we are to have an ordinary Committee, I believe that this will not be such an effective weapon as that which we ourselves propose to provide, and in any case I say this, that in the first place retrenchment ought to be made by Government itself, and Government ought to be given a chance of setting seriously about it. That was done at Home. The Departments were first given a definite mandate for retrenchment and I believe secured sixty million pounds by it. In the present case we have attempted to devise a procedure which will give Government that first chance of securing retrenchment; but we have also agreed that non-officials should be associated with us in order that there may be some security to the country that we are doing the best we can to reduce our expenditure to the lowest possible figure. That is the proposal I put before the House. I should ask *Dr. Gour* and his friends here, who are anxious for retrenchment, to consider whether, in the first instance, it is not advisable to adopt the procedure I have suggested, and if afterwards it is found that it has not achieved the end in view, the House still has its remedies. The first duty lies on the Government, and the first opportunity should be given to Government.

Sir Frank Carter (Bengal: European): Sir, I, as a non-official European Member, wish to support *Dr. Gour's* Resolution, but, in doing so, I do not wish this House to think that I at all agree with what he has said in his speech. I would first like to draw his attention to the fact that he wants to reduce the British Army in India. I don't think that he can realise, at the present time, with all this non-co-operation, civil disobedience, riots, etc., going on, what the result would be of reducing the British Army. The British Army has already been reduced, and, I think, it would be a very serious matter if it was reduced still further.

There is one other point to which *Dr. Gour* alluded, and that is the Air Force. Personally I was very pleased to see in the paper the other day, that the Air Force is going to take charge on the North-West Frontier. I think that this is a jolly good stunt.

As regards *Mr. Samarth's* remarks, I entirely agree with what he has said, especially as regards contracts for sugar, etc. I know something about sugar.

I am pleased to see in the paper this morning that a Special Officer has been appointed to inquire into retrenchment; but, I don't think that this is enough. We know that the Super-Tax Committee has been sitting at Home on the subject of retrenchment, and it is hoped that a reduction may be made to the extent of some millions of pounds. I don't think it is unreasonable for us to hope that, if a Committee is appointed to inquire into retrenchment here, we shall be able to make reductions of several crores of rupees.

At the last Budget debate, I brought forward a Resolution that Stamps and Stationery should be reduced by ten lakhs. That was carried by the House, and was also accepted by Sir Thomas Holland; I understand that a reduction has been made this year to the extent of about 8½ lakhs. If this can be done in one Department, what can not be done in several other Departments?

But there is one thing that I do wish to ask Government, and that is, whether any retrenchments have been suggested to them in their various Departments, whether these have been adopted; and whether they have been given a trial. I understand not. If that is the case, then, I do not think that the appointment of a single Officer with four non-officials associated with him is sufficient. We want a Committee of this House (Hear, hear), and not merely an Officer with four non-officials associated with him. That is the reason why I think that the Honourable the Finance Member has not gone far enough. I am well aware that the Honourable the Finance Member is himself very much in favour of retrenchment. I know it, because I hear so many remarks about his stinginess. But it looks to me very much as if there are some Departments in the Government which do not want retrenchment. It is very easy to go on in the old style, to run along the straight road, but that is not what we want now. We must have retrenchment. Sir, I wish to support, heartily, Dr. Gour's Resolution.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta : Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, when there is so perfect an agreement and accord between Members on both sides of the House on the cardinal issues involved, I do not see what difficulty there is in accepting the Resolution as it stands. I quite believe that Sir Malcolm Hailey is himself as concerned in economy as any of us—in fact much more. He is the best abused man on both sides of this House and outside, for he cannot please all or any. When he has to come to the House with his deficit Budget, he would naturally want that the deficit should be as small as possible and we all want to help him. What is it that this Resolution is seeking? A Committee of officials and non-officials, whose choice and appointment will be in the hands of the Government. It is sufficiently elastic for all purposes. The Honourable the Finance Member has indicated, in a spirit which we all appreciate, that the Government of India is willing to associate four non-official Members with an official who is going to make inquiries exactly of the kind that the Resolution indicates. It is only a quarrel about terms, or a question of ways and means, of machinery. A Committee of this House would have powers which the advisory board associated with the officer will not have. (*The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey* : 'How?') Because questions of policy and not mere details will have to come up if for nothing else—questions of policy which will have to be endorsed by the Assembly as well as by the Government of India; and questions of policy as well as questions of detail can best be gone into by a properly constituted Committee such as this Resolution seeks to achieve. I

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

am aware that in the Council of State an assurance was given, but that did not meet the requirements of the case. I do not think that the assurance conveyed by the Honourable the Finance Member will meet the requirements of the case in this Assembly either, and we hope the voting here will be different. We ought to insist upon and have the Committee of Inquiry that has been suggested here. We are not going to constitute ourselves in this Assembly here into a Committee of Inquiry and go into the details or the merits of the cases that have been quoted or challenged. It is apparent to all that a strong *prima facie* case has been made out and that ought to be enough. The Honourable the Finance Member himself has stated that the Government is taking active steps regarding anti-waste. Sir Godfrey Fell has also said so. It reminds me of London posters in the recent Parliamentary elections, where every candidate was putting himself forward as an anti-waste candidate and some were absolutely the other way. Somebody called it an admirable camouflage. I do not think that there is any idea of camouflage or sheep-skin here. But every one is anti-waste according to his light and still waste goes on. Why is it so? Should we not insist on focussing the light and finding proper remedies? I associate myself with Sir Frank Carter and Mr. Samarth in the idea that we do not suggest a reduction of the Army. All that we want is reduction of waste in expenditure. Sir Godfrey Fell told us that we must not mind waste in war time. Even when waste is pointed out and even when waste can be avoided, is it to be said that waste is to go on? We have heard of military schools of various kinds, schools where instruction proper is imparted to members of the Army, and also the other kind of schools where would-be staff officers are to be trained for contingencies. Do we not know, Sir, the glorious 'contemptibles' who joined the Army and really won the war, were not long in training, and do we not know the admirable work the so-called untrained Army has done? We want to avoid the mistakes of the past. But is it really necessary to keep up indefinite training and nursing like that? These are questions that cannot be gone into by the Routine officer that has been appointed, if he be not associated with non-official Members. I admit he ought to be very useful in preparing cases and getting information and material.

Then, Sir, if further points were needed for making out a *prima facie* case, it is not difficult to suggest them. Sir Frank Carter has referred to the Stamps and Stationery Department and the possibility of reduction there. Matters have gone further than last year, and I think a case may well be made out for the total abolition of the Stationery Department and assigning its functions to the different Departments concerned which can without much difficulty each get their stationery under co-ordinated systems that can be devised, and it may not be necessary to keep up a central body. Each Department can deal with its own stationery under its own contingent grants that can be carefully guarded. Judging by the broad smiles across, I see that it is not a point that appeals to Members on the other side of the House. It may not immediately appeal to others. It is well worth consideration, however, whether that cannot be done because some think it can be. In the same way, Sir, take the Auditor General, who has taken place of the Comptroller General, and look at the way a large body of officers have sprung up round, about and below him, more or less unnecessarily. Then there is the excess number of military officers not dealt with by Sir Godfrey Fell. Other things will suggest themselves to other

Members. I do not say that everything that we may suggest must necessarily be right. We suffer from want of information, probably want of training also, and the Committee that will go into the subject will be able to get proper information and material with honest official help, for I believe many officials are genuinely anxious for retrenchment. They will be able to examine matters carefully and in an authoritative way.

I am very grateful to Sir Godfrey Fell for his appreciation of the way in which the appeal for Territorials has, under the circumstances and with the prevailing handicap, been responded to. That is a sort of appreciation that we do not unfortunately get everywhere and the movement is not encouraged. Nobody looks into matters properly and everybody criticises ruthlessly. For example, in Bengal we heard that the response was very poor. Nobody looked into matters close enough, and facilities are yet not forthcoming. These are matters that we want to bring up and we want to show how the Territorial movement can succeed and corresponding expenditure can be reduced. Rupees 250 may be enough to efficiently equip a man recruited for the Territorials with rifles and some necessary articles, as Dr. Gour suggests. But that is not all. Here it may be a case not for retrenchment but really for enhancement, for expenditure in the real interest of the movement. If the Territorials are to be placed on a sound footing, and genuinely relieve the military only at an increased expenditure, that also is a matter that can be gone into. Reference has been made to the needless Education Department. I am afraid that I cannot agree with all that Dr. Gour said with regard to this and some other matters. Education is no doubt a transferred subject. There is, however, a great deal that can, should and must be done in the Central Government, particularly with regard to research and technology, and you do want a strong if reformed Education Department here to co-ordinate work and avoid duplication. That may not be Dr. Gour's point of view, but that is the sort of matter that can be gone into by a Committee of the kind that this Resolution asks for and not by mere associates of an official.

All these considerations are a strong *prima facie* case for careful and authoritative inquiry that will command confidence and beget confidence. Like the Geddes Anti-waste Businessmen Committee, this Committee may not be able to achieve much, specially if departmental heads are to be guilty of hoodwinking, with which we would not think of charging them but which Sir Malcolm Hailey gratuitously apprehends may take place under certain circumstances. Those conducting the inquiry can be sufficiently on their guard only if they be responsible, and have such authority as the adoption of this motion will give. In view at least of these considerations, I think the Assembly ought to accept this motion and unmistakably declare that the announcement which Sir Malcolm Hailey has made is not enough to meet the requirements of the case.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban) : Sir, I do not think I should take the time of this House much in speaking in support of this motion. I was rather surprised to hear Sir Frank Carter stating that the army should be maintained for the purpose of protecting the Government against the people of the country. It is a very novel proposition indeed for any Government to entertain that an army should be maintained for protecting itself against the people of the country. Armies are maintained all over the world against external aggression and for defence against foreigners, but to maintain an army

[Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

for the purpose of defending a Government against the people, well, it is the first time I hear that on the floor of this House: and I am surprised also that my friend Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary says he takes no exception to that statement.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: No, not to that.

Rao Bahadur T. Rangachariar: I stand gladly corrected. Sir, it is a very very vital question to go into as to whether any Government is justified in maintaining a costly army in order to protect itself against the people. I say, no army should be maintained for such a purpose. You must tackle the problem in the best possible way, and produce a contentment and satisfaction of the people that will make the people a part of the Government and not the people against the Government. Sir, it is very important that we should have a strong Committee. The task of the Committee will be a most unpleasant one; it will be a most responsible one; and I should like to have the assistance of expert outsiders in a task of this sort. Sir, it may be that the Committee may have to recommend the reduction of the number of Executive Councillors of the Governor General. I do not think there is need for six Councillors indeed to deal with the administration of the country. I do not think there is necessity for so many Departments. I do not think there is need for so many superintending officers, supervising officers, directing officers, Directors General, Deputy Directors General, Assistant Directors General, Superintending Engineers, Chief Superintending Engineers and all the others. In fact there is a large mass of supervising staff which, I think, might fairly be dispensed with. It is all very well no doubt to aim at efficient administration. But, Sir, there is a point beyond which the country cannot bear efficient administration. Can it be contended that nearly 35 per cent. of the revenues of the country should be spent, and that expenditure defended, on maintaining an army in any country? Does it not require close investigation? And, again, can it be contended that a country like ours can afford to pay such high costly salaries? Should not Indians be content with less pay? And should not attempts be made, and a programme be chalked out, of gradually Indianising the services and fixing an Indian pay? It is all very well to talk of retrenchment by abolishing a few clerks here and a few peons and menials there: that is not the sort of retrenchment we want; we want retrenchment in the high quarters; we want a change of policy; we want really to protect ourselves against the financial burden, which has become very heavy indeed. It will be, as I stated, a troublesome task, an unpleasant task, a responsible task; it may be a prolonged task also; I do not think you can effect all that you have in view in a month or two, as some expect; it requires patient investigation, and this Committee, Sir, ought to be assisted by a very independent officer. No Committee can perform its task. No lay Committee like the one which we want to appoint can perform its task without the assistance of an independent expert. The officer who will be placed on duty in that connection should not be on the establishment of any of the Departments in which retrenchment is going to be effected. He should be quite independent of all the Departments. His salary, for instance, should be placed on the estimates of this House like that of the President of this Assembly. We want an independent gentleman like him, and at the same time one who is an expert and will know where exactly to find the weak spot. Such an officer should be associated with the Committee proposed in

the Resolution. Sir, I heartily support this motion and I hope that good results will come out of it.

Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas (Sind : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I do not propose to follow the debate into the new channel to which it has been diverted, *viz.*, the maintenance of an army for the defence of the Government against the people. I think that that is a question upon which we need not enter just now. All that I wish to say is that those people who are in touch with the army, the commissariat and supply and transport, are generally of the opinion that there is a good deal of leakage going on. Perhaps Sir Godfrey Fell and Sir Malcolm Hailey do not realise what people are feeling on the subject, and they cannot in their position probe the depths and ascertain the true state of things. I am therefore strongly of opinion that, not only in this branch of military administration, but in several other branches also, there is a good deal of room for retrenchment. When the Treasury Bench was replying to this debate, I did not at first understand their attitude, because Sir Godfrey Fell's speech was merely a defence of Government's policy. But when he was followed by the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey, it dawned upon us that Government quite agreed with us on the question that retrenchment was necessary, but the difference related only to the question of method. The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey advocated his own method, namely, that four Members of the two Assemblies should be associated with a special officer. All that we are now concerned with is, whether that method is preferable to the one suggested by Dr. Gour in his Resolution, which has been supported by several speakers and especially by Sir Frank Carter. I add my testimony to that of Sir Frank Carter that everything is not fair and square so far as the contract system is concerned. But—to come back to the point as to which of the two methods is preferable. I think it is quite clear, and I hope the whole House will be convinced that the method suggested in the Resolution is by far preferable to that suggested by Sir Malcolm Hailey; for the principal consideration, that the Committee to be appointed by this House, will carry a great deal of the confidence of the people. That is one consideration. Another point is that that Committee, if they are convinced by the Government Departments or by the special officer concerned that everything is all right, will come back to this House and give a certificate to Government, and so much the better for Government. Why should not the Government be prepared to lay all its cards on the table? I think they will be entirely in agreement with that view, and at any rate they ought to be, because when I heard the opening words of Sir Malcolm Hailey's speech, I drew the conclusion that he was going to accept the Resolution. But then, while accepting the principle underlying the Resolution and while approving of the speech of Mr. Samarth, he diverted to the position that a Committee should not be appointed but that his suggestion should be adopted. I say, Sir, that Sir Malcolm Hailey has not been able to make out a strong case for the adoption of his suggestion, because those Members who he wishes to be associated with the special officer will not serve the same purpose as a Committee. For the reason—as Mr. Rangachariar has pointed out, and I quite agree with him—that that special officer should have nothing to do with the Committee. As it is, those officers will be probably dominating. These four Members of the different Houses might not be able to do the duty in the same manner as the Committee suggested in the Resolution would do. There is also another point. With due deference to the view that has just now been put forward by

[Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas.]

Government Members, I, for one, think that there are always different angles of vision from which to look at this question. Government Members conscientiously and honestly will be thinking that some particular items of expenditure are justifiable and should be continued. On the other hand, Members of the Committee who will be representing the people and who will have the angle of vision with which the people look at this question, will be able successfully to point out to Members of Government that their point of view is wrong and that retrenchment is possible in these directions and if they are able to convince the Government and if they are able to convince the House, to which this question will be eventually referred, then we shall be able to come to a right decision. I might say that Government may rest assured that whatever Members are appointed to the Committee in pursuance of this Resolution, they will be perfectly reasonable men, not pig-headed and mulish to insist upon their own view in spite of the reasonableness of the case of Government. I am perfectly sure that if Government Members are able to convince them that for the good of the country such and such departments should be retained or that such and such expenditure should be retained, they will certainly agree with the Government. (Hear, hear.) That being the case, I think Government ought not to oppose this Resolution, but support and accept it.

Mr. J. Chaudhuri (Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions : Non-Muhamadan Rural) : Sir, I think the reforms will not be either popular or a success in the country unless we can show that it has resulted in the reduction in the cost of administration and that more money has been diverted for the development of the country. We may have a partiality for efficiency, but the people outside think that the administration in this country is much too costly. When that is the popular view, we have to take note of it. What is the scheme of the reforms ? The scheme of the reforms is decentralisation, decentralisation of the administration, and if that decentralisation is being brought about we do not see why the Central Government should continue to be as costly as before, and why the cost of central administration should go on increasing. That is the general impression amongst the Members here and the people of the country outside and it is desirable that a Committee should be appointed, largely composed of elected representatives of this House, to inquire into every department of administration and submit a report as to how the cost of administration in the different departments of the Government of India may be reduced. India is a poor country, if not the poorest country in the world. (*Voices* : 'No', 'no'.) I mean, the civilized world, and I repeat that India is one of the poorest countries in the civilized world. It is Macaulay who said that it is poorer than Portugal. I shall try to satisfy the House that this is so. The average individual income of an Indian, according to Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, is Rs. 10 or a little more and according to Lord Curzon, who laboured hard to controvert this, it is Rs. 30, whereas the average income per head in England (I am speaking from recollection) is more than £30. So, I say, India is one of the poorest countries and the administration of this country is undoubtedly very costly. Therefore it is for us, as representatives of the people, to see that the cost of the administration is reduced and that not much additional burden is thrown on the tax-payers. India is in need of development, educational development, sanitary development, industrial development. If taxation has got to be imposed, it must be imposed for the purpose of the development of the country, not for maintaining a much costlier administration or for increasing the cost of the military.

So I say that the method that we should adopt is, that we should appoint a Committee of the House to inquire into every department of the Central Administration, and that the Committee should, in consultation with the Members in charge of the various departments, and with assistance of the heads of departments, examine the present state of things and consider carefully to what extent the expenditure in connection with these departments may be cut down.

I therefore heartily support the Resolution which has been moved by my Honourable friend, and which has been supported by Sir Frank Carter, Mr. Samarth and other speakers.

Mr. P. P. Ginwala (Burma : Non-European) : Sir, many experts in this House have already spoken on the subject, some on this side and some on the other ; but I must confess, that in a contest of this sort, the experts on this side of the House must necessarily have the worst of it, because the Government experts and we are never at arm's length. On such questions, they have in their possession information which they throw in our faces and say : ' Here you are. You accuse us of something, but these are the facts.' That is precisely what has been done this afternoon in some respects. The Honourable Member for Military Affairs, Sir Godfrey Fell, was, it seemed to me, thoroughly unrepentant. We complained that this military expenditure was too high, but he was impenitent. He said : ' Yes, it is too high, but it is all justified. Here and there of course it may be cut down. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has given certain orders, and we are following them.' That was about as far as he could go. Fortunately, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Member was in rather a penitent mood and he did admit, that retrenchment was necessary, but he suggested a method which is not altogether the kind of method that appeals to this House, for it is very much like asking a sheep to shear its own wool for the benefit of the shepherd or asking a patient, first of all, to try a little dose of medicine himself or to try himself to cut off a limb that is suffering from some disease, and, then, if that fails, to consult a doctor. That, Sir, is precisely the procedure that the Honourable the Finance Member suggests. He thinks that it will do if he applies this medicine himself to purge himself of all the diseases from which, we say, he is suffering. On the contrary, we want to be doctors to him and we want to advise and compel him, or rather induce him, to take proper medicine. That is the difference between the procedure that the Honourable the Finance Member proposes and the procedure that is proposed by this House. We want an independent Committee assisted by all the experts of the Government who choose to advise us, but an independent Committee with authority to go into every question which would help us in investigating the sources of waste in every Department. Then only would it be possible for us to come to some definite conclusions which would enable us to cut down our expenditure. We have got to start with this fact, that between 1913-14 and this year, our expenditure has increased from 83 crores to 129 crores. The military expenditure has risen from 26 crores to 62 crores. It may be that there is good reason for this increase, but we want to satisfy ourselves, with your assistance if you will, whether this expenditure is necessary, whether it is in proportion to our needs, and whether it is within our means. If you satisfy us on those points we shall be willing to agree to your going on with your expenditure. If, on the other hand, you do not, we shall certainly insist on your cutting it down.

[Mr. P. P. Ginwala.]

On these grounds, Sir, I support the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend, Dr. Gour.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Sir, after the pronouncement by the Honourable the Finance Member, my task has become comparatively easy. He admits, that I have made out a *prima facie* case for some sort of inquiry, but he suggests, that the best means of making an inquiry would be to appoint a Special Officer with whom should be associated four Members of this and the other House. But, at the same time, the Honourable the Finance Member confessed, that the necessity for this inquiry is not merely to re-examine the whole question, but also to carry out retrenchment, with a view to effect economies and inspire public confidence as well as to convince this House, that the expenditure incurred is the irreducible minimum which is necessary for the administration of the Central Government. Consequently, on the main principle, there is no divergence of opinion between the Honourable the Finance Member and ourselves; but, what we differ on, is the constitution and scope of the Committee which he proposes. The Honourable the Finance Member must admit, that an officer of Government, however able and efficient, cannot possibly sit in judgment over his employers. The Honourable the Finance Member must further admit, that that Officer will merely examine the existing Departments with a view to effecting economies, but he will not, in any way, do the work which I propose a Committee of this House should do. The Honourable the Finance Member says, that a *prima facie* case has been made out, but give us the chance to set our house in order before you appoint a Committee of this House to examine the whole question. I am perfectly certain, that the Honourable the Finance Member will recall what was said from this side of the House during the debate last year, when the necessity for the appointment of a Retrenchment Committee was insisted on by one speaker after another. If the Honourable the Finance Member wanted a *locus poenitentiae*, he has had one, but I do not base my Resolution on that ground.

I desire, that the Committee of this House, with which will be associated such other persons as the Committee may consider necessary for the purpose of making the inquiry into the whole question, should inquire and report not only upon the best method of effecting retrenchment and economies, but upon the general question affecting the working of the central administration with a view to reducing its expenditure. Sir, the Army Contract is a festering sore from which the Army Department suffers. But it is a well-known fact that those who play the game do not see the points which on-lookers sometimes see, and I, therefore, ask the Honourable the Finance Member, that we in this House, may be able to offer him suggestions which may be found useful to him. I ask, Sir, that this Committee should be appointed, firstly, because it will inspire public confidence, secondly, because it will be a Committee which will be in the confidence of this House and whose report will satisfy the Members of this Assembly. If the Committee suggested by the Honourable the Finance Member is appointed, I venture to submit, that it will neither inspire public confidence nor convince the Members of this House. The Honourable the Finance Member himself has given no reason why a Committee, such as I suggest, should not be appointed. He has merely made an alternative proposal, but he has certainly not shown what

advantage that Committee would have over the Committee which we, on this side of the House suggest for appointment.

I am glad, Sir, that the beginning of such a Committee has already been made by the Honourable the Finance Member; he tells us that a Special Officer has been appointed by Government. I hope that it will be possible to appoint that Officer as Secretary of this Committee. I ask the Honourable Members of this House to support my Resolution.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Sir, it would have been a great pleasure to me had I been able to accept this Resolution exactly as it stands. It would have been an even greater pleasure, Sir, had I been able to comprehend fully the difference between Dr. Gour and ourselves. What Dr. Gour set out to recommend to the Assembly was that the Governor General in Council should be so pleased as to appoint a mixed Committee of officials and non-officials to inquire into the cost of the Central Government and report on the possibility of effecting economy therein. But throughout his speech I find constant references to a Committee of this House (which was not suggested in his Resolution) and to a report to this House (which again was not suggested in his Resolution). In fact I was in doubt whether he was not at times speaking on some amendment to his own Resolution. I do not gather from the terms of his Resolution that a single member of the Committee would necessarily be taken from this House. Do they really now propose that we should have a Committee of this House and nothing else? Or do they propose that the Governor General in Council should appoint, as is suggested in the Resolution, a mixed Committee of officials and non-officials? What is it exactly that they want? I have told the House what action I am prepared to take, and I maintain that, in spite of the fact that it does not seem to meet with the full acceptance of Dr. Gour and his friends, that my method affords the best machinery, while it actually gives to the Legislature a representation which the Resolution did not attempt to ask for.

If I wanted to put off retrenchment for a long time, I would at once appoint a Committee; for I know that when a large Committee, a Committee with many different interests and different points of view comes to consider departmental questions, the general conclusion is a compromise. I have seen it not once or twice, but I have seen it a dozen times. When I want a cutting weapon, I select the keenest I can find and I believe that the cutting weapon I have devised is a far better one than any general Committee, whether it is a Committee appointed by the Governor General of officials and non-officials or whether it is a Committee of this House only.

Mr. President: The question is :

‘This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to be so pleased as to appoint a mixed Committee of officials and non-officials to inquire into the cost of the Central Government and report on the possibility of effecting economy therein.’

The motion was adopted.

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