

9th 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.

MONDAY, 6TH FEBRUARY, 1922

- 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.

2221-2243

TUESDAY, 7TH FEBRUARY, 1922

- The Indian Limitation (Amendment) Bill.
- The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
- Resolution *re* : Suppression of Traffic in Women and Children.
- The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill.
- Discussions in Select Committee.

2245-2282

WEDNESDAY, 8TH FEBRUARY, 1922

- Presentation Ceremony and Royal Durbar.
- The Indian Lunacy (Amendment) Bill.
- Resolution *re* : Committee on New Arms Rules, 1920.
- Disturbances in the United Provinces.
- Resolution *re* : Withdrawal of Martial Law in Malabar.
- Disturbances in the United Provinces.

2283-2342

THURSDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY, 1922

- Oath.
- Question and Answer.
- Unstarred Question and Answer.
- Statement of Business.
- Resolution *re* : Improvement of Medical Education in India.
- Resolution *re* : Equality of Status for Indians in Africa.

2343-2400

SATURDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 1922

- Questions and Answers.
- Unstarred Questions and Answers.
- Governor General's Assent to the Benares Hindu University (Amendment) Bill.
- Resolution *re* : Indianisation of the Services.

2393-2428

MONDAY, 13TH FEBRUARY, 1922

- 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 Exhibition.
Resolution *re*: Prohibition of Traffic in Minor Girls.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 9th February, 1922.

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

MEMBER SWORN.

Raja Rajendra Narayan Bhanja Deo, O.B.E., of Kanika, M.L.A.
(Bihar and Orissa: Landholders).

QUESTION AND ANSWER.

SCHOOLS FOR TRAINING MEN AND WOMEN TELEGRAPHISTS.

177. **Mr. N. M. Joshi:** (1) Will Government be pleased to give a list of schools conducted or aided by Government for training men and women telegraphists for the Telegraph Department and the annual recruitment for each, mentioning which schools are for (a) Europeans and Anglo-Indians, and (b) Indians?

(2) Will Government be pleased to state the scale of grants paid to aided telegraph schools or classes attached to schools?

(3) Will Government be pleased to state whether any Indian schools have been ever invited to open such classes on the Grant-in-Aid system, and if so, with what result?

(4) Will Government be pleased to give the figures relating to the annual recruitment of telegraphists to the Department during the last three years for (a) General, and (b) Station Services, and what are their scales of pay?

Colonel Sir S. D'A. Crookshank: (1) Attention is invited to the reply given to Mr. Muhammad Faiyaz Khan in the Legislative Assembly in September 1921. Since that reply was given, a class for non-Indian boys has been opened in the Bombay Educational Society's High School at Byculla, Bombay. Each class consists of not less than 8 pupils in the first year and not less than 12 after the first year. The total number of recruits annually is not a fixed quantity, but varies according to the requirements of the Department.

(2) For every candidate trained in a Telegraph Training Class attached to a selected school and admitted into the Department, a bonus of Rs. 100, if he is drafted into the General Service, and Rs. 70, if into the Station Service, is paid to the school by the Telegraph Department. This payment is irrespective of any grants payable by any other Departments of Government.

(3) A copy of the rules under which telegraph classes can be opened in schools was sent to all Postmasters-General for communication to all schools where there was a possibility of opening classes, and two schools training Indian candidates were selected. There has been no expansion recently of

the system, as the requirements of the Department are being met by the existing arrangements.

(4) The average number of telegraphists recruited during the last three years is as follows:

					General Service.	Station Service.
1918-19	154	Nil
1919-20	129	Nil
1920-21	122	195

The Station Service was introduced in the Department only from the 1st December 1919. The scales of pay are as follows:

General Service	.	.	Rs. 80—5—100—10—250 (Efficiency Bar at the stage of Rs. 200).
			{ At Calcutta, Rangoon, Bombay, Madras and Karachi (A Service)
			Rs. 70—5—160 (Efficiency Bar at the stage of Rs. 115).
Station Service	.	.	{ At any other place where adopted (B Service) Rs. 60—5—150.
			(Efficiency Bar at the stage of Rs. 105).

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Does not the Government see the necessity of opening more classes in Indian schools?

Colonel Sir S. D'A. Crookshank: I will inquire into that question and give the Honourable Member a reply later on.

MR. GANDHI'S CHARGES AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT.

Dr. H. S. Gour: May I ask the Honourable the Home Member to reply to my question, of which he has been supplied with notice?

Mr. President: When an Honourable Member wishes to ask a question by private notice he must submit it to the Chair as well.

Dr. H. S. Gour: May I ask for the reply, with your permission?

The Honourable Sir William Vincent: Sir, I have not seen any written question myself, but I received oral notice that I was to be asked a question as to the action, if any, the Government intended to take in regard to the recent statement made by Mr. Gandhi. The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to that statement. The Government have already made an announcement on the 6th of February which contains a full statement of their policy, and they have given a more detailed explanation of it in this Assembly. They have nothing to add to those pronouncements.

As regards the specific charges of misconduct made in Mr. Gandhi's last statement, I will have inquiries made from the Local Governments as to the truth of the allegations and I will place any information I receive at the disposal of the Honourable Member. But I must remind the Assembly that all these questions are really matters for Provincial Administrations to deal with, and many of them have, I believe, been taken up, or are being investigated by Local Governments. I would also ask the Assembly not to place too much reliance on vague statements of this kind, bearing in mind the fact that similar allegations, those, for instance, regarding the jail administration in Delhi, have proved to be without foundation. There are two particular charges, however, to which I must draw attention. One relates to the dispersal of unlawful assemblies by force, and I want to make it quite

clear that, where it is necessary to disperse unlawful assemblies and such assemblies refuse to disperse when ordered to do so by competent authority, it is the intention of the Government that, as in all other countries, they should be dispersed by force when this is necessary. In such cases force is the only remedy.

In the second place, attention is drawn in this statement of Mr. Gandhi's to the question of searches and arrests by night. The Government of India will give no undertaking that searches and arrests will not be made by night or by day, as may be found necessary.

There is one more point to which I shall refer, and that is the statement that a special form of pledge has been devised to be signed by volunteers with the deliberate purpose of keeping out all but men of approved character. I want the Assembly to bear in mind the recent tragic occurrence at Gorakhpur, where so many servants of the Crown have lost their lives, and to consider whether that is any indication that this new pledge is being kept. In my judgment, it remains for Mr. Gandhi to consider that occurrence in the light of some of the remarks which he made after the more fatal disturbances in Bombay.

UNSTARRED QUESTION AND ANSWER.

CONTROLLER OF CONTRACTS ORGANISATION.

255. **Mr. K. C. Neogy:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the Controller of Contracts organisation at present attached to the Quartermaster General's Branch, Army Headquarters, is a central agency set up mainly, if not wholly, for the wholesale and economical purchasing of foodstuffs, petrol oils, lubricants, mineral fuel and other miscellaneous supplies for the Army in India and abroad;
- (b) whether proposals are at present under consideration of Government for placing the above organisation on a permanent basis in view of its proved utility to Government as considerably economising expenditure of military funds on supplies arranged by it: if so, the approximate date by which the organisation will be made permanent and its exact future status, i.e., whether it will be absorbed in the Quartermaster General's Branch or will remain as a separate office directly under the control of the Commander-in-Chief;
- (c) whether it is a fact that the first Controller was an eminent businessman of Calcutta, and whether, on his relinquishing the appointment, it has throughout been and is even now held by Supply and Transport Corps Officers? If so, what are the business qualifications of each of these officers to hold the appointment?

Sir Godfrey Fell: (a) The Controller of Contracts administers a separate organisation, which is controlled directly by the Quartermaster General in India. The purpose of this organisation is as stated.

(b) The question of making this organisation permanent is at present under the consideration of Government. The future status of the Controller

of Contracts will depend upon the decision which His Majesty's Government may make regarding the recommendations of the Army in India Committee on the subject of the creation of the appointment of a Surveyor-General.

(c) The answers to the first two parts of this question are in the affirmative. As regards the third part, the senior officers of the Supply and Transport Corps have considerable experience in the purchase of supplies.

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir William Vincent (Home Member): Sir, may I make a statement of the legislative business to come before the House next week? On Monday, the 13th February, the following Bills, which were passed by the Council of State and laid on the table of the Assembly on the 1st of February, will be taken into consideration, and, if the Assembly so thinks fit, will, it is hoped, be passed:

- (1) A Bill to repeal certain provisions of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908.
- (2) A Bill to repeal certain special enactments supplementing the ordinary criminal law.

The Report of the Select Committee on Standing Orders will probably be taken into consideration on the same date and Standing Orders, as amended by the Committee, will be passed, if approved by this Assembly.

RESOLUTION *RE*: IMPROVEMENT OF MEDICAL EDUCATION IN INDIA.

Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated Anglo-Indian): Sir, the Resolution which stands in my name reads as follows:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to appoint a Committee of professional experts, half to be obtained from the United Kingdom in consultation with the General Medical Council, and the other half from India, to tour India and to inquire into the training that is obtained in the various Medical and Surgical institutions, both official and non-official, and to submit recommendations with a view to bringing the Indian institutions, in all respects, on a level with those of the United Kingdom and thereby creating in India a suitable field of recruitment for its entire Medical Services.'

The Resolution that I am putting before this House places me in a position of some singularity inasmuch that I have not got any medical man here to contest what I am to say. It also leads me to state my disappointment and regret that there is not a Medical Member attached to this House sitting on the Government Benches, for, I submit, in such intensely professional matters it will be much better for me to be replied to by a medical man, especially when the Indian Medical Service and the medical needs of India are very prominent before the country to-day. The Service is represented most worthily by the Member who holds this portfolio, but at the same time, Sir, in these intensely scientific subjects, it is much better that they are dealt with first-hand by a medical man. Sir, I feel I am entitled to talk with some authority on this matter, and, as such, I feel that I

should be thrusting my opinion on this House and they may think, as a professional man, what I say is correct. Sir, I speak with some authority, because I have received my training in India, in London, in Edinburgh, in Oxford and in Cambridge, in all of which places I have qualified and received my degrees. I feel I can, therefore, speak with some authority. My Resolution is the sequel of one that was moved at the last Simla Session by Mr. Subrahmanayam. Honourable Members of this House will remember that at that Session Mr. Subrahmanayam pointed out to this House a certain letter which was received from the General Medical Council, in which he showed, or tried to show, the discourtesy extended to India, as compared with the courtesy given to the English schools. This House will remember that, on that occasion, it expressed itself in no uncertain terms regarding this Resolution. The General Medical Council, no doubt, was informed of this and they acted in a very wise manner inasmuch that they have extended their grace regarding the affiliation of Indian Universities and graduates, to a longer period than they had intended doing. To place themselves in a more secure position and to justify this extension of grace, they have taken it upon themselves to send out a representative, named Dr. Norman Walker. Now, it will be necessary to know what Dr. Norman Walker is going to do or why he is coming out. I believe I am right in thinking (but I am open to correction) that Dr. Norman Walker has come out in consultation with the Government of India. I do not know whether the provincial Governments have been consulted in this matter. I am told that he left England on the 13th of last month and should be here now or will shortly be in India.

To Dr. Norman Walker's staff is to be appointed one of the most capable officers of the Indian Medical Service to help him—I refer to Colonel Needham who is the Deputy Director General of the Indian Medical Service—and, when he tours each province, he is to be aided by, I believe, two or three non-official Medical members. His intention, I understood, at first was to inquire into our defective system of midwifery training, but I have since learnt that his inquiry will embrace a larger field, inasmuch as he will find out the various rules which govern our institutions, with a view to placing before the General Medical Council his opinion as to whether our schools should or should not continue to be affiliated by the General Medical Council in England. I believe that is correct. Now, the Committee that I propose in this Resolution goes many steps further. It is to inquire into all our medical needs and the object is to advise the various Governments regarding the defects in their medical training with a view to bringing them up to equality with the best in Europe. Before I go further into this matter, it is perhaps necessary for me to enter into some little detail as to the training that is at present given to medical students in the Indian Universities and Colleges. I make one exception, and that is Madras, for, I believe, that Madras stands *par excellence* about the best medical institution in India, so far as medical training is concerned. The training of our students devolves on two sets of tutors or teachers or professors. The first is the Indian Medical Service and the other is the tutorial staff consisting mainly of Assistant Surgeons or those who have qualified in the Indian Universities. There is no doubt it is the current belief that most of these professorial appointments, or the best of them, are held and retained by the Indian Medical Service officers. •I offer no arguments for or against the

[Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

justice or wisdom of this retention, but I believe that is the current opinion in India. At the same time, I must admit that the selection for these appointments amongst the Indian Medical Service is not always of the best; I mean by this that it does not always depend entirely on merit. These Professors devote an hour or two daily to the training of the students, a few hours to their hospital work and the rest of the time is, I believe (and very rightly so, as I did myself) devoted to maintaining a lucrative private practice. Now, it is well known that most of the members of the Indian Medical Service, to which I belonged, are birds of passage. The result is that the preliminary, and in some cases more than the preliminary, training devolves on the second class of teachers, *viz.*, Assistant Surgeons. I call them Assistant Surgeons, because they generally are of the M. B., B. S. or the L. M. S. type and enter that service in Government. They are young, inexperienced, and newly-fledged doctors, who, for their own benefit and their own experience, keep on for a year or two, and in some cases longer, on the residential staffs of our various hospitals. They are very rarely, if ever, permanent men. I must, at the same time, admit that there are a few good professorial chairs given to Indian Medical men. Bombay is an example of this. But, at the same time, there is no doubt a feeling that these appointments are few and far between. Now, what is the result of this training? Our graduates are imperfectly trained compared to the European schools and graduates. They are absolutely devoid, or to a large extent devoid, of any national medical pride. Those wishing to succeed in life and to improve their knowledge are compelled to go to Europe, to England, to the Continent: some go to America and even to Japan. When they return, they look down on their own Indian degrees, and yet India offers the finer field for practical work than any other part of the world. It may surprise this House to know that Indian students who wish to qualify or obtain a degree in ophthalmic surgery (a disease which abounds in India, to which specialists from all parts of the world come to gather experience), ears, throat, teeth, etc., have perforce to go to Europe to acquire this so-called special knowledge.

Our poorer and most brilliant students are therefore penalized, and they have to remain in the background for want of funds to enable them to go to England. It may be pertinent here to ask: 'Why should these brilliant students in India be so penalized, and those who wish to get on in this world be forced to go to England to spend their parent's hard-earned money when India offers the best field, provided efficient training were imparted to them? Why should this be so? I submit, with all respect to those in charge of our various Hospitals in India, that there is a want of skilled staff, which results in deficient and defective training and which in its turn is partly attributable to a parsimonious Government. The Indians, rightly or wrongly, say that, owing to the official monopoly, our institutions are defective, though the staff are very keen indeed in improving things. There is another factor which plays an important part in this defective training, *viz.*, the inferior type of Indian Medical Service men who are coming out to India to-day. The Indian Medical Service was once the most brilliant Service in any part of the world. It consisted of a band of devoted men who gave their lives to this country, and who have made their names in the various branches of research work. The Indian Medical Service at-

tracted the cream of the European schools: to-day it attracts the skimmed milk or the whey, and men of a distinctly inferior professional type, I believe, are now coming out. That applies to the men who are recruited from England. Now let me refer to the men who are *nominated* (not by examination) now in India, the Indians. Before I refer to them, I should like to say something more about the Indian Medical Service. I say that the best of the English schools will not come out to India for various reasons, *viz.*, India, they see now, is not good enough; they realise the unsettled state of the country; the economic conditions press them very heavily; the Service is unattractive to them, and there is not the faintest doubt that the racial feeling which exists to-day is playing a big part in preventing them from coming out. Similar reasons apply to the paucity and inferiority of the other services in India—the Indian Civil Service, the Army, and even, I believe, the Women's Medical Service.

I now come to the Indians. The best Indians of our Universities will not look at the Indian Medical Service, because they can do better in private practice. They say, and very rightly say, that the plums are reserved, not for them but for the Europeans. There is too much colour prejudice and official influence at work; but, whilst on this point, I must make a digression and offer my tribute of gratitude and acknowledgment to the present Director-General of the Indian Medical Service, Sir W. R. Edwards, who, I know, has got the Indian interests deeply and truly at heart.

Let me continue. There is too much of the European hall-mark and the European-trained *versus* the country-born and the Indian-trained at work in official circles. This even applies to our Nurses to-day. Another handicap is this: we cannot go to England, because the European schools are so congested that it is difficult for the Indian to secure admission. I do not think that what I have said here can be refuted in principle. I challenge the Government to do so. Now, who are the sufferers in these conditions? Our hospitals, our students, our graduates, and the women and children of this country whose high mortality still confronts us with awe. Let me now make a mental leap from my Medical Committee to the Reforms. The ultimate goal that we aim at in India to-day is *Swaraj*. To attain this, I submit, we must prepare the ground so far as our medical needs are concerned. Are we doing so to-day? I say emphatically 'No', for there is no national medical pride existing in our institutions, no unification of medical degrees; there is no one—or very few—who is proud of his Indian M. D. or other degrees. It is for this reason mainly that I regret that medicine and the medical administration of this country has been made a transferred provincial subject. I submit that it should have been retained as an Imperial reserved subject, for we might then have got our own Indian General Medical Council. I want to change all this; I want to inculcate some national medical pride; I want to put our house in order, to raise the standard of medical training and make it equal to the very best in Europe; to demand equal recognition by deserving before desiring; to improve our training and to get the best staff possible; to kill the European hall-mark and all these distinctions that stand in our way; to supply our own medical men for the entire medical services, including the army and civil; to make the Service more popular; to have it a first class Service and open to the best men in the world; to recruit freely in India, instead of depending on other countries for our medical men; and to be independent like other Dominion States, to let

[Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

others come to us, not we to them. To shake off the control of the General Medical Council; and to have our own General Medical Council. Such is the *Nirvana* that I am trying to portray; such is the medical *swaraj* that I am trying to put before you to obtain for India and which, I submit, will be obtained by accepting my Resolution.

There is no use saying with one breath, 'We want *swaraj*', and in the next, 'borrow our medical needs from other countries'. Can we obtain this *Nirvana* with the present system which is in force in India? I say emphatically 'No'. It is impossible with the present type of medical men who are coming to India. It merely results in inferior training at the hospitals, when compared with the European schools.

Now, what is the remedy? Appoint a Committee to thoroughly investigate and level up all Hospitals in India and make them the equal of the best in Europe. I am indifferent as to its national constitution, but it must be the very best obtainable and must consist of experts, both European and Indian. Let it tour all important places in India—Calcutta, Bengal, Lahore, Madras—inquiry into our present day training and draft out remedies, however drastic they may be. Of course, it must be admitted that, for a few years to come, we shall have to employ medical experts and specialists from abroad.

What is the constitution of my Committee? Three experts from Europe and three from India, in Medicine, Surgery and Midwifery, with power to co-opt experts in specialistic subjects. Let me compare my Committee with the Committee of Inquiry suggested by the General Medical Council and supported by the Government of India, with its solitary representative on it from the General Medical Council, who, I may *en passant* say, is an eminent Dermatologist, and which will tour the various parts of India receiving the local help of two or three officials and non-official medical men. Can India's legitimate and pressing medical needs be remedied by a skin specialist, however eminent he may be? Do we want our skins improved? If he, as a skilled Dermatologist, removes the cursed colour bar, I, for one, would gradually welcome him to my Committee, for nothing is more needed in India to-day than the complete and final eradication of this cursed colour bar and distinction. To my mind, the two Committees I have put before you are not comparable.

Now, it might be said here that this Committee of mine will interfere very seriously with the provincial Governments. I say that it will not. This interference with provincial Governments is a much hackneyed excuse, conveniently put up on occasions by the Government of India to suit its own convenience. I have no desire to interfere in Provincial Governments with my Committee, but I object to such pious objections and such efforts of platonic homage rendered to provincial sensitiveness. My Committee will not interfere with any provincial Government more than will Dr. Norman Walker and his Committee. Let me ask: Is not the Government of India, the adviser of all provincial Governments? Is not the Legislative Assembly representative of all the provinces? Do we not represent the people of India, and do not the people of India form the various provinces? Of course they do.

I am not out to interfere with or thwart the medical progress in Provinces. I say my Committee is out to help, not to thwart them.

I am not actuated by impertinent curiosity or interference; so, why should the provincial Governments, if they are genuinely desirous of improving their own schools, object to my Resolution or to the Committee? Why should we anticipate that they will say: 'Mind your own business, we will mind ours.' I will no doubt be told that by my Committee I will be poking my nose into provincial hospitals and their working. Well, if I am poking my nose into their affairs, is not Dr. Walker doing the same thing with his Committee, the only difference being that I will be poking more noses than he, possibly much better and more penetrating noses than he? I submit, with all respect, that provincial Governments cannot and should not object to the Committee that I propose in my Resolution. Let me now refer to the expense involved in my Committee: I submit this will be only three times the amount the Finance Committee has already sanctioned for Dr. Walker's Committee, but the greater expense will be more than compensated for by the greater gain. With Dr. Walker we will derive partial gain, whereas with my Committee we will derive more gain and will thoroughly inquire into all the branches of our medical training, and, as you know, the whole is always greater than the part. I repeat, this solitary representative of the General Medical Council cannot possibly be an expert on all our medical needs.

We do not want to improve in midwifery only, as suggested by my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, but in all subjects which, in many cases, are perfunctorily taught in our schools for want of an efficient training staff, and which will be felt more and more as the years go by. We are often told, and no doubt Dr. Walker will repeat it, 'wait a little longer, when there will be more men and better men coming into the Indian Medical Service from England.' I do not believe this for a single moment, and I ask this Honourable House to accept this from me. You may take it from me—and I ask you, with all respect, to do so—that the Indian Medical Service, so far as England as a recruiting ground is concerned, is *absolutely* dead, a past history and a past glory.' We must, therefore, look for our future men from and in India, and now is the time to put our schools in order, so that within a few years they will be able to supply our entire medical needs. If I had the choice, I would say that I would rather have the best from India than the mediocres from Europe. India to-day demands of the very best. She must have that. She cannot supply it herself to-day, but I want her to supply it within a few years. She must do so. My Resolution asks and seeks for this, nothing more and nothing less. In support, Sir, may I be permitted to read just a few extracts from the debate which was held in the Imperial Legislative Council in 1918 upon the Resolution moved by the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri on the Civil Medical Services. Most of these extracts support what I have said here, some reflexly, others directly. The Honourable the Home Member, when he entered into that discussion, said as follows:

'Further, nearly all the officers of the Indian Medical Service possess English degrees and have been trained in England in specialist and practical work, which officers trained in India are generally unable to obtain'—and mark this point—'not through any fault of their own, but simply as the result of local conditions.'

The Honourable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in talking on the same Resolution said as follows:

'We are not blind to the fact that in this country we have not got those medical institutions as you have in England. But I ask you to consider whether the non-existence of these institutions is not the result of the present system of recruiting the Indian Medical Service? So long as you will not look for the recruitment of this

[Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

Service in India, you will not get institutions where the highest education can be imparted. I consider it a matter of regret and of reproach to India that, while it has had such a large number of medical experts and distinguished medical men in its service, there should not be one first-class institution where the higher training could be imparted, and that it should be possible to urge that the absence of these institutions constitutes a difficulty in the way of employing Indians in the higher ranks of the Service.'

Further on, he remarks :

'The real feeling is that medical science should become more nationalised, that the results of medical researches and the advantages accruing from a knowledge of medical science should be retained in India; they should be scattered more broadcast in the country, that they should go down among the people in a larger degree than is possible under present conditions. It is towards that end that it is suggested that a separate Civil Medical Service should be constituted. It is in the interests of humanity that it should be so constituted. Where our existing institutions are deficient, let provision be made for improving them up to the highest standard. Let it be open to Indians as much in practice as it is in theory to obtain a fair share of appointments in the Indian Medical Service, if they prove their merit and worth.'

I have but a few more extracts left. The Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri, in summing up and in reply to a question put by the Honourable Sir William Vincent, said :

'I think it has actually been proposed—it came out abundantly in the evidence—that an Indian, before being admitted to this examination, should be compelled to undergo a hospital course in England. Some fix it at one year, some fix it at a year and a half, and some fix it at two years. That, it seems to me, is not according to free admission, nor contemplating with equanimity the results of the free admission. Let it be remembered too, it is becoming increasingly difficult for us to gain admission into any place of technical training in England.'

Further on, he says :

'It will, at all events, place within the reach of those who want the advancement of this country the services of a body of people who will be patriotic, who after their pensions will remain in India and give the benefit of their matured wisdom to the service of this land.'

The Honourable Surgeon General Sir William Edwards, the Director General of the Indian Medical Service, when speaking on this Resolution, said :

'I will not weary the Council by speaking further on this point, but before touching on the second part of this Resolution, I think it my duty to inform this Council that there is every reason to fear that the Indian Medical Service, unless its conditions are greatly improved, will cease to attract medical men of the highest attainments, either British or Indian. It must, therefore, be mended or ended, and I unhesitatingly maintain that, in the interests of India, the former is the wiser course.'

Truer words were never uttered by any officer in charge of the Service. That statement was made in 1918, four years ago. The question is, has it been mended?

With these few remarks, Sir, I place my Resolution before this House for their consideration, hoping that they will consider it from the various aspects which I have placed before them, and I trust that they will receive it with approval.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi (Education Member): Sir, the deep interest which my Honourable friend, Colonel Gidney, takes in the cause of medical education in this country is, in his case, perfectly

natural, and I am sure Honourable Members will agree with me that, in bringing forward this Resolution, he is actuated by the best of intentions. At the same time, from the various schemes of Indianisation of our Imperial services, many of which have already been adopted and others are in the course of formulation, as well as from the institution of examinations in this country for the purposes of recruitment to those services, Honourable Members will realise that the Government of India are in entire sympathy with the ultimate object which the Honourable Mover has in view.

The question which arises upon this Resolution, therefore, is not one of principle, for in respect of principle we are all in agreement. The question at issue is really one of method, and, in offering the few observations which I intend to make upon this Resolution, I propose to confine myself to that question—that is to say, the question of method.

Sir, it is quite true that the Member in charge of Education in the Government of India is not a medical expert, but the question before the House is not one of a scientific medical proposition with reference to which different medical schools hold different opinions. The question is one upon which, I venture to submit, every Member of this House, be he an expert in medicine or not, is in a position to pronounce a definite opinion.

Sir, a careful analysis of the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend
 12 Noon. will make it clear to Honourable Members that the proposal put forward by him is divisible into three parts. In the first place, there is the proposal for the appointment of a Committee and the constitution of that Committee. There is, in the second place, the nature of the inquiry which this Committee is intended to make; and there is, in the third place, the ultimate object with which that inquiry is to be undertaken. Now, I propose to deal with these three aspects of the proposal embodied in this Resolution separately, in order to show that, while I am in entire sympathy with the object which my Honourable friend has in view, the method proposed by him is entirely misconceived.

Sir, the Honourable Member has referred to what happened in Simla in the September Session. Honourable Members will remember that, during the summer of 1921, the General Medical Council, being very anxious that practical training in Midwifery both in England and in India should be brought up to the requisite standard, took certain action in connection with the training which is being imparted in this country. As I emphasised on that occasion, that action was not based upon any racial or political considerations and was taken by the General Medical Council in the discharge of the statutory obligations which rested upon their shoulders under a Statute passed by the British Parliament. Well, Sir, in connection with the action which was then contemplated by the General Medical Council, a debate took place in this House in its Simla Session, and a certain Resolution, to which I need not refer in detail, was adopted. That Resolution was communicated by the Government of India to the Secretary of State and by the Secretary of State to the General Medical Council. Honourable Members are aware that in response to what was urged by this House and the Government of India, the General Medical Council have postponed the carrying into effect of that Resolution and have sent out Dr. Norman Walker to make inquiries on the spot as to the exact position with regard

[Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

to medical education in this country. As the Honourable the Mover has informed the House, the Government of India have on their own behalf associated Colonel Needham with Dr. Norman Walker in this inquiry, and the proposal is that, when these two gentlemen tour about all over the country, in each Province they will have co-opted with them in their inquiry one official and two non-official medical representatives. It will thus be seen that, in this inquiry, which is about to be inaugurated—I may inform the House that Dr. Norman Walker is already in Delhi and he proposes to address those Members of the two Houses who will be present at the gathering to-morrow upon the nature of the inquiry he has come out to make and upon other matters connected with the subject-matter of this Resolution—well, Sir, we shall have a representative of the General Medical Council, a representative of the Government of India, an official representative of the Provincial Government—meaning one official representative of the Minister—and two non-official medical experts in each Province representing the profession. In these circumstances, I ask: Is it at all necessary, would it not be entirely superfluous on the part of the Governor General in Council, to appoint another Committee of Inquiry, which also is to tour about the country for the purposes mentioned in this Resolution? It seems to me that the proposition, as I have put it, has only to be stated in order that it should be readily accepted by this House.

Again, my Honourable friend himself has admitted that the expenditure involved in the inquiry which he advocates will be, according to him, three times as much as the expenditure involved in Dr. Norman Walker's inquiry. I was not aware that the Government of India were possessed of a superfluity of funds which they could spend on this inquiry and that inquiry. Indeed, we are face to face with a financial stringency unparalleled in the past history of India, and, in these circumstances, when we have an inquiry already actually, practically, going on, or at any rate soon to be commenced in circumstances which I have already explained, does our financial position justify the acceptance by this House of a Resolution involving an expensive inquiry of the kind which my Honourable friend has proposed in this Resolution?

The next point which I wish to place before the House for its consideration is this: What is the nature of the inquiry which the Resolution contemplates? Now, let me invite your attention to the exact wording of the Resolution in this connection. This is how the Resolution runs:

'to inquire into the training that is obtained in the various Medical and Surgical institutions, both official and non-official, and to submit recommendations with a view to bringing the Indian institutions, in all respects, on a level with those of the United Kingdom.'

Now, Honourable Members are aware that, in the new state of things which has been brought into existence by the Reforms Scheme, University education, including medical education, is a transferred provincial subject. What the Resolution asks the Governor General in Council to do is this: to appoint a Committee to inquire into a branch of University education in the provinces when the administration of that subject has been transferred into the hands of Ministers, elected representatives of the people who, in

the discharge of their responsibilities, are answerable to the Provincial Legislative Councils. The latest theory, I understood, was that the Universities ought to be given more and more of an autonomous character in the discharge of their duties, and it seems to me that one of the fundamental principles for the successful working of the Reform Scheme which we, this House as well as the Governor General in Council, have to bear in mind is non-interference with the administration of subjects which, under the Government of India Act, are now transferred provincial subjects. Sir, there may be, and possibly there is, a good deal of truth in what Colonel Gidney has said with regard to the actual state of things obtaining in our educational institutions in the provinces in so far as medical training is concerned. But Colonel Gidney has misconceived the place in which such a proposition ought to be discussed. I am sure my Honourable friends here who represent the Madras Presidency will not be prepared to admit the correctness of any criticism which has been made by my Honourable friend with regard to medical education in their province.

Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney: I made an exception with regard to Madras.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: And I doubt very much, I doubt very much indeed, if the representatives of the Presidency of Bengal, and particularly if amongst them there are any who are Fellows of the Calcutta University, will be prepared to admit that the criticism made by my Honourable friend applies to medical education in that Presidency. Indeed, my recollection is that, when the Resolution with regard to the action which the British Medical Council proposed to take last year was discussed in the Simla Session, loud protests were heard from the Bengal Benches against what was said by my Honourable friend himself with regard to the defects in medical training and medical education in this country. As regards the other provinces, the criticism made by him may be partially or even wholly justified. I do not think it necessary to enter into a discussion of that. But it is the provincial Legislative Councils of those provinces in which medical education is defective which constitute the proper place where such a discussion as this ought to be raised, so that the attention of the Ministers who are in charge of education in those provinces may be invited to the defects obtaining in those systems, with the object which my Honourable friend has in view. That, I submit, is the proper procedure to be adopted in a case like this, and I would earnestly request this House not to accept a Resolution which is calculated to drive a coach-and-four through this sound constitutional principle.

Then, the ultimate object which my Honourable friend has in view, in connection with the inquiry which he has proposed, is embodied in the last words of the Resolution. He seeks to create in India a suitable field of recruitment for its '*entire Medical Services*.' Now, here again I am in entire sympathy with the ultimate object which my Honourable friend has in view. But I would invite the attention of the House to the phrase '*entire Medical Services*'. That phrase includes not only the Indian Medical Service, but it also includes the Provincial Medical Service and the Subordinate Medical Service. Here again the same constitutional objection arises. In regard to the Provincial Medical Service and the Subordinate Medical Service the Governor General has no power whatever, in the conditions which have been brought into existence by the Reform Scheme, to interfere. Those are concerns of the provincial Governments,

[Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.]

exclusively the concerns of the Ministers in the new state of things. It is only the Indian Medical Service which is the concern of the Governor General in Council. Now, with regard to the Indian Medical Service I have one or two observations to make. Our proposals with regard to this Service are now before the Secretary of State, and no orders have yet been passed by the Secretary of State in connection with those proposals. A discussion, therefore, of what the position will be when those orders are passed is now premature. After the Secretary of State has passed his orders, if still a discussion is necessary, that will be the proper time for such a discussion. Moreover, I would like to mention to the House that the question of passing an All-India Medical Registration Act is now under the consideration of the Government of India. And should we, after consulting the Local Governments, be in a position to place before this House an All-India Medical Registration Bill, the next question that will arise will be the constitution of a General Medical Council in India, and in consequence, it seems to me that it is, at this moment, both premature as well as inadvisable to discuss the question raised by my Honourable friend in regard to the Indian Medical Service. On all these grounds, therefore, I appeal to my Honourable friend to withdraw his Resolution, and, in case he insists on a Division, I ask the House to reject the Resolution, not on the ground that the principle involved is one with which the House should not be in sympathy or that the ultimate object is such that the House should pronounce against the Resolution, but on the ground that the remedy placed before the House by my Honourable friend is entirely misconceived.

Rai Bahadur S. P. Bajpai (Lucknow Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, in view of the statement made by the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi, I beg to withdraw my amendment*.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, the angelic rigidity with which Colonel Gidney has chosen to circumscribe himself makes it difficult for us to rush in where he has not feared to tread. I have been trying to find out what super-scientific expert knowledge is necessary to take up his challenge and have failed, for he is fairly intelligible to the laymen. However, I agree with him it is unfortunate that there are no more medical Members, for their ancestors established the British Indian Empire. If, Sir, the next best title were any good, I should urge some on my own behalf. Not only as one who has watched medical education with the keenest possible interest all one's public life, but as one who is the son of a doctor, the brother of doctors and hopes to be the father of a doctor (Laughter), I have some claim, and I admit the need of improvement, for our methods are anything but perfect. My amendment shows, Sir, that I do not agree with the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi in his position that there is no occasion for an inquiry. An inquiry, on the other hand, has been forced on us. An inquiry has been undertaken and that inquiry will not be fully satisfactory. The assent to that inquiry, however, shows that there is not really very much in the constitutional position that the Honourable the Education Member seeks to take

* For the Resolution substitute the following :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he may be pleased to take early steps to bring the Indian medical institutions on a level with those of the United Kingdom and thereby create adequate facilities for the entire recruitment to Indian Medical Services in India.'

up, and I believe central advice and central financing in these matters would be useful and acceptable. I must take exception, however, to the sweeping nature of the inquiry that the Resolution seeks to attain. Representing Bengal and as a Fellow of the Calcutta University, I have no desire to claim perfection on behalf of our medical teaching, for with more resources we can and should do more. It is common knowledge, however, that the Medical Colleges of Bengal and the infant Belgachia College, that has come into existence during the last few years, have, in spite of a tremendous handicap, achieved wonders. I do claim also that the Lahore and Bombay Medical Colleges have done work of which any medical institution similarly situate might be proud.

We are on insecure ground on the question of Midwifery. In September last, the Assembly took up the question and the Resolution here was of great assistance in putting off the evil day. Before the Assembly moved in the matter, the Lytton Committee had taken it up in London and pressed upon the authorities the utter undesirability of interfering with our medical graduates in the way that they proposed to do, because, among other things, one of the surest things that would happen would be agitation for retaliation of a kind that would not be desirable. That representation of the Lytton Committee had some effect on the authorities and they agreed to pause. The Secretary of State also had already taken up the matter and the Resolution of this Assembly was of great assistance in bringing about the inquiry that is represented by Dr. Norman Walker. There were some rather ominous words in Colonel Gidney's speech that I did not understand. Colonel Needham has been deputed, he said, to be on the staff of Dr. Norman Walker. Well, if that is not so, the official Member who will follow me will probably correct Colonel Gidney or me, for I believe Colonel Needham is, and should be, one of the Commission, and not a member of the staff.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: Sir, may I be permitted to make the position clear? I think I stated that Colonel Needham is being associated on behalf of the Government of India with Dr. Norman Walker in that inquiry as a colleague.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: And not as a member of the staff. I am glad to have that assurance, because a great deal may depend upon that, and the position of the provincial associates will also depend upon what Colonel Needham's position on the Commission or Committee may be. Sir, Colonel Gidney has chosen to say, and he may have good reasons for saying, what the General Council of Medical Education in England has not yet thought fit or dared to say with regard to the whole of our medical training. He has said that which the Sadler Commission, which went as far as possible into the question, has not thought necessary or fit to say. The expression of disapproval of the General Council of Medical Education is not with reference to training and teaching in subjects other than midwifery. Midwifery is the only sore point, as far as one knows, with the Council in England, and that is the point with which, I think, we need trouble ourselves for present purposes, and my amendment is directed towards that.

There also I do not admit that the General Council of Medical Education in England occupies a strong position. Nor do I admit that, in the action that they are taking, they have been actuated only by a sense of statutory

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

obligations. The statutory obligations, Sir, have been always there. How is it that, only within the last few years, they have been troubled with considerations like these and found it necessary to threaten withdrawal of recognition of Indian graduates. There would not really be very much the matter with regard to the exclusively Indian position if the threatened withdrawal of recognition came, particularly if the scheme for the Indianization of the services is given early effect to as it ought to be. If the inquiry, to which the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi has referred, for a general All-India Medical Registration Act and the scheme for the formation of an Indian Medical Council fructifies, I do not think it will really matter from this exclusive point of view whether the General Council of the Medical Education in England continues to recognise our graduates or not. But I am sure we do not want to be and cannot in these days afford to be exclusive, insular or isolated. Moreover, there will be some outstanding matters in regard to which we shall still be dependent upon Great Britain particularly with regard to admission to institutions like the Schools of Tropical Medicine, and examinations for the Diplomas of Public Health and other things about which Indian students are naturally keen in England. Unless you are registered on the British register, you cannot be admitted to the Tropical School of Medicine or to the examination for the Diploma of Health and some other Diplomas.

Regarding the Indian Medical Service, we hope, Sir, that we shall very soon achieve all or at least much that we want. So long as that, however, does not come, we are interested in proving to the General Council of Medical Education in England that they are entirely under a misapprehension with regard to the training and teaching here, and I propose to go into the matter a little in detail and show why, if there is to be an inquiry, it ought to be confined to the teaching and training in Midwifery, and need not be of the comprehensive type that Colonel Gidney suggests. It is not the difficulty about the statutory obligations that made the General Council of Medical Education take up the matter so much as the objection of some amiable gentlemen in the Indian Medical Service, who were super-anxious about the efficiency of our training here. The first suggestion, as far as I have been able to find out, about the defective midwifery training was put forward before the Public Services Commission in 1913. Various members of that Service gave evidence before that Commission. They were not very happy that Indian Medical graduates got into the Indian Medical Service within a short time of their arrival in England, as if the Universities and the institutions there could not take care of themselves, they thought it necessary to suggest a time-limit. A sort of incubation was insisted on, and an Indian Medical graduate would have to be there for one, two or three years before he could be permitted to show what he was able to do in examinations and hospitals. Time will not permit me to go into details. Colonel Smith of the Punjab, Colonel Rogers of Bengal and Colonel Elliot of Madras gave their evidence and supported this point of view. They, however, did not succeed, so far as the Public Services Commission was concerned, and Mr. Abdur Rahim's note settled the matter. When they failed with the Public Services Commission, they took their second step. It was a sort of trench warfare that has been going on since 1913. The next trench was the British Medical Association in 1918. They waited in deputation on the Secretary of State and the whole tale of woe about midwifery inefficiency was again laid bare. The Secretary of State reminded the deputation that the Public Services

Commission had gone into the matter very thoroughly and had not supported their case. However, he said:

'I agree that the training must be acquired in this country, but I look forward with confidence to the time when India itself will provide facilities for an all-round medical training.'

That is what Colonel Gidney undoubtedly also aims at, and that, I think, can be achieved without the comprehensive inquiry that he is wanting to have instituted. I need not quote at length what the Secretary of State said on the occasion, but it was fairly decisive. Then came, Sir, the Medical Services Committee in 1919—a sort of *purdah* or *semi-purdah* commission. It did not take the public into its confidence in its inquiries and took upon itself to say this:

'It is impossible to obtain in Indian Medical Colleges complete instruction in gynaecology, obstetrics and diseases of children.'

It confined itself practically to this, and went on to say something about ear, nose and throat surgery, advanced X-ray therapeutics and electro-therapeutics—very important but not by any means essential matters for general medical training. There the matter was allowed to rest. Indian Medical Service officers have kept up the agitation more or less, and the General Council of Medical Education in England sent out an ultimatum to the Indian Universities that, unless they mended their ways, withdrawal of recognition would come. That is what made the Secretary of State as well as the Lytton Committee, as I have told the House, take up the matter with the Council of Medical Education, and the Secretary of State agreed that a representative of that Council should come out to this country and investigate matters for the Council, and that he would be prepared to afford facilities such as have been indicated by the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi.

Here again, Sir, a grave doubt arises as to what is intended to be done. Dr. Norman Walker will tell us to-morrow what his inquiry will be. We shall not anticipate him. But what we are concerned with is training in midwifery. As has been pointed out, that is not Dr. Walker's subject, nor do I believe is it Colonel Needham's, and, therefore, whatever this Commission may be able to say or do—unless it is very strongly supplemented in the Midwifery side in the provinces—may not be acceptable to the General Council of Medical Education in England. Supposing Dr. Norman Walker's inquiry is, however, no more than what I may, for our present purpose, call administrative; if he is going to do what the Registrar of a University would, under normal conditions, do, *viz.*, take the regulations and see how far they can be complied with in the Indian colleges and schools and report to the Medical Council that these regulations cannot be complied with—there will be greater difficulty in the situation. It, therefore, becomes obligatory upon us that the inquiry should be specially directed towards what the Medical Council in England has been considering as defective and we must show what can be done by co-ordination and supplementing of our resources. From that point of view, my amendment would be necessary, that is to say, if Colonel Gidney, in response to the appeal of the Honourable the Education Member, does not withdraw his Resolution. For myself, I should not be very unhappy if the Resolution is withdrawn, and with it my amendment. I submit, however, that the scope of the inquiry

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

ought to be limited in the way that I have described in my amendment, namely, that it should be an inquiry by a Committee,

'consisting of representatives of each of the Medical Colleges affiliated to Indian Universities and of the Government of India inquiring into and suggesting improvements (in conjunction and consultation if necessary with the nominee of the General Council of Medical Education proposed to be sent out for the purpose.)'

—this had been drafted and sent, Sir, before Dr. Norman Walker had arrived—

'for teaching Midwifery in Indian Medical Colleges by means of inter-University practical training on lines prevailing in Europe and otherwise.'

I need not go into a variety of details that might be urged in support of the position that what the Council in England says is not tenable. It is no use doing that in this Assembly, and, if there is to be an inquiry, all the details may usefully be placed before that Committee.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadian Rural): I oppose the Resolution and also the amendment that is proposed. An inquiry into any institution or any concerned presupposes a belief that something is wrong. Unless the House comes to the *prima facie* conclusion that there is something wrong in the medical instruction in the colleges of India, I do not think that the House will be justified in according its assent to an inquiry of the kind suggested in the Resolution or in the amendment. Now, Sir, this question of medical education was the subject of discussion in the last Simla Session, and now, as a result of that discussion, we have a gentleman coming out to make the necessary inquiries. I think that it would be very wise on our part to await the results of the inquiry made by this gentleman and those associated with him, and then see whether it is necessary that we should go further and investigate the conditions of the medical institutions in India. Over and above all this, there is the question of cost, and the question of cost is a matter which we ought always to keep in mind. Of course, if the anticipated results are such as to outweigh the considerations of cost, if we are assured that the matter is one of great need and an inquiry would result in bettering our conditions, then possibly the question of cost might be put aside. After what we have heard from Sir Muhammad Shafi and considering the really important position which the Reform Scheme has given to the Local Governments and to the Ministers, an inquiry of this sort, started from here, I think is inadvisable, and, therefore, I would ask the House to reject the Resolution, and, as Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary has said that he will be quite content to withdraw his amendment and await further developments, I think the House will be wise in rejecting both.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadian): I confess with the majority of the laymen in this House that we are perhaps not qualified to speak on a subject purely medical, but, as the Honourable Member for Education has pointed out, this is not a question which deals with the technical aspect of medical education, and my further justification for speaking on this subject is that I have received a clear passport from the Honourable Mover of this Resolution. I think that all Members of this House will sympathise with the principle underlying the Resolution, but I cannot accord my support either to the Resolution or to the amendment

moved by Dr. Sarvadhikary. As it has been said from the Government Benches that this is a question which appertains to the provincial Governments, I beg to draw the attention of the Honourable Member for Education to the fact that the constitution of the Walker Committee is the best refutation of the plea that the matter is not within the jurisdiction of the Central Government, and, if that had been the sole obstacle to the inquiry proposed, I submit that the Members of this House would not regard it as insuperable. But there are other and more weighty objections. As my friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, has pointed out, the question of cost is the main objection to the carrying into effect of this proposal. The Honourable the Education Member tells us that a Committee has already been appointed to inquire into the condition and state of medical education in this country. But, from what has fallen from the Honourable Mover of the amendment, Dr. Sarvadhikary, I feel that the scope of the inquiry to be made by the Walker Committee would be necessarily limited. Dr. Walker comes as a delegate from the British Medical Council. He is, no doubt, to be associated in this inquiry with a representative of the Government of India, but I think that the primary object of the inquiry directed by the General Medical Council in England is to submit a report to that body as to the condition of teaching in the medical colleges in this country. If that be the sole object, and it appears to be the sole object, then, I submit, the inquiry ordered by the Secretary of State is not a substitute for the inquiry proposed in the original Resolution. If the Government Benches can assure the House that the scope of this inquiry will be enlarged so as to cover the ground proposed by the Honourable Mover of the Resolution, it will give us great satisfaction. Will the Walker-Needham inquiry be made generally into the condition of medical education in this country? Will it suggest improvements in the matter of medical education with a view to make it possible that persons for the Indian Medical Services would be trained in this country? Would it, for instance, examine the condition of other departments besides that relating to midwifery? The Honourable Mover of this Resolution made a pointed reference to Dr. Norman Walker and said that he was an eminent dermatologist, and he pointed out that a dermatologist is not necessarily qualified to conduct an inquiry of the nature suggested by him. To this my friend, the Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi, vouchsafed no reply. He told us, no doubt, in an extremely ambiguous way, that some meeting of the combined Chambers was to take place to-morrow.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: I said I understood that there will be held a meeting to-morrow to which Members of the two Chambers have been invited.

Dr. H. S. Gour: We are told that a meeting will take place to-morrow. I was inquiring from my neighbouring friends as to when and where this meeting is to take place and they say they are in as much obscurity about the time and the place and the nature of the meeting as myself. I hope that, when there is this meeting, the Honourable Member in charge of this Committee will be able to assure the Members of this House that the inquiry will be on the general lines indicated in this debate and that it will eventually result in the improvement we want in the medical education of this country. If this is assured, I have no doubt the Honourable Mover of this Resolution would be satisfied, but, if this is not assured, then the only thing we can say is, we shall await the result of this inquiry and revive the agitation launched by the Mover of this Resolution for the improvement of medical education in this country.

Mr. J. N. Mukherjee (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I had no intention to participate in the debate over this subject, but, after listening to my Honourable friend, Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam, I thought I might usefully add a word or two to the debate that is going on. Now, Sir, I agree with the Honourable Member for Education that the scope of the inquiry that has been suggested by the Resolution is too wide for practical purposes, especially at the present time of financial stringency; and I think that even if suggestions were made for effecting improvements in the entire medical education system in this country, there would be no funds coming forth to carry out suggested improvements all along the line. There is another point before the House. It is not long since debate in this House was directed to the question of education in midwifery in this country, the Faculty in England not being willing to recognise the practical training on the subject which India could impart to students in certain parts of this country. That being so, Sir, and further it being a fact that Dr. Norman Walker is now in this country to make an inquiry, we shall not be doing wisely if we allowed this opportunity to go by without bringing this subject of education in midwifery specially before this Committee of Inquiry. I, therefore, have very great sympathy with the amendment which has been brought forward by my friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary. The present seems to me to be a very opportune moment for carrying on an inquiry regarding the teaching of midwifery, and I venture to suggest that inasmuch as this point has been very specially under the consideration of the Council of Medical Education in England, we in this country should try and associate with Dr. Walker the very best man available in India as regards the practical teaching of midwifery obtainable here in order to assist him in the investigation that is going to be held by him and his Committee. This will advance the solution of the question of backwardness, if any, in this respect very much forward. Instead of making a general inquiry into the whole subject of medical education, it seems to me that, if we directed our energies towards the practical aspects of this subject, we might hope to achieve some useful result. Therefore, Sir, my submission to the House is that it should take the amendment into consideration and give it its support.

Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney: Sir, I have listened very attentively to the various criticisms made on my Resolution and regret to observe, with much surprise, that it has not met with much support from the House, the chief objection being financial stringency. I have always looked upon Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi, the Honourable Member in charge of Education, as a very gallant courtier, but I have now learnt that he is an arrant flirt. He first started flirting with Madras, with which Presidency I had already made love when moving my Resolution. Next he started a violent flirtation with Bengal to whom I am already wedded, as I received my first medical education in that Province. This was certainly not very gallant of him. He then referred to a certain discussion which took place between myself and the Members from Bengal when the midwifery training was discussed at the last Simla Session. He then indulged in various incidental and somewhat irrelevant statements, and finally announced, for the edification of this House of laymen (I use that word with great respect), that Dr. Norman Walker would deliver an address to Members of both Houses, to-morrow, on the scope of his inquiry when in India, etc. I have puzzled my brain as to why he tried to bait or influence this House by referring to a lecture to be given by Dr. Norman Walker. It seems to be in the guise of a sprat to catch a mackerel. I should like to know, otherwise why this invitation to laymen to this lecture?

The Honourable the Education Member has given three main reasons for opposing my Resolution. Firstly, he said that this was such an intensely provincial transferred subject that we must keep our 'hands off.' He then gave us the constitution of his Committee on which there is one official, an Indian Medical Service officer, an administrator and a brilliant departmental administrator, I admit; but what I want is a man versed in hospital training, a man who has lived his life within the four walls of a hospital and trained medical students. We are told there is also to be a Government official who will give the Committee a Government blessing and complexion no doubt; also two non-official medical men. Now I admit the strength of that Committee, but it is not strong enough and is mainly Indian in character and constitution, with one man only from England—a skin specialist who is not an expert in midwifery even. I am most certainly not going to act the apologist for having a skin specialist to investigate our midwifery deficiencies. Dr. Norman Walker is an eminent man in his particular subject, but what I complain of, in the formation of this Committee, is the absence of suitable and adequate European experts on it. We have had our hospitals going for years and years in this country, and what is our condition to-day? Not accepted by the General Medical Council. Our men have to go to England and spend large sums of money in foreign lands to acquire a little extra polish or complexion to their knowledge, due *perforce* to local deficient training, as the Honourable the Home Member himself admitted in a former discussion in 1918 on the Civil Medical Service.

He then told us about India's financial stringency. I know that there is acute financial stringency, and no doubt we will know much more about it in a few days more; but, are we always to have that thrown at us whenever any one gets up to ask for some urgent and vital improvements in India? Are we going to suffer for the financial profligacy that has characterised the Government of India in the past? Are the needs of India going to be sacrificed and suborned in that? Are we always to be told, when some improvement is needed, that it is impossible because there is no money—the Exchequer is depleted? If that is the case, then it is absolutely useless to make requests for Committees in this House and there is no need our trying to improve the condition of things in India. This is not fair and I refuse to accept this reason.

The Honourable Member for Education next told us that we must not interfere with Provincial Administrations. I ask, Sir, why then is he interfering? He cannot tell me not to interfere and then interfere himself, although in a more limited capacity. Colonel Needham, Deputy Director General, Indian Medical Service, is a sort of an attached member of this Committee, but he is employed in the Imperial Government. If that is not interference of the Government of India with the Provincial Administrations, I would like to know what is and what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander? What is allowed to him should be allowed to my Committee also, if it were sanctioned.

He then told us that the administration of universities depends very largely on their autonomous character. I quite agree with that. He then told us plainly—and I thank him for it—that many things I have said are more or less correct. Well, if there are these faults—be they more, be they less—they *must* be rectified, and it is up to this House to do so. Are we going to allow the medical needs of India to suffer? We have the Member in charge of this Department admitting that there is some truth in

[Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

what I have said. My friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, asks for *prima facie* evidence that such a state of things do exist; well, this admission from the Education Member gives it to him and is also my answer to him. I, for this reason, again regret very much that there is not another medical man, as a Member in this House to support or challenge me. None of the Members of this Honourable House can answer this question, as they are laymen. The students and doctors themselves can alone answer it, and the truth of our defective training in some branches is found in its rejection to-day by the Medical Council in England, and it must be the final judge of my statements. If our system of training in India is not up to the standard demanded by the General Medical Council to enable our students to enter the Indian Medical Service, then there is something wrong. And I *emphatically* state that it is so—I challenge its denial. (*A voice*: 'No, no. We won't admit that.') Thank you very much, but I do and medical men do.

The Honourable Member in charge of this Department then told us that there are certain proposals before the Secretary of State for—I did not quite catch what he said—but I think it was the Indianisation of the Indian Medical Service or certain proposals for the reorganization of that Service. I do certainly think this House should know something about those proposals. It claims such knowledge and this is one of the reasons why I have brought forward this Resolution. If he says this disclosure is inadvisable at present, am I then to understand him to mean that it might be advisable at some future date?

Then, my friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, said that this question had been gone into by the Sadler Commission which had given an opinion on it. I understand that the Sadler Commission did *not* go into this question. I understand that it went into medical education in India *very* incidentally and as a side issue. It was not entitled to give an opinion on our medical education in India, not being sufficiently equipped or qualified for the purpose. He then brought forward reasons for limiting this Resolution and inquiry into training in midwifery only. Now, Sir, it is no use confining our activities to midwifery only. Would this House have known anything about the imperfect training in midwifery in India, had it not been for the Resolution which my friend, Mr. Subrahmanayam, moved at the last Simla Session, and had it not been for the letter—the mandatory letter, as it was called—which the General Medical Council issued to our universities? I say, but for this, we would have known nothing about it. Those were the reasons which opened the eyes of this House on midwifery training and which I showed in my address on that Resolution existed to the extent that some of our Universities were sending out their doctors as qualified to practise gynecology, with an experience of only *half* a labour case per doctor. I say this is assisting in a professional tragedy. If that is the condition of our training in regard to midwifery, what might not be the state of affairs in regard to the training in surgery and medicine, and what other defects might there not be? A Committee of experts such as my Resolution asks for would show what improvements were necessary in the entire medical training now being given in our Universities and this, I say, *does* remain defective, especially in the clinical training imparted to our students. This is what I want

to remedy by asking this House to accept my Resolution. Training in midwifery, it is admitted by themselves, is sadly deficient in certain universities and various reasons have been adduced to account for it. I do not accept them entirely. I am not confining the activities of my Committee to an inquiry into midwifery training only. I want to cover the whole ground. Our medical institutions have been in existence, as I said, for years and some of them have been turning out this class of doctors. Just think of it, Sir,—we have discovered, after all these years, that we are turning out doctors with a training in midwifery of only *half a labour case*. Could anything be more lamentable, more dangerous, more defective? What other defects might not be brought to light if my Resolution were accepted? Mr. Subrahmanayam asked the Education Member for definite evidence of defects and of the necessity for improvement before he would agree with my proposal. The admission of the Honourable Member in charge of this Department, that there is some *truth* in what I have said is a sufficient answer to him and he must accept it, and I say this House must accept it or should accept it. Then Dr. Gour asked the House for an assurance that the inquiry which Dr. Walker's Committee is making will embrace the general medical training given in India. Now, Sir, what is the use of that? It is absolutely futile to give me that information. I do not want to know that; because, I submit, with all respect to Dr. Walker, who, as I have already said, is an eminent member of the profession as a skin specialist, that he cannot look into *all* our deficiencies. He is not qualified to do so. I do not want official and non-official Indians and Europeans in this country only on my Committee. I want two or three eminent medical men who are experts, well-known experts in the administration of European medical institutions and in the care and training given to medical students in Europe. You cannot get away from the fact that the training imparted in England is better and far superior to that obtained in India. These are the members whom I want on my Committee, for, again, I submit that one single individual, in the shape of an expert skin specialist, is not the right man to investigate the condition of things in regard to the general training given in our institutions. In fact, he is the wrong man. I believe that the General Medical Council has not done wisely in limiting the sphere of its inquiry and in sending out a man merely to look into, as I am told, the various regulations governing our institutions only. We are in urgent need of a thorough and searching investigation of our entire medical training. It makes no difference to me what the Government Member says about the scope of his inquiry for, to my mind, it falls lamentably short of the mark I ask for. Dr. Gour has taken it upon himself to oppose a general inquiry; why he should do so and relegate to himself this function, I for one do not know. He styles himself a layman, but he is also a 'Doctor' (only of Laws?). Why should he, a layman, say to this House: 'You should be satisfied if the Government says this and says that.' I am the Mover of this Resolution and I also want to be satisfied, but I am not satisfied, because the Honourable Member in charge has not disproved the truth of my charges against our training though he has had ample opportunity and time to do so. The Honourable Member has asked me to withdraw my Resolution. It is because I am *not* satisfied; because the medical needs of the country will not be satisfied with these assurances, that I will not withdraw, even though several speakers, being wrongly influenced, have spoken against it. This inquiry, I submit, should not be limited in this manner. I

[Lieut.-Col. H. A. J. Gidney.]

want to probe much deeper than that and to go into the entire medical needs and training and not into the need for better training in midwifery, only, nor should my Resolution be refused acceptance merely on the grounds of provincial interference and financial impotency. I submit this is false economy on the part of Government. I, therefore, with all respect to the Honourable Member in charge of this Department, and my friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, regret I cannot accept their offer of withdrawal or of supplanting my Resolution by the amendment that he has put before this Honourable House. Sir, I know, judging from the speeches delivered, that various Members are not in favour of this Resolution. Notwithstanding this I warn this House that our medical training sadly stands in need of a thorough investigation and I make bold to say that the day is not far distant when some of the Indian Members will again move this Resolution in the House, and I feel sure it will then be carried. (*A Voice : 'Leave it to the provinces.'*) No, I do not intend to do that. I now want to know what will be the cost of Dr. Walker's Committee and what will be the cost of my Committee, if allowed. This question was raised by an Honourable Member who is an advocate of the Government on this point, so far as financial stringency is concerned, and offered as an excuse, *viz.*, Mr. Subrahmanayam. He asked what would be the cost attached to this Committee. Will the Government kindly tell me what will be the cost of Dr. Walker's Committee? Mr. Subrahmanayam will then be answered, this House will then be answered, I will then be answered and we will then be able to say whether the gain, if my Committee is sanctioned, will be commensurate with the expenditure or not. I wait for the reply of Government. This is most regrettable—most astounding and yet the Member in charge of this Department has brought forward, as one of his *main* arguments, against my Resolution, the present financial stringency, and at the same time he does not know what it is going to cost. (Laughter). Sir, I stick to my Resolution, I stick to my guns, and I decline very respectfully to withdraw my Resolution. Let it be accepted or rejected on its own merits.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: With your leave, I beg to make a suggestion to the Honourable Member. Some of the points of view urged by Colonel Gidney and me would be met if a specialist here is deputed, say, like Dr. Hamilton of Bombay.

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: Sir, I desire to say a few words in connection with the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, in order to remove a misconception. My Honourable friend was pleased to say that the fact of Dr. Norman Walker's inquiry itself showed that there was very little in the constitutional objection advanced by me, and in that view he was supported by Dr. Gour. I am afraid both my Honourable and learned friends have entirely misunderstood the position. By an Act of Parliament the General Medical Council in England is possessed of certain statutory authority and has also certain statutory obligations to perform. All medical degrees given by any University whatsoever throughout the British Empire have to be registered under the Act with the General Medical Council before they can be recognised for certain purposes. Those purposes, Honourable Members will remember, were mentioned in the speech which I delivered in Simla in connection with the

Resolution which was moved by Mr. Subrahmanayam there. Now, an authority established under an Act of Parliament, possessed of certain powers and having certain obligations to perform is well within its own power in sending out a delegate in order to satisfy itself that the medical education given in our Universities is up to the requisite standard.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): At whose expense?

The Honourable Mian Sir Muhammad Shafi: Dr. Norman Walker has come out as a delegate of the General Medical Council and the inquiry which he will hold in conjunction with certain representatives of the Government of India and the provinces, is by virtue of the authority which the General Medical Council is possessed of under the Act of Parliament which brought it into being. Therefore, the fact of that inquiry has no relevancy whatsoever, no bearing whatsoever, upon the constitutional objection which I put forward as against my Honourable friend Colonel Gidney's Resolution. I said in my speech that University education in India, including medical education, is, under the Reform Scheme, now a transferred subject under the complete control of provincial Governments, *viz.*, the Minister in charge of Education, who, in the discharge of his responsibility, is answerable to the Provincial Council. That argument is in no way met by what my two learned friends were pleased to say in connection with the inquiry which is to be held by Dr. Norman Walker.

Then, my friend, Colonel Gidney, while paying compliments, well-deserved compliments, if I may venture to say so, to Dr. Norman Walker, at the same time emphasised the fact that he was no expert in the particular branch of the subject connected with the inquiry to be held by Dr. Norman Walker. May I point out that the object of the association or co-option, or whatever term may be used in connection therewith, of three representatives, one official and two non-officials, from every province with Dr. Norman Walker, in the inquiry which he will hold in the various provinces of India, is that medical experts, official as well as non-official, who are thoroughly well acquainted in the provinces with the state of medical education there, should be associated with Dr. Norman Walker in the inquiry which he will hold, so that the object which my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, has in view—and if he will kindly glance at his own amendment, he will find that I am right in what I am saying—will be fully met, and, therefore, there is no need really for him to insist on his amendment being put to the vote. I quite understood what was at the back of my Honourable friend's mind. He really did not want his amendment to be put to the vote, should my friend, Colonel Gidney, withdraw his Resolution, but, in case Colonel Gidney were to insist upon his Resolution being put to the vote, my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, who is opposed to the proposition embodied in Colonel Gidney's Resolution, would insist upon his amendment being put to the vote, in order that the inquiry may be limited to the scope which Sir Deva Prasad would give to the inquiry which is to be held. As the object which he has in view is really met by Dr. Norman Walker's inquiry, I hope the House will reject both the Resolution and the amendment.

Mr. President: The original question was:

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to appoint a Committee of professional experts, half to be obtained from the United Kingdom in consultation with the General Medical Council, and the other half

[Mr. President.]

from India, to tour India and to inquire into the training that is obtained in the various Medical and Surgical institutions, both official and non-official, and to submit recommendations with a view to bringing the Indian institutions, in all respects, on a level with those of the United Kingdom and thereby creating in India a suitable field of recruitment for its entire Medical Services.'

since which an amendment has been moved as follows:

'That the words from 'of professional experts' to 'of the United Kingdom' be omitted, and in their stead the following words be substituted:

'consisting of representatives of each of the Medical Colleges affiliated to Indian Universities and of the Government of India for inquiring into and suggesting improvements (in conjunction and consultation, if necessary, with the nominee of the General Council of Medical Education proposed to be sent out for the purpose) for teaching Midwifery in Indian Medical Colleges by means of inter-University practical training on lines prevailing in Europe and otherwise.'

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was negatived.

1 P.M. **Mr. President:** The question is:

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to appoint a Committee of professional experts, half to be obtained from the United Kingdom in consultation with the General Medical Council, and the other half from India, to tour India and to inquire into the training that is obtained in the various Medical and Surgical institutions, both official and non-official, and to submit recommendations with a view to bringing the Indian institutions, in all respects, on a level with those of the United Kingdom and thereby creating in India a suitable field of recruitment for its entire Medical Services.'

The motion was negatived.

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

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

RESOLUTION RE: EQUALITY OF STATUS FOR INDIANS IN AFRICA.

Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri (Central Province Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhamadan): Sir, I beg leave to move the following Resolution:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do represent to the Imperial Government that the failure on the part of the Imperial Government to meet the lawful and modest claims of Indians, for equality of status of British subjects in all parts of Africa, will be regarded as a serious violation of equal status promised to Indians in the British Empire.'

Sir, the history of British rule in this country could be described by an extremist in two phrases, 'breach of promises. and the interpretation of promises in favour of the whites' and it was but natural that, from the experience of the past, many Indians had lost all faith in the promises

made by England or in the British sense of justice. It had been a deep-seated belief with many of my countrymen that British statesmanship would, under no circumstances, rise equal to the occasion and concede equality of civil rights and political privileges to Indians. But, after the acceptance of the 'Equality' Resolution by the Imperial Conference, excepting General Smuts of South Africa, I, for one, believed that the 'Equality' Resolution would be given effect to by the Overseas Dominions and the Colonies. I gave notice of this Resolution to lay before the British Government and, through them, the South African Government our feelings of deep regret and disappointment which the non-acceptance of that Resolution has caused in this country. The public was a little re-assured by the opening speech of Lord Reading in the Legislative Assembly at Simla.

But, Sir, little had I thought that I should so soon get one more instance of that breach of faith and betrayal of Indians, at the hands of the Colonial Office. The unsympathetic and tactless utterance of the Right Honourable Winston Churchill, His Majesty's present Secretary of State for the Colonies, has shocked public feeling to a very considerable extent. It has given Indians sufficient cause to be sceptical in taking English statesmen at their word. It has made them question whether, after all, the non-co-operators are not right. Sir, it now lies solely in the hands of the British statesmen themselves to remove the feelings of suspicion from the minds of Indians by the fulfilment of the pledges and promises given and the hopes raised.

It is a fundamental principle of every Government that its subjects shall enjoy equal rights and status, and be entitled to even-handed justice; and, in consonance with this fundamental principle, when the Crown took over the administration of this country from the East India Company, the late Queen Victoria the Good issued a Proclamation which has well been called 'India's Great Charter,' wherein she very graciously declared that Her Majesty held herself bound to the natives of her Indian territories by the same obligations of duty as bound her to all her other subjects. Indians were, in fact, to become true British subjects, with all the rights and privileges of British subjects. This promise was reiterated by Lord Lytton in 1877 in the Proclamation issued by him in the name of Queen Victoria; and was also adopted by His Majesty Edward VII. Our present Sovereign, His Majesty King George V, in his letter of 24th May, 1910, addressed to the Princes and people of India, graciously declared:

'These (i.e., the Proclamations of 1858 and November, 1908) are the Charters of the noble and benignant spirit of Imperial Rule and by that spirit in all my time to come I will faithfully abide.'

I need not say how these solemn promises were fulfilled by the British Government, so far as they affected the Indians in this country, but, for the present, I shall confine my attention to the question as to how far those solemn promises were kept in the case of Indian British subjects abroad. In Africa, the Indians are mostly domiciled in (1) South Africa, comprising the Transvaal, Orange Free State, Natal, the Cape Province and Zululand; and (2) East Africa, comprising Kenya, the British mandated territories of Tanganyika, and Uganda, and British Guiana.

According to Sir Benjamin Robertson, the Indian community in South Africa had its origin in the indentured labour which was introduced by Natal between 1860 and 1911 for the development of her industries, and more specially for the sugar and tea plantations. In the wake of the indentured labourer came the trader from the Bombay Presidency. He went to supply

[Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri.]

the wants of the labourer, but, when once established, he quickly extended his dealings to natives and Europeans. These Bombay Muhammadans have for centuries traded along the East Coast of Africa, the Persian Gulf, Burma and the Further East. They are men of considerable enterprise; and spread into the Transvaal and the Cape Province, finding a favourable field for their activities in the pioneer development of the Transvaal which followed the gold rush generally. They maintain a close connection with India which they still regard as their permanent home. The Asiatic Inquiries Commission's Report says :

' They are born traders and have the reputation of being remarkably capable and astute business men and competent to hold their own against European competitors in that respect. Some are wealthy merchants with branch businesses in the districts.'

The majority of the emigrants have settled down in that country in various capacities, considerable numbers of them have taken to occupations such as household service, industrial labour, both skilled and unskilled, employment on railways, and under municipalities, clerical work, trading and the learned professions. South Africa has now become their home and few of the Colonial-born have seen India. Many of them cannot speak or understand any Indian language. There are about 155,000 Indians in all in the Union of South Africa of which about 60,000 and more were born there.

By Article 14 of the London Convention of 1884, entered into between the British and Republican Governments, ' all persons other than natives ' acquired full liberty with their families to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Republic, and the right to hire or possess houses, manufactories, warehouses, shops and premises and to carry on trade; and they were not to be subject to any special taxation other than that to be imposed upon citizens of the said Republic. Indians thus got full rights of citizenship. But, to the great misfortune of Indians, this attitude of the Republicans changed soon after and the Government wanted to take away the rights assigned to Indians; and, with that view, addressed a letter dated 6th January, 1885, to the Imperial Government inquiring whether the proposed legislation would be regarded by Her Majesty's Government as being a contravention of the London Convention. Correspondence ensued and the Republican Government concluded that the British Government waived their right to the strict interpretation of the Convention of London and passed Law III of 1885 based on the general principle that ' no equality between the white and coloured races shall be tolerated.' That sealed the fate of Indians in that Province and took away all the rights of citizenship acquired by Indians there. It reduced them to the position of helots. It made them the target of the whites for cruel, unjust and disgraceful treatment. That was the greatest breach of trust and promise ever committed by the British Government in having thrown the Indians overboard. I am pained to observe that, at that time, the British Government and the Government of India forgot their duties and responsibilities to their Indian subjects abroad. There was practically no public opinion in this country at the time to press on the Government its duties. The Indian traders of the Transvaal protested and the British High Commissioner raised a very feeble protest against that law. It had its effect. An amendment was made to the law by the Republican Government. Law III of 1885 as enacted was to the effect that persons belonging to any of the aboriginal races of Asia, including thereunder the so-called Coolies (Indians are described there as ' Coolies,' it will be noted), Arabs (meaning traders), Malays and Muhammadan subjects

of the Turkish Empire, shall not acquire the rights of citizenship in the South African Republic, shall not be owners of landed property in the Republic, and the traders shall have to get themselves registered and pay £25 as registration fee, and the Government shall assign special places for their habitation, though they were free to live with their masters. After the amendment, the law, as it exists to-day, is to the effect that Asiatics cannot obtain the burgher right and cannot be owners of fixed property except only in such places as may for purposes of sanitation be assigned. The British High Commissioner wrote on the 24th September, 1886: 'Although the amended law is still a contravention of the 14th Article of the Convention of London, I shall not advise Her Majesty's Government to offer further opposition to it, in view of Your Honour's opinion that it is necessary for the protection of the public health.' On 4th November, 1886, the Secretary of State intimated that Her Majesty's Government no longer raised any objection to the legislation in regard to Asiatic traders having regard to the amendment introduced into Law III of 1885. What equanimity of mind? It did not strike them that 'sanitation' was only an excuse to hide the ulterior motives of the European traders of the Republic. The status and rights of British citizenship were quietly allowed to disappear and the gravest act of injustice was done to Indians in the Transvaal. I cannot find words strong enough to describe the remarkably indifferent attitude which the then Government of India adopted towards this.

Under this amended law, the trading, residential and owners' rights, in parts beyond those assigned, were doubtful, but somehow, either under the pressure of the British Government or owing to some other cause, the law was not strictly or immediately enforced. It also seems that the Government encouraged the Indians to purchase property in the name of Europeans and then to obtain mortgages from them. Later on, in the nineties, the Republican Government desired the enforcement of the law but, under the advice of the British Agent, the Indians disobeyed the law. The Indians' trading rights were further curtailed by the Gold Law of 1898. I do gratefully acknowledge here that the Government consistently opposed the restrictive interpretation of the law. Under this law, the Indians could not work up mines or do the diggings in the gold mines. The bad treatment of Indians was one of the avowed grounds of the Boer War and it will be interesting to know that the status of Indians suffered most after the war and during the period when the province was a Crown Colony. It was then that the old laws were enforced with the greatest rigour. The British authorities in the Colonies changed front after the war and introduced further restrictions on the Indians. Lord Milner, the then Governor of the Transvaal, wrote to the Secretary of State:

'I think that to attempt to place coloured people on an equality with whites in South Africa is wholly impracticable, and that, moreover, it is in principle wrong.'

The Secretary of State, in his reply of 20th July, 1904, emphasized that up to the outbreak of the war, the British Government had steadily maintained, at first as a matter of right, and subsequently to the award of 1895 by a diplomatic persuasion, the interest of the British Indian residents in the Transvaal, and that the treatment of these fellow-subjects formed part of the British case against the late South African Republic. After this, the proposed legislation for restricting further the rights of Indians was dropped.

In 1906, the British Government granted full responsible Self-Government to South Africa. The British Government, at this stage, also forgot their duty and responsibility to their Indian subjects in the Colony. They

[Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri.]

were fully cognisant of the Colonials' bitter feelings against the Indians. They knew that they could not, while in power, do much to safeguard or protect the Indians' interests in the Colonies; still, without any thought in the matter, they kept no reasonable safeguards to protect the interests of Indians under the new Government, but left the Indians helpless and at the mercy of the Colonials. This was another breach of faith and violation of trust on the part of the British Government. From that time onwards, the British Government's responsibility was confined 'to the tendering of friendly advice'—as was once said by Mr. Winston Churchill in the House of Commons in 1906. I believe that there is some provision in the South Africa Act governing the Union, relative to the reservation for Imperial consideration of enactments adversely affecting the interests of subject races as a class, but, like all such reservations, the provision seems to be a delusion in view of the established principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a Self-Governing Dominion.

This conversion of once subjects of England into subjects of South Africa was a matter of grave concern, specially when it was effected without having consulted the wishes of the people concerned.

Immediately after the grant, in the very first session of the Union Parliament, Acts were passed for further restricting the rights of Indians, whereby the access to the Transvaal was further restricted. Indians were not allowed to get their wives and children from India, and were required to give thumb impressions at registration. Indian visitors and tourists, of howsoever high status they be, were not allowed to enter the province. The Indians, getting no assistance from the Indian or Imperial Government, had recourse to passive resistance and got some relief. Later on, the late Mr. Gokhale's visit to the Colony relieved the tension of feeling between the Government and the Indians. But the agitation continued and the Immigrants Regulation Act of 1913 gave an impetus to it, and passive resistance was started on a large scale under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. Later, an agreement, known as the Smuts-Gandhi Agreement, between Mr. Gandhi and the Union Government, was arrived at. An Indian Relief Bill was passed and the Indians, thereafter, enjoyed slightly better rights with respect to trade, leases, etc., and were allowed to get their families from this country. This state of affairs did not last long. The Union Government again resiled from their agreement and passed Act XXXVII of 1919 which had the effect of restricting the rights acquired after the agreement of 1914. It is now for the Imperial Government to exercise their wholesome influence in securing to Indians the rights of a British subject in the Colony.

In Orange Free State, the Indians are much worse off. By the laws of the former Republic, which are still in force, they are prohibited from trading or carrying on business of any description whatsoever.

In Natal, the Indians have always enjoyed the same rights and privileges as to ownership of land as Europeans. The same licensing laws are applicable to both, but the treatment accorded to Indians in the administration of those laws is different. In Natal, the Indians settled there mostly at the request of the Natal Government. According to the report of the Asiatic Inquiries Commission:

'The South African-born Indians form an intelligent, well-educated and energetic element of the Indian community both in Natal and the Transvaal.'

The Natal Government attempted to pass two drastic measures in 1908 which were destined to restrict the trading rights of Indians and had for their object the complete eviction of Indians. The Imperial Government expressed their views in very forcible language, and the laws were not passed. The Law, III of 1885, applies to the northern districts of Natal, where the Indians have the same restricted rights as in the Transvaal.

In Zululand, there is nothing in the law to debar Indians from owning lands, but it is said that they can neither reside nor trade there.

In the Cape Province, which is the only province where Indians have better rights, the Asiatics possess both parliamentary and municipal franchise. They cannot stand for election, though the Indians are on terms of equality with Europeans with respect to the rights of ownership and trade. There is no disposition on the part of the Europeans to deprive Indians of those rights except in certain municipalities which attempt to restrict the number of traders. The licensing laws are not administered properly by certain municipalities; the licenses to Indians are frequently refused. On the whole, the Indians are better off. My countrymen feel very grateful to the Europeans of the Cape Province for their just and sympathetic attitude towards our men settled there. In short, the position of British Indians in the Union of South Africa is as shown below :

—	Number of Indians.	Existing rights of privileges.	Existing disabilities.	Proposed or possible disabilities.
Cape Colony	7,000	Municipal franchise, political franchise, no segregation in law or practice. Colour bar not rigidly enforced.	Arbitrary treatment by certain local bodies of trading rights.	None.
Natal . .	125,000	Municipal franchise, no segregation in law or practice, right of ownership and purchase of all kinds of property including land.	No political franchise. No actual representation on local bodies. Racial distinction in trading licenses and municipal bye-laws. Social ostracism, e.g., in respect of public and semi-public conveyances and places.	Restriction of acquisition of uplands. Restriction of trading rights. Harsh treatment under immigration laws. Segregation (residential and commercial)—should be removed.
Transvaal .	15,000	Right to trade. No segregation in practice.	No political franchise. Racial discrimination in trading licenses and municipal bye-laws. Social ostracism. Segregation in law. No ownership of land direct or indirect.	Restriction of trading rights. Harsh treatment under immigration laws. Segregation (residential and commercial)—all these should be removed.
Orange Free State.	200	None except the right to live as domestic servants.	Absence of all rights.	These rights should be allowed.

Sir, General Smuts' assurance at the Imperial Conference in 1917 had raised some hopes in our hearts and it was believed that in future the Indians in South Africa would get better treatment. In the Imperial Conference, in 1918, Lord Sinha, who went as a representative from this country, moved a

[Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri.]

Resolution known as the 'Reciprocity Resolution,' and it was accepted by the Imperial Conference. It may be that he may have moved it probably with a view to secure such rights as could amicably be got, but many of my countrymen thought it to be an unwise compromise. It was inconsistent with the principle of equality of status in the British Empire. It empowered the Colonies to prohibit and restrict immigration, which is the inherent right of every British subject to move within the Empire. The speech which Mr. Burton delivered, while accepting the Resolution on behalf of the Union, further raised our hopes for a satisfactory solution of the problem. Shortly after, these hopes were cruelly dispelled by Act XXXVII of 1919, introduced by General Smuts himself. It took away much of the vested rights as stated above. It caused much dissatisfaction among the Indians; and the Asiatic Inquiries Commission was appointed to inquire and report on the rights of Indians with respect to ownership, trade and business. The recommendations of the Commission are far from satisfactory. The repressive measures complained against for decades past have all been fully confirmed by the Commissioners, and more, the veritable relic of barbarism, the Transvaal Law, III of 1885, which relegates Indians to locations and ghettos is to be continued and applied to certain northern districts of Natal. Natal Indians are to be deprived of rights they have enjoyed for 50 years, rights to own and occupy land anywhere within that province. Indians are to be given facilities for purchase of land in the coastal belt. The report is veritably a retrograde measure; as one of the Commissioners, Mr. Baxter, noted in his Minute of Dissent:

'It seems to me a retrograde proposal, inconsistent with other recommendations in the Report which are founded on an idea of voluntary separation, and not compulsory. It is also a restriction of existing rights of ownership and, in the case of ex-indentured Indians and their descendants a breach of the conditions of recruitment which I think should be scrupulously adhered to in the interests of good feeling and a sense of fair-play, so necessary in our relations with the Indians in South Africa and the Government of India.'

The Government of India sent a very strong memorandum setting forth their views as placed before the Imperial Conference in 1921. We feel very grateful to the Government of India and to the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri for the able way in which they championed our cause in the Imperial Conference. It was a surprise to learn that General Smuts could not see his way to accept it. I believe he is very sympathetic to us but is handicapped by his countrymen. Still we believe and trust that he will leave no stone unturned to concede to us our just and legitimate rights.

In East Africa, the Indians have a greater cause of complaint against the Imperial Government. Being a Colony under the direct control of the Imperial Government, the Indians naturally expected that the principle of equality of rights would, as a matter of course, be applied to them; moreover, it is a province in which, by reason of long stay also, they are entitled to them and to more even.

The Indian trade connection with Zanzibar and East African territories is about three centuries old. From the time of Lord Canning, British Indians and the Government of India have taken a very active part in the development of that country. This fact was also admitted by Sir John Kirk before the Sanderson Committee in 1910.

He said :

' But for the Indians we should not be there now. It was entirely through being in possession of the influence of these Indian merchants that we were enabled to build up the influence that eventually resulted in our position.'

Here the Indians were pioneers. Here the Indians had arrived long before the European settlers. The Indian traders and settlers have been the chief contributors to the development and prosperity of this province. Here the Indians were helpful in civilizing the Africans. One of the grounds for the grant of the Royal Charter to the Imperial British East African Company in 1888 was, that it was calculated to be advantageous to the ' commercial and other interests ' of the British Indians and that ' the possession by a British Company of the East African Coast Line ' would ' protect British Indian subjects from being compelled to reside and trade under the Government and protection of Alien powers. ' Indians also had a leading share in the late war, in defending this part and winning German territories. The territory was primarily meant for Indian emigration and settlement. Mr. Baker stated to the leader of the Indian deputation :

' When the Government was approached to make the Railways, they were rather reluctant to do so on account of the cost, so Sir F. Freeguard, General Macdonald and Mr. Gerald Portal were asked to see the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, Glasgow Chamber of Commerce and the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce. They came to Manchester first. Mr. Arthur Hutton, Chairman of the Cotton Growers Association and myself as representing the Chambers were deputed to meet them. This resulted in recommending the Government to make the railways, almost solely on account of releasing the congested districts of India, otherwise it would not have been proposed by us.'

In East Africa, there are Indians in the ratio of 4 to 1 European. Indians control the greater part of trade and pay a larger proportion of taxes than the Europeans. They had the Indian currency and had the Indian Law administered, until recently. The relations between Indians and Europeans before the immigration of Dutch from South Africa were pleasant. The troubles of Indians commenced with the transfer of control from the Foreign to the Colonial Office. The fact of development of the country by Indians has also been admitted by Mr. Winston Churchill in his book ' My African Journey.'

In 1907, the Land Board of the Protectorate recommended that Government land in certain areas should not be allotted to Indians and be reserved for Europeans. Unfortunately for Indians, Lord Elgin said :

' With regard to the granting of land to Indians it is not consonant with the views of His Majesty's Government to impose legal restrictions on any section of the Indian community, but, as a matter of administrative convenience, grant should not be made to Indians in the Upland areas.'

It was thus that, in the name of ' administrative convenience,' a death-blow to the status of Indians in East Africa was given by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Here also, as in the case of South Africa, the Imperial Government deliberately subordinated the rightful and just interests of Indians to those of Europeans, and cannot get over the charges of injustice and favouritism to a section. Since that time the feelings between these two races became more marked. Professor Simpson advocated the segregation of Indians. He says :

' Unless measures of this kind be taken for Nairobi, it will lose the opportunity of becoming mainly a European town, as the centre of the European district, and as the capital it by right and destiny is to possess.'

[Mr. K. B. L. Agnihotri.]

What a sound reason for turning out the Indians from the town ? This caused much anxiety to Indians, and the Government of India, in a strong despatch, exposed the racial prejudice underlying it. In 1919, the East African Government appointed an Economic Commission of European officials and non-officials, which, blinded by race prejudice, reported injuriously to the Indian interests and in most offensive and provocative language maliciously slandered the Indians settled there. The report justly created great indignation and exasperated the feeling among the Indians in East Africa and this country.

The Mining Ordinance, 1912, excluded Indians from the Mining Industry. The Crown Lands Ordinance, 1915, practically excludes Indians from the farming industry. The Municipal Corporation Ordinance, 1919, and the Electoral Representation and Nomination Ordinance, 1919, are designed to give over-representation and majority to the Europeans. The Public Health Ordinance restricts the rights of ownership and trade of Indians. Even in the past war, rewards were given only to Europeans. Even Lord Milner defended the policy of segregation and expressed his determination to extend it to neighbouring territories. The condition is becoming intolerable. But the only redeeming feature is that the Government of India are strenuously trying to secure the just and legitimate rights of Indians whose demands also are quite just and fair.

The recent speech of Mr. Churchill has created another cause of anxiety. It has added insult to injury. It is the Colonial Office that has often been the cause of denial of just rights to Indians abroad, and it is well that the Imperialists should realise that peoples will not now remain mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. The Indians regard the Kenya problem as an acid test of Imperial good-will and fair-mindedness towards our countrymen. The Government of India has also assured us of their whole-hearted sympathy in our demand for equitable treatment to Indians abroad.

If the Indians cannot get equal rights with their fellow subjects in the British Empire, of which they form a part, with what grace would the Imperial Government ask for those rights in the territories under foreign control ? The Imperial Government has betrayed the trust and confidence reposed in them by allowing the South Africans to mete out undignified and disgraceful treatment to us and I am afraid they are going to throw justice and fair-mindedness to the winds in the case of Kenya also. Could such flimsy grounds as administrative convenience, sanitation and social amenity take away the cherished and fundamental rights of the subjects ? As the Imperial Government had betrayed us in the past, it is but proper that they should redeem now by influencing the South Africans to restore us to our legitimate status and should themselves see that we are in every respect treated on terms of equality in East Africa also. Political hypocrisies are very disgraceful and will ruin the Empire in no time. Are these the principles for which England entered into the Great War ? At that critical period British statesmen were not ashamed to regard us on terms of equality and brotherhood but would they now relegate us to terms of inferiority ? Let the warning be taken in time. No Indian can tolerate this insult any further.

In Uganda and Zanzibar, so far, Indians have been enjoying equal rights, but it is feared that the infection from Kenya might spread there too. In the Uganda Railway, Indians are not allowed to travel by first class unless the station master so pleases.

In Tanganyika, under the Law of Mandate, Indians have the rights of equality, but it is just probable that, here too, the interpretation and administration of the law may be injurious to our interests. Justice, fair play and equality in treatment of subjects are the cardinal principles of the Empire and the fabric of the Empire is bound to shatter the moment these are given way.

In conclusion, Sir, I again take the opportunity of thanking the Government of India for the noble and bold representation of our case, and we feel confident that they will continue to press our rights. His Excellency Lord Reading said:

'It cannot be doubted that they have secured a notable recognition of the status of Indians in the Empire. It may be a tardy recognition but it establishes beyond all question, and authoritatively, by the conclusions of the Premiers assembled at the Imperial Conference, with one dissentient, the equal status of Indians in the Empire; secondly, the attitude of His Majesty's Government and their recognition of this principle will mean that it will be applied in other parts of the Empire which are not under Dominion Government and notably in East Africa.'

and, I appeal to the British Government to stick to these words and give us equal rights and status in South Africa as well as in East Africa.

Mr. N. M. Samarth (Bombay: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, while associating myself with most of what has been said by the Honourable Mover of this Resolution, I wish to dissociate myself from his remark that it is the Imperial Government that is responsible for what is contained in the speech which Mr. Winston Churchill has made. I do not think it is permissible, from the utterance of any responsible Minister of the Crown, to anticipate the view which the British Cabinet may ultimately take. Those who have been careful to analyse the career of that glorious Minister know that, some months ago—or the year before last it was, I think,—he made a pronouncement in favour of the Bolsheviks in Russia, and the Prime Minister was compelled to say, in a public speech, that he repudiated that pronouncement as the hankerings of his lieutenant. Those who remember again, the pronouncement that he made, when the controversy was at its height, in favour of the nationalisation of Railways, know also what fate it met with at the hands of the British Cabinet. And I take it that his recent pronouncement at the British East African Banquet will receive a similar burial very soon at the hands of the British Cabinet. But, Sir, I wish to rivet the attention of this House and of the authorities on the amendment of which I have given notice. It is this:

'At the end of the Resolution add the following:

'and in particular that he do cable to the Secretary of State for India and through him bring to the notice of the British Cabinet the Assembly's feeling of indignation at the pronouncement reported to have been made recently by the Right Honourable Winston Churchill at the East African Dinner in London.'

My object in bringing this amendment forward is to let it be known to the British Cabinet that this pronouncement of a responsible member of the Government has produced in India a feeling of indignation. Why? Because, while the Government of India was fighting the battle of Indians in Kenya and had sent a despatch to the Secretary of State for India. While that despatch was placed before the Joint Parliamentary Committee

[Mr. N. M. Samarth.]

for its consideration, while the Joint Parliamentary Committee upheld the views which the Government of India put forward in that despatch, and while negotiations were going on, here comes a Minister of the Crown, no less than the Colonial Secretary, at an East African Banquet, in a post-prandial speech, giving the go-by to all the recommendations and all the proposals which the Government of India and the Joint Parliamentary Committee had made. The Government of India asked for a Royal Commission to go into the whole of the details of this question in order that a satisfactory solution may be arrived at. The Joint Parliamentary Committee accepted that as the right solution and asked also for a Royal Commission. While this proposal is being discussed and has not yet been finally decided upon by the British Cabinet, Mr. Winston Churchill comes to the East African Banquet and makes a pronouncement that the highlands in Kenya will be reserved for all time for European settlers. I am taking Reuter's report, and I take it that it is fairly accurate. If afterwards it is repudiated, then I would say that my condemnation also will be of no avail. But I take it that Reuter could not have given an inaccurate and incorrect report, and upon that I proceed. Reuter says:

'Mr. Churchill proceeded to emphasise that the highlands of East Africa should be reserved exclusively for European settlers. The decision must be regarded as final and it was not intended to depart therefrom—(as though he was giving the law over the head of the British Cabinet)—He further wished to apply broadly and comprehensively as far as practicable, Cecil Rhodes' principle of equal rights for all civilised men, meaning that natives and Indians who had reached and conformed to a well-marked European standard would not be denied the fullest exercise of the enjoyment of civil and political rights.'

And who was to determine that standard, and how was it to be determined?

'The standard to be adopted', he proceeded to say, 'was certainly a matter in which the European community would be fully consulted.'

Now, Sir, that constitutes, to my mind, a betrayal of the whole promise that had been made to us that the question would be fully considered and ultimately decided upon by the British Cabinet. The Honourable Mover of the Resolution has already placed before you certain facts, namely, that it was by Indian industry and labour that the Uganda Railway had been constructed, that the Indian trader had gone there and settled there long before these European settlers came, that it was by Indian enterprise that what is known as the Kenya Colony to-day had been developed; and yet he is to be squeezed out of the land where he has toiled for the benefit of the Empire! My answer to the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Winston Churchill, in brief, is this. I will tell you afterwards who is the author of that answer. My answer is this:

'It was the Sikh soldier who bore an honourable part in the conquest and pacification of these East African countries. It is the Indian trader, who, penetrating and maintaining himself in all sorts of places to which no white man would go or in which no white man could earn a living, has more than any one else developed the early beginnings of trade and opened up the first slender means of communication. It was by Indian labour that the one vital railway on which everything else depends was constructed. It is the Indian banker who supplies perhaps the larger part of the capital yet available for business and enterprise, and to whom the white settlers have not hesitated to repair for financial aid. The Indian was here (that is, in Kenya) long before the first British official. He may point to as many generations of useful industry on the coast and inland as the white settlers—especially the most recently arrived contingents from South Africa (the loudest against him of all) can count years of residence. Is it possible for any Government with a scrap of respect for honest dealing between man and man, to embark upon a policy of deliberately squeezing out the native of India from regions in which he has established himself under every security of public faith?'

Whose utterance, do you think, is this, Sir? It is Mr. Winston Churchill's in his 'East African Journey'. It is again a case, and a very strange case indeed, of the strange story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Whom am I to believe? Mr. Winston Churchill who advocates the Indian cause with all the fervour that an Indian can bring to the advocacy of it, or Mr. Winston Churchill who sold away that Indian cause a few days ago in the East African Banquet? I ask the Minister of the Crown, the Colonial Secretary, the same query which he put in that quotation from his book on his East African Journey. Well, Sir, apart from these things, one thing which really pains me is this. The Government of India has advocated the Indian cause—no national Government even could have done better in this matter—It is fighting our battle. It is at the same time confronted with difficulties of a very delicate character at the present moment;—and yet here is a responsible member of the British Government indulging in an indiscreet, unwise, reckless and irresponsible utterance. Surely, it is due to the Government of India that no responsible Member of Parliament, much less a responsible Minister of the Crown, should say or do anything to intensify or accentuate the situation in this country and make the position of the Government of India more burdensome and more trying than it is at present. There is another reason, Sir. I belong to that party,—I take it that every Member of this Assembly belongs to that party, whichever label it may have—we are here, and there is the bulk of the thinking public outside in the country also,—whose dominating idea and guiding principle is that Englishmen and Indians should join hands and work together in a spirit of *camaraderie* in order that by their joint efforts India may be speedily uplifted into a self-contained, self-respecting and self-governing unit of the British Commonwealth,—a unit of the British Commonwealth in the rights and responsibilities of which, in the burdens and privileges of which, in the glory and benefits of which, His Majesty's Indian and European subjects alike would be partners and participators on a footing of perfect equality. We are striving for it. And, as everybody knows, there is a large party outside against us, and, surely, Members of Parliament, in responsible positions in the public life of England, ought to know that they should say or do nothing at this juncture, or hereafter even, which is calculated to thwart the progress and arrest the development of this party. I feel indignant,—I use the word 'indignation' in this amendment, and I use it deliberately,—I really feel indignant that a Minister of the Crown should be so oblivious of considerations of this character. But, Sir, there is one more thing which I wish to say. I have no doubt that the Government of India will cable, if this amendment is adopted, to the Secretary of State, in whatever terms they like, in whatever phraseology they adopt, the feeling of this House on this matter. I am anxious that they should do so immediately in order that the British Cabinet may not uphold and endorse the view which Mr. Winston Churchill has held forth before the East African Banquet. If the British Cabinet unfortunately comes ultimately to the same conclusion, all I need say is,—it is hard to say so, but I think sometimes it is no use mincing matters—I can scarcely help saying that, if the British Cabinet does ultimately uphold the decision and the views adumbrated in Mr. Winston Churchill's East African Banquet speech, then its decision and action will stand out in the pages of history.—to use the apt phraseology employed on another occasion by a statesman, writer, thinker, philosopher, and a great master of diction who was for some time the Secretary of State for India,—it will stand out in the pages of history as 'a masterpiece of melancholy meanness.' I feel confident that the British Cabinet will never

[Mr. N. M. Samarth.]

do anything of the kind, but let me give a warning to the British Cabinet that, in matters of this kind, they must be very careful to see that nothing is done, in a Crown Colony at any rate, by which the rights and privileges of Indians are subordinated to those European settlers who came there afterwards.

One word, Sir, and I have done. The Honourable Mover of the Resolution referred to the lessons of the Great War. One great lesson which stands out in the philosophy of history and will be recorded by the historian in future is this, that the Great War illustrates once again the truth that there is, in the case of individuals as well as of nations, such a thing as the operation of the moral law. A deviation from the moral law,—a violation of the moral law—is bound to bring about its own retribution in God's own time. The lesson of the Great War was that righteousness exalteth a nation. The absence or the reverse of it, Sir, degradeth it.

Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, Mr. Samarth in moving his amendment has asked the House not to fix the Cabinet of England with responsibility for the speech of one of its Members. Sir, at the same time, he must remember that the Cabinet at times allows one of its Members to offer a feeler to the public. They, first of all, want to feel the pulse of the public and, if they find that opinion is against them, they would conveniently disown the speaker, but, if there is no strong opinion against it, then they would adopt it. Can we not regard this statement of Mr. Winston Churchill as a feeler by the British Cabinet in regard to a matter which is vitally interesting the whole of the Empire? Moreover, it ought not to be forgotten that Mr. Winston Churchill is the Colonial Secretary and one who has got authority to speak on the subject. The second qualification which he has is this, he is the rising hope of the nebulous new party which is being formed in England; that may have been the reason why he has chosen this occasion to say a few words upon a subject which is troubling the British mind considerably. Therefore, Sir, while I agree with my Honourable friend that we should not attach too much importance to the words of one Cabinet Minister, we must not forget that what is said by a Cabinet Minister to-day may become the opinion of the Cabinet itself to-morrow; therefore, we have to guard ourselves against the speech being accepted with equanimity by the people of this country; and, I think, my Honourable friend was justified in moving the amendment of which he has given notice.

Sir, I wish to give a concrete instance of the meanness and of the indefensible way in which the European settlers deal with
 3 P.M. Indians in Kenya. I believe Nairobi is the capital of the Kenya Colony. It consists, I believe,—I read of it the other day,—of 8,500 inhabitants, of which 5,700 are Indians and 1,600 are Europeans, and the rest are Dutchmen and so on. Now, there is a municipality there which consists of 18 members, if I remember aright. According to property qualifications, two-thirds of the taxes are paid by Indians and, therefore, they would ordinarily be entitled to 12 seats out of the 18. If you apply the educational test, I am informed that out of the 5,700 Indians 1,400 can qualify. That would again give the Indians about 7 out of the 18 seats. What is it that they have actually got? They have got only one seat and they have been

promised two (*An Honourable Member*: 'Promised 4 seats interim'): well, they have the promise of four seats. Now, Sir, is there any justification for this treatment? Look at it from the point of view of the Indian paying the municipality, enriching it and enabling it to carry on the administration. Look at it from the point of view that he is an intelligent person who is able to take part in the municipal administration. Is there any justification for not giving the Indian his rights according to property qualifications or according to the educational test? Is there any justification for withholding from him his franchise and asking him to accept only four seats? That shows, Sir, that our friends in South Africa are not prepared to deal with him honestly and fairly. Sir, when people become restive in consequence of such unfair treatment, another Cabinet Minister rises up and says that the hard fibre which won the Empire for England will still be able to maintain that Empire. Everybody knows that the hard fibre of the muscle of the English people would be able to maintain the Empire, but Lord Birkenhead and others had better be told that, if they employ the hard fibre of the arm, it will have to be done at the expense of some finer fibre of some more important part of the body. This would create a great deal of discontent in this country; it must not be forgotten that, in recent years, very many of the troubles which have arisen owe their origin to statements made in the House of Lords or in the House of Commons. It is because of statements like those made by Mr. Churchill and Lord Birkenhead that the unrest in this country has been intensified, and it is for this reason that we, as representatives of the people, are bound to raise our voice against them. Sir, I was reading yesterday, while I was coming from Bombay, a novel in which an Australian tells a British Member of Parliament that the best way of dealing with the Indian problem in South and East Africa is to tell the Indian that he must confine his energies to some place north of the Tropics of Capricorn. There the Indian can work and the Englishman cannot work. If the Indian is relegated to the north of the Tropics of Capricorn, there would be no trouble at all in South or East Africa. If that had been told honestly, probably it would ease the situation much better. If we are told that we have no place in South or East Africa, that we are not wanted there, that there is no use in our toiling for the benefit of ourselves and for the benefit of the Empire, probably a great deal of the unrest which is now prevailing in the country could be mitigated; but we are told that we are citizens of a great Empire, of an Empire, as Lord Palmerston once said, the citizens of which have as great and valuable a right as the citizens of ancient Rome. We are told that we have equal status, self-determination and that, wherever we go, our rights will be respected. After telling us all that we are now told that we cannot acquire land in the Highlands, that it is reserved for the European settlers, that we must take houses ourselves in the dirty quarters of the place, that we cannot be expected to exercise all the rights which the Europeans are entitled to exercise, and that our status is not as high as that which has been deliberately conferred on the European settlers in that country. Now, Sir, if an honest statement is made that we have no rights equal to the rights of Europeans, probably we in this Assembly will not be able to raise our voice; because we may find ourselves helpless when such an ukase has gone forth but, after having told us that we can go there and work there, to tell us now that, though we have worked there and have enriched the

[Mr. T. V. Seshagiri Ayyar.]

country, we should not acquire certain rights, seems to me one of the meanest things that can be done in the name of justice and fair play.

I do not want to take up any more of the time of the Assembly, because I know that, even on the Government Benches, the same feeling prevails as amongst us. I may say this much that, ever since I heard the famous speech of Lord Hardinge in the Banqueting Hall in Madras, where, with fine enthusiasm, he condemned the policy pursued in South Africa, the people of this country have been rallying round the Government of India on this subject at least. The Government of India have done a great deal for us. Successive Viceroys have done their very best to ease the situation, but, Sir, they have to fight against the Cabinet at Home, a Cabinet which is looking to the interests of the settlers in South and East Africa, namely, the interests of the land-owning classes. They seem to think that Indians can have no rights and they should not be encouraged to claim rights. That is, unfortunately, the position which confronts Government and confronts this Assembly and it is time that we, both Government and the people, raised our voices and warned the Cabinet that, if they go on at this rate, they will find it impossible to govern the country, and that there will be more serious unrest than they are facing now.

Sir Frank Carter (Bengal: European): Sir, the Resolution proposed by the Honourable Mover deals with Africa as a whole. I do not propose to refer to Africa as a whole, but I will confine my remarks to East Africa only. Let me say, at the outset, and I do not want to be misunderstood by my Indian friends, that I sympathise with their natural aspirations and I fully agree that they should be treated on an equality in other parts of the British Empire. I take it from the terms of the Resolution that this has been promised to Indians in East Africa.

- You will all recognise that there are two sides to every question and it is the opposite side to which I should like to draw attention. I am sorry to have to disturb the harmony of the House, but it is only fair to put the European side forward. The Government of India have done all in their power to get Indians recognised and to get them equal status in East Africa. They sent Sir Benjamin Robertson to inquire into the condition of Indians in East Africa and I understand that he reported favourably. Now, what is the situation in East Africa? There are, I believe, at the present time about 35 thousand Indians and nine thousand Europeans. That is in 1921. In 1911, there were roughly nine thousand Indians and two thousand Europeans, so we may say that the increase on both sides has been very much the same. I beg to differ from the speakers who have preceded me, and I say that these Europeans are the founders of East Africa. They are the pioneers of the country. The Colony has been made by these pioneers and by British capital and not by the Indians who are only traders and artisans. I do not think Members of this Assembly recognise that these Indians in East Africa are not Sastris. I assure you they are not. They are artisans. Now, do they want a change in the constitution? I do not believe it. Has anybody in this House been to East Africa? Has anybody gone there and studied the question? It is merely the agitators now in India who are going about the world and stirring up these traders to demand rights which

they do not really require. I believe I am right in saying that the Highlands of East Africa have been definitely promised by Lord Esher, and again by Lord Milner, to Europeans, and, when the war was over, facilities were given to ex-soldiers to go and settle there. The area of the highlands is about 40,000 square miles and the area of the rest of Africa is about 200,000 square miles, so that it is really a fifth that the Europeans want. They do not want Indians to buy land there. (*A Voice*: 'Why not?') Well, you can say 'why not.' I shall bring forward the case of Kashmir where we Englishmen cannot buy land. (*A Voice*: 'That is not British territory.') Well, I cannot buy land there. But, apart from that, no European foreigner is allowed to buy land in East Africa unless it is with the consent of the Governor General. Now, the Honourable Mover has referred to what was done by the Indians in East Africa during the war. I should like to refute that statement. I have here a copy of the '*United Empire*.' This is what it contains:

'Local Indians joined 1,100 (mostly as clerks, drivers and sweepers) wounded *nil*; killed *nil*, shot or hanged as traitors 12.'

That is the record, as I have it, of what the Indians in East Africa did during the war. I do not think you realise that the people whom you are fighting for are not worth all this trouble. Now, as regards the African himself, how does he view the situation? I have not had a chance of speaking to him, but I am told that he does not like the Indian at all, and, that if the Europeans clear out to-morrow, the African would clear the Indian out. Whether that is correct or not I do not know. (*A Voice*: 'Does not matter'.) But, apart from all that what is the chief deterrent to East Africa being recognized at the present time as an equal part of the British Empire? It is this Gandhi non-co-operation. I call it revolution. Can any Member of this House say that this open preaching of sedition is not a deterrent, a very severe and serious deterrent, to the aspirations of all right-thinking Indians? Much as I desire the unity of the Empire, I do not think that we can ask any of our Colonies to conform to the vagaries of agitators such as Gandhi, and that is what, if these agitators are in East Africa as I understand they are, you are asking this House to do. Until we can put our house here in India in order, we cannot expect that other parts of the British Empire will accord to us what we know is our due. We must look to our own home first, and, until we do this and realize that British rule is prevalent throughout the country, we cannot expect the Colonies to treat us as a trustworthy part of the British Empire. We must not sit on the fence; we must come down on one side or the other, and the sooner we do it the better.

I was reading a letter the other day from a man in New Zealand. I do not know if Members of this Assembly realize that there is a growing feeling in the Dominions that, if the conditions at present prevailing in India continue, they seriously doubt the feasibility of being able to pull in the same boat with India. I do not want that and you do not want that. But the Dominions are afraid of India upsetting the equilibrium of the relationship between the self-governing peoples of the Empire.

There is an amendment to this Resolution by Sir Sivasawmy Aiyer, which, had he been here, I would have liked to have supported. I can say

[Sir Frank Carter.]

this, that I would far prefer to vote for a Conference between the representatives of the South African Union and the representatives of the Government of India and the Indian Legislature than the Resolution of the Honourable the Mover, but there is little use in calling such a Conference until, as I have said, India has set her house in order.

Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): I rise, Sir, to support the amendment moved by my Honourable and esteemed friend, Mr. Samarth, and, in doing so, I wish to associate myself with every word that he has spoken in support of that amendment. I am sorry, Sir, that my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Carter, whose sympathy ordinarily with Indian aspirations is well known to this Assembly, should have thought it proper to take the attitude that he has taken. What does Sir Frank Carter say? Sir Frank Carter says that the demand has never come from Indians in East Africa, that it is the work of agitators who would give them something that they do not want. Sir, as far as I am aware, I have reason to believe that the demand for the rights of citizenship has always come from the people concerned. But, if it is true, assuming for one moment that it is true, that a band of people, backed up by the united opinion of the Indian people, demand for their countrymen the free rights of citizenship that have been denied to them, it does not behove either the British Government or any European Member to come forward and say that the right of citizenship will not be granted because it is not demanded by the people concerned. (Hear, hear.) It is a question of self-respect for us. It is a question for us of demanding the right that every subject of the British Government has a right to demand. (Hear, hear.) And it does not lie in the mouth of any one, either the Minister of the Imperial Crown or any European in any part of the British Empire, to deny that right to any British subject, however humble his position may be. Sir, we are asked by Sir Frank Carter to set our house in order before we ask for the rights of Indians in other parts of the Empire. Who can deny that the Members of this Assembly and many outside this Assembly in the country are trying their best against all odds to set the house in order? Is His Majesty's Government going to help us in setting this house in order or is His Majesty's Government, by allowing a responsible Minister like Mr. Winston Churchill to make statements of an irresponsible character, going to co-operate with Mr. Gandhi in fanning the flame into a fire? I submit, Sir, that every sensible Indian, every Member of this Assembly, is anxious to set the house in order. I agree that Mr. Gandhi would set fire to this house. I do not want, in the interests of this country and in the interests of the British Empire, that a responsible Minister of the Crown should be a party in co-operating with Mr. Gandhi in setting fire to this house. One word more, Sir, and I will have done. My friend, Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, has referred to the memorable speech that Lord Hardinge, late Viceroy of India, made on a memorable occasion in Madras. I wish the Government of India at this moment to come out like Lord Hardinge and proclaim, as Richard II proclaimed in olden times, that they would lead in this matter, that they would fight our battle in England and that, with the help of Mr. Montagu, in whom we have absolute faith, and with the help of Lord Reading, they would defeat the mischievous designs of Ministers like Mr. Winston Churchill. I hope, as Mr. Samarth has rightly pointed out, that the statement is a statement of the Minister and that it will receive no support from

the Imperial Government. It is unnecessary to point out that, if the British Cabinet backed up the statement made by Mr. Winston Churchill, the state of affairs that would be created in this country would be something that it is impossible for us to describe. With these words, Sir, I support Mr. Samarth's amendment.

Rao Bahadur C. S. Subrahmanayam (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, the words 'equal partner of British citizenship' have been dinned into our ears and the simple question I ask is, is the British Cabinet, the British Government, going to stand by those words or is it going to whittle down the essence, the substance and the meaning of those words? That is a simple proposition I put before this Assembly to consider. Are those words unmeaning words, merely words and nothing more than words? If we are citizens of the Empire, no portion of the Empire, no part of the Empire shall say: 'You are not members; you shall not enter our territory.' Excluding the Indians from any portion of the Crown Colonies territories means destroying the meaning and import of those words. I take my stand—and my countrymen take their stand—on those words, and this action is the breaking of the meaning of those words, and this has been the substance and the motto in every agitation against Government.

Now, Sir, Sir Frank Carter said something about the Indians in Kenya Colony. I will read only the following sentence:

'The claim of the Indian community cannot be lightly disregarded, seeing that they were in the country long before Europeans had settled there; and that, but for Indian labour, the Uganda Railway would not have been constructed: that most of the trading wealth of the country was in the hands of the Indians; and finally, that Indians were British subjects.'

I think this sentence sums up the whole of the case for the Indians. We have all the three points, capital labour, intelligence and enterprise emanating from the Indians, and their being in the country before the European. This I quote not from an irresponsible paper, but from a statement of the Kenya Commissioner of Lands in 1907. I think this is enough to support the case we have got.

Mr. N. M. Joshi (Nominated: Labour Interests): Sir, I shall only confine my remarks to the criticisms which my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Carter, has thought proper to make on this occasion. In the first place, he said that East Africa was developed with the capital of the Europeans, and, therefore, they have a better right to settle in that Colony. Sir, I doubt the accuracy of that statement. Mr. Winston Churchill himself says that the Indian traders financed a large number of Europeans, and, moreover, my friend, Sir Frank Carter, himself knows that in East Africa you do not find a very large number of Indian labourers, but a very large number of Indian traders. But, accepting for the moment that it is British capital that developed East Africa, I say, when you do some work of construction, is it only capital that can achieve it? Has not labour any responsibility for that work? Let him answer my question frankly.

Then, Sir, admitting that Europeans in East Africa have got a very large capital, where then is the difficulty for the Europeans buying up the highlands in open competition and retaining it for themselves? If they do it, the Indians will not be able to get any portion of the highlands. But what the Europeans want is not to buy up in open competition but to get the lands cheaper by reservation. They are afraid that the Indians will

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

beat them in the competition, and, therefore, they want the Government to make a preserve of the highlands.

He also referred to the war services of the Indians and said that the war services of the Indians in East Africa were not very considerable. They may not have been very considerable, but whose fault was it? Let him answer whether the educated Indian can get the same privileges in the Army, even in the Indian Army to-day as the Europeans gets. You will not, I say, get the educated Indian to join the Army on terms of inferiority. If the educated Indians, merchants, barristers and pleaders, were given the same opportunities which Europeans in similar circumstances had, I am quite sure my countrymen would not be found lacking in the military spirit.

With these words, Sir, I support the Resolution as well as the amendment.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, the historical sequence in Sir Frank Carter's remarkable speech is puzzling, and, unless the matter is cleared up, his case will not be very much strengthened. If I understood him aright, one of the deterrents in the way of the Indian settler being allowed rights of equal partnership in the Colonies is the revolutionary movement in India, to which my Honourable friend has referred. The troublous Colonial question has, I am afraid, been with us long. This infant revolution, though sufficiently terrible, like that other terrible infant, Mr. Winston Churchill (Laughter), has been of far less long standing. In fact, some people would be inclined to say that the germ and the seed of the present revolutionary movement lay in the South African troubles, when there was persecution untold of Indian settlers which were not settled in time nor satisfactorily. And, but for that chapter there, a chapter that we cannot recall to mind with any pleasure or pride, probably the virulence of the movement here would have been less, following constant blundering on one hand and scheming on the other, though, in the march of events, revolution of a more or less troublesome type was bound to come. Sir Frank Carter says that these people are not all Sastris, and are not worth it for they are traders—shall I say *box wallahs*? Is he at all sure that those who are hailing from his country and are claiming exclusive rights are all Sastris or anywhere near Sastris of non *box wallahs*? (Laughter.) Why, Sir, one of the boasts of some Colonial settlers in former times was that their ancestors had been selected by 12 British men, good and true. (Laughter.) That was the origin of some of these settlements, where we now hear of a white settlement. If you are to be really white and all white, there must be a judicious balancing, a balancing of the white with the black and the brown. That is what is practically told us, day after day, in proclamation after proclamation, and, if you cannot get that stand the test in other parts of the British Empire, faith in those professions will be getting less and less every day. We have been told: 'Why talk of exclusion of Hindus or Muhammadans from India? European foreigners cannot get settled there unless the Governor General in Council agrees.' But, where is the difficulty in the Governor General in Council agreeing to the right kind of foreigners coming there? There may still be a desire, for good reasons or bad, to keep the German or the Austrian out, and that is why a clause like this may have been necessary; but that is no answer, so far as British subjects are concerned, whether Indians or others. Do you say that the Australian will have to get the same sort of concession, or the Canadian,

or the South African or the Irish, for the matter of that? No such thing. Why then apply this to the British Indian, who has done and suffered so much there? It may be that the whole of the highlands had been bespoken in favour of, or given away to, the European, though this should not have been done. Does that bar the Indian acquiring by purchase or otherwise property in the market, let alone the question of open competition and auction sales, such as Sir Sydney Crookshank's department is going to have at Raisina at the end of the month. He might as well lay down, as one of the terms of sale, that undesirables of a certain kind shall not have the right of bidding, especially if they hail from Bengal (Laughter) 40,000 square miles of land and 9,000 men.

Mr. R. A. Spence (Bombay: European): The 9,000 can increase.

Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary: If the 9,000 can increase, so can the land, because by bringing the land under cultivation and making it fit for human habitation, you can go on indefinitely expanding a country like that. Well, we are told they are pioneers; they are founders of the Empire (which has been challenged), British capital, enterprise and suffering. Every stock argument of that kind has been brought forward, in defiance of the moral of the 'belly and other limbs' story. Excellent condemnation this of all that Viceroy and Governments of India have done up to now, from Lord Hardinge downwards, in advocating reasonable rights for Indians on whose behalf similar claims are to the fore. We are now to begin a new chapter. A Member of this Assembly, representing certain strongly canvassed interests, says all this is wrong and whatever may have been done in the past by Viceroys and Governments of India cannot be upheld; there cannot be any grievance with regard to Indian exclusion and you have got to begin a new chapter. Well, that will not be helpful from the points of view of peaceable settlement or good faith. To-day's debate and yesterday's make one very sad. Viceroys may be with us; Governments of India may be with us, whether with regard to the Khilafat question, the Colonial question or any question outside India in which Indians may be interested; yet, if there is a strong counter interest, there is no guarantee that we can achieve much. Viceroys and Governments are as helpless as ourselves whose importance makes some wonder whether other means have not to be employed, which by itself is another seed of revolution. If a balanced black, brown and white East Africa is impossible, a similar impossibility will be naturally overtaking us in other parts of the Empire, in spite of compacts and conferences. In the ideal of Swaraj that many of us have in view, the Britisher, Christian or otherwise, the Hindu, the Muhammadan, the Jew, the Parsi, the Jain, the Buddhist, is to have an equal place according to his title. Why should that be denied elsewhere? We are told that, because some or many of us have been misbehaving, the whole of the Indian people is to be condemned to penance, and, after due penance and purification, probably their claims will be taken into consideration—By the time that is achieved, may not more be driven to the misbehaving? Mr. Joshi was very anxious the other day for his labour emigrants and wanted liberty of action for them. What is the value of that liberty if that is the sort of thing that is allowed to prevail where he will emigrate? Canada, Australia and the older Colonies put forward certain demands by virtue of their constitution. Is that sort of thing to be allowed in the case of the Crown Colonies also, where considerations which exist in Canada and Australia cannot arise? That would create an impossible position. Mr. Samarth has quoted from Mr. Winston Churchill. That, I suppose, was

[Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary.]

not a quotation from an after-dinner speech which probably may account for the difference. Mr. Seshagiri Ayyar, with his usual acuteness, has suggested that this might have been a little feeler thrown out to see how the land lay, and that a man who has been often enough discredited by a Cabinet would not be hurt by being discredited once more. I am afraid that that cannot be said of one who is the Colonial Secretary for the time being, and he could not have said things which had not the tacit consent of the Cabinet. The position, therefore, is all the graver; and the earlier we can make strong representations through the Government which has sought to be helpful, and, the firmer the representations are, the better chances we shall have of finding some solution.

Mr. R. A. Spence: Sir, I rise to support the expression of opinion given by my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Carter, because I feel that that expression of opinion was given in the spirit which was mentioned during this debate by my Honourable friend, from Bombay, Mr. Samarth. We are all actuated by the spirit of *camaraderie* to work together here and we feel that, if we do injustice to the British in one part of the Empire, that spirit will not prevail. My friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary, who has just spoken, said that Sir Frank Carter had got his historical references in wrong sequence. Well, I cannot speak for him because I have not had an opportunity of consulting him; but I think that Sir Frank Carter was speaking of present day conditions and not of the conditions of the past. I think he was referring to what is happening at the present time and that is why he mentioned that subject. Now, in the Resolution which was introduced by the Honourable Mover, it struck me as rather curious how he seemed to harp on the question of breach of promise and breach of faith. I ask you to look upon this subject from the point of view of the white settler in Kenya and how he regards a breach of faith made to him. He went out to Kenya on the promises made to him by Lord Esher and by Lord Milner. He went out after fighting in the war for us, after four or five years of service in France, or possibly in Mesopotamia, or on this Indian frontier of ours; he goes out to Kenya to settle. It is not a tropical country—these highlands; it is a place where those of us who live in, shall we call them 'temperate,' though at the present time they seem rather 'intemperate' climates, people, for example coming from Canada and from Great Britain and the colder parts of the world, can settle. There are 45,000 square miles of highland; there are 160,000 or 200,000 square miles of other land. This British soldier or officer goes out to that country, buys his farm and settles there because of the promises made to him by the British Government, by the British Government, I say, because there seems to be a sort of feeling that the statements made by Ministers are not those of the British Government, but made by a member of the Government. What sort of feeling is that man going to have if that promise is broken? And I really do not see why we in India should want that promise to be broken. It is perfectly true that Indians have worked for the development of Kenya and East Africa. I do not suppose there is any one who would deny it; but would they have been able to do anything for that country if it had not been for the British there?

Mr. N. M. Samarth: The British came after.

Mr. R. A. Spence: Who were the people who went there first? The Arab slave-dealer is the one who went there first; do you want to recommend that the country should be restored to him? The original Asiatic

who went there was the Arab slave-dealer and it was the Britisher who put down that traffic, and the trader came along with the Britisher. That is not a reason why the Englishman should not be allowed to have land in that part of the country.

There is no doubt about it that, by this Resolution that has been proposed, an attack has been made at Kenya, and, to bolster up that attack at Kenya, the Mover of the Resolution has spoken a tremendous lot about South Africa. He finds he cannot do anything against South Africa. Even the great General Smuts cannot settle things, and so my Honourable friend goes against a little Colony which has been established only 17 years ago, and says: 'Oh, yes, we will make this a test case.' I should have preferred him to have gone for the South African Government, who are a big people, who can fight well, and not against the small community in Kenya.

Then, in the course of his observations, my Honourable friend said that 'blinded by race prejudice, the Economic Commission of European officials and non-officials reported injuriously to the Indian interests and in most offensive and provocative language maliciously slandered the Asiatics settled there.' Why should he say that the European officials and non-officials were blinded by race prejudice and maliciously slandered the Asiatic settlers? Surely, there is a bit of race prejudice in that statement of his.

Then, there was a reference in his speech to the principles on which the British Government entered the War. It was for those principles that the white settler in Kenya fought, and it was because he fought for those principles that he was promised his land. We did not dispossess any Indian. Can any of my friends here say that we have dispossessed a single Indian from the highlands of Kenya? Not one. Nor does any one in this Assembly wish to dispossess any man who is there. I do not think anybody in Kenya wishes to do so either. The whole attack seems to be against Winston Churchill. What is the gravamen of Mr. Winston Churchill's post-prandial speech? He has said that the highlands of East Africa should be reserved for the Europeans exclusively and that elsewhere there should be equal status and rights. I have got the Honourable Member here (Dr. Gour) waiting to correct me. I am sure he will put me right if I am wrong. It seems to me that that is the gravamen of Mr. Winston Churchill's speech, and because he has done that we have got all this accusation. Sir, these sort of speeches, as my Honourable friend, Sir Deva Prasad Sarvadhikary said, are likely to stir up ill-feeling.

Sir, before I sit down, I should like to say, that I should agree with Sir Frank Carter when he said that he would have supported the amendment that stands in the name of Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer; it is a very much better motion than the original Resolution, and I think it is more in keeping with the dignity of the Mover of the amendment than the amendment moved by Mr. Samarth.

Munshi Iswar Saran (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, in my young days, I had heard a story and it was this. A poor little lamb was drinking water at a stream towards the end. Some time after, came a tiger and began to drink water near the source. A few minutes after, the tiger looked at the lamb and said: 'How dare you defile the water of this stream?' The poor lamb said, with folded hands: 'Sir, I have been drinking water here long and the water is

[Munshi Iswar Saran.]

flowing my way; surely it is not going to you'. The tiger said: 'Nothing of the kind: This is impertinence for which I am going to punish you'. The punishment the poor lamb did receive and it was that he went inside the tiger. Now, these Indians, artisans, 'men who do not count,' in the words of my Honourable friend, Sir Frank Carter, who gave expression to this sentiment with great vehemence in answer to an interjection of my Honourable and esteemed friend, Mr. Samarth. He said: 'They do not matter; you need not bother about them'. These Indians are traders, shop-keepers and I suppose, coolies, whom my friend, Mr. Joshi, represents here. These were the men who were living and working in Kenya. A long time after comes the white man and says: 'Good gracious. How impertinent these black men are. These black men living here have the impudence and audacity to dream of occupying land in the highlands! Nothing of the kind. We have built this Island out of our capital. We have fought this Great War'. All these arguments are being trotted out in order to deprive the Indian of his right to acquire land in the highlands. My Honourable friend, Mr. Spence, says: 'Why should you deprive the Englishmen of the highlands?' Good gracious! Deprive the Englishmen! Even the wildest amongst us has not got the courage to dream of depriving the Englishmen of land in the highlands. What the poor Indian, who does not count, who does not matter, according to Sir Frank Carter, is struggling for is to have his little right recognised to a little share in those glorious highlands. That is all. We are not seeking to oust the Englishman. It is our claim, it is our prayer, it is our appeal, that we should have our share in them. Sir, I am exceedingly obliged to Sir Frank Carter and to my Honourable friend, Mr. Spence, for the speeches they have delivered. They have made the position of the Britishers in this country quite clear. We now know where they stand. Sir Frank Carter, as is usual, started with an expression of sympathy with our aspirations. That, Sir, is the approved style now of doing things. With apologies to the Honourable gentlemen occupying the Government Benches, whenever they want to defeat a Resolution, they get up and say: 'Oh I can assure this House that Government is in considerable sympathy with it, *but*'. You wait for the '*but*' and when it comes, the result is that the Resolution is destroyed. And no one, by the way, is a greater adept in this art than my Honourable and esteemed friend, Sir William Vincent. (Laughter.) Now, Sir, the non-co-operator is the whipping boy of this Council. If there is a collision between two trains, the non-co-operator is in some mysterious way responsible for it. Had it not been for these wicked non-co-operators, the trains would have gone on all right. Had it not been for non-co-operation, the British settlers and the white people in Kenya would have said: 'Hullo, my friends, Indians, we have been dying for you. We are trying to do everything for you. What nonsense? You are such silly dears. We can't get on without you. Highlands, you take them. We go to the lowlands.' But now they say: 'Look here! We would have done everything for you but for this non-co-operation'. And Sir Frank Carter tells us: 'Set your house in order'. To be serious, Sir, Sir Frank Carter once was perfectly right. Unless and until you set your house in order, you cannot expect your people to be respected out of India. It is in India that the real battle has to be fought. It is in India that your right has to be recognised, and, if it is recognised, no one, not even that oppressed individual, the Britisher in Kenya, will have the courage to get up and deny our right, which is the inherent right of every British subject. Sir, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill has been taken to task. I

do not agree with my Honourable friends at all. You must make allowance for post-prandial speeches. There are various reasons why a man in a post-prandial speech sometimes says more than he really means to say. I have not the honour of the acquaintance of the Right Honourable gentleman, but it may be that there are causes which are not known to the public why this speech was made. Sir, I wish to express my entire sympathy, not sympathy of the Carter brand, but really genuine sympathy, with the observations of my Honourable friend, Mr. Samarth, who, if I may say so, has delivered an admirable speech and has put the Indian point of view in very clear and forcible language before the House. Sir, the question which this House has got to consider, and which Government has got to consider, and which the Colonies have got to consider, is this: Is all this talk of equal partnership in the Empire a camouflage, or is it a reality? If it is a reality, then Indians claim, and, I submit, rightly claim, that their rights, in the Dominions and in the Colonies and everywhere, should be equal to that of any other British subject, be he dark, be he white, or be he brown. If that be so, then I submit that there is absolutely no justification for the Right Honourable gentleman saying that the highlands will be reserved for Europeans and this decision is final. May I tell him, in all humility, that to say that any decision in politics is final is a mistake. Many a final decision has been upset. It has been upset in India. It has been upset in other countries, and I may say that it will be upset in future. Sir, this is a question on which there is absolute unanimity between Indians of all shades of thought and opinion. They consider it to be the test of the sincerity of the statement that Indians are the equal subjects of the King. If they are the equal subjects of the King, they want equal rights and they are ready for equal responsibilities. It behoves us, it behoves the Government of India, and it behoves the authorities in England, to recognise this fact clearly, so that the non-recognition of this principle may not lead to trouble—trouble which we may not be in a position to clearly foresee at present.

Sir, before I sit down, I wish to say that our grateful thanks are due to the Government of India for the bold fight that they have put up on our behalf as far as this question is concerned, and we wish to say nothing, and to do nothing that might embarrass them in their fight. We wish in this matter, to strengthen their hands, so that they may fight our battle,—the battle for the absolute equality of the whites and non-whites within the Empire.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadian): In speaking to this Resolution, I shall not take my cue from the facts of the casual correspondent, a South African European resident of Kenya, who contributed his effusion to a journal, from which my Honourable friend on the left has given a garbled quotation. Due to his courtesy, I am in possession of this magazine and I shall complete the quotation which he left imperfect. That very correspondent, putting up an appeal for the Kenya European, in the very next sentence after the one quoted by Sir Frank Carter, admits that 'with the exception of these Indians'—and I give to the House his *ipsissima verba*:

'Other types of Indians did their duty well during the War. But undoubtedly that is not the type who are going to be affected by the decisions.'

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

The correspondent admits that the Indians as a class have served well during the War, but he says that, because the Indians then resident in Kenya have not served as well as he should desire, therefore the Indian nationhood in this country and elsewhere must be denied the common right of citizenship within the Empire.

My friend, in championing the cause of the few straggling settlers of this Colony, said: 'Let us set our house in order.' My friend, no doubt, claims India as his home, but he tells us that India is the home of himself and me, but Kenya is his home but not mine. That is the position of the Europeans with reference to the Colonies of the Empire. They are the citizens of the British Empire, but the Indians are denied the right in any of the Colonies of the British Empire. We are told—this is your home, settle your differences and, after you have settled your differences, make a claim upon the Kenya Colony.' My esteemed friend on my right (Mr. Spence) stood up to reinforce this argument by saying, upon what authority I know not, that the Kenya Colony highlands had been promised to returned British soldiers. Now, Sir, wherever he got his fact from I know not, but Members of the House will bear with me when I repeat that in the House of Commons, on a memorable occasion, when the Colonial vote was under discussion, this very question was raised by the Members of Parliament, and Mr. Winston Churchill, speaking from his place, not at a banquet, but from his place in the House of Commons, solemnly declared as the unaltered and the unalterable will of Parliament to treat the Indians on an equal footing with the citizens of the Empire. Let me quote to you the words which he used not many years ago but only in the month of July last. When this question was raised he said this:

'The case of the Indians is one of very great difficulty, first of all because of the relations between the Indians and the whites, and secondly, because of the relations between the Indians and the native, which are by no means so ideal as is sometimes suggested. In the main, we must make a continuous effort to live up to the principle that racial distinctions do not determine the status or position of any man in the British Empire, a person who is otherwise qualified to occupy a position or exercise a function of responsibility.'

That is the line on which we shall endeavour to proceed. These are the memorable words of the Colonial Secretary uttered in the House of Commons when the direct vote of the Colonial Office was challenged by the responsible Members of the House.

Now, at the end of that very year, this question was agitated in the House of Commons; and Mr. Winston Churchill was asked why the claims of Indians in South Africa were not settled, and a suggestion was made for the appointment of a Royal Commission. In the debate, which took place on the 14th of July, 1921, Mr. Winston Churchill expressed a desire that the Government of England would settle this question upon the basis of equality; and he, further, gave an assurance to the Members of the House that, if he was unable to settle this question to the satisfaction of the Indian people, he would submit the whole question to a Royal Commission. At the end of the month, this promise was once more alluded to, and the reply that Mr. Winston Churchill gave was:

'I am perfectly agreeable to submit this question to a Royal Commission, but I am hopeful of a just and honourable settlement.'

This was the utterance made by Mr. Winston Churchill late in the month of July last. Now, my friend, Mr. Spence, tells us that responsible Ministers like Lord Esher and Lord Milner had promised the highlands of Kenya to European settlers. I am perfectly certain that my friend must be under some delusion, because Mr. Winston Churchill explained to the House of Commons that these highlands of Kenya, situated as they were at the high altitude of 6,000 and more feet, were not suitable for European settlement. . .

Mr. R. A. Spence: There is some mistake.

Dr. H. S. Gour: And it was pointed out that a number of Europeans who had taken land on the highlands of this Colony had to mortgage and give them up, because they were not able to manage them. This was the statement he then made,

Mr. R. A. Spence: A terminological inexactitude.

Dr. H. S. Gour: Then, Sir, followed the Imperial Conference; and in that Imperial Conference we were told that the rights of Indians in all parts of the British Empire would be respected. General Smuts, as a matter of formal protest, entered his dissentient note. But it was understood, and understood by all concerned, that it was merely a formal protest and that adherence would be given to the deliberate Resolution then arrived at. This was the situation when, all of a sudden, at the East African dinner, Mr. Winston Churchill completed another of these somersaults for which the Colonial Secretary has made himself notorious. As pointed out by Reuter; he told us that, as a curious result of the war, the discontented agitators in African and Asiatic countries seemed to think that they had only to express the wish that Britain should lay down the Government and Britain would comply; that it was high time it was made clear that this was not the rule Britain intended to follow. Then, referring to South Africa, he did not say what his wish was, but he evidently meant to imply that he was publishing the conclusions at which he had arrived, but whether in consultation with the other Members of the Cabinet or on his own responsibility, I know not.

I give you his exact words as reported by Reuter:

'Mr. Churchill proceeded to emphasise that highlands of East Africa should be reserved exclusively for European settlers; that decision must be regarded as final and it was not intended to depart therefrom.'

Now, Honourable Members here have been referring to the fact that this is a post-prandial effusion. Well, Sir, I should be extremely delighted to hear that it was nothing more. But, I submit, it has sent a thrill of indignation coupled with consternation throughout the length and breadth of this country when my fellow-countrymen read that the Colonial Secretary had announced to the assembled East African people that decision, which might be the decision of the British Cabinet, excluding them completely from the highlands of Kenya. If this were all, there would be some doubt. Later on he said:

'The interest of the British settlers and native population alike require that the future emigration of Indians should be strictly regulated.'

Here was the benefactor of mankind. Winston Churchill, speaking in the interest of the natives of East Africa, was safeguarding their rights and

[Dr. H. S. Gour.]

preserving their liberty by squeezing out the Asiatic. We are not unfamiliar with these benevolent people. I have two such benevolent gentlemen sitting on my right and on my left. The Honourable Mr. Spence, speaking on behalf of the people of Kenya, tells us that the British soldier would be at sea unless this Colony is reserved for him. The Honourable Sir Frank Carter tells us: 'You would have certainly got all the rights you want, had it not been for that mad Gandhi.' Now, Sir, the connection between Mr. Gandhi and his non-co-operation movement and the claim of the British Indians in Kenya is as intimate as Mr. Gandhi's relation with the sun spots. My friend tells us that this non-co-operation movement is responsible for our not getting the rights in Kenya. I ask my friend, is he not fanning the flame of the non-co-operation movement by denying to the people of this country that elementary right? (Hear, hear.) Can he deny that we, the people of this country, are subjects of the British Crown? Can you deny that as subjects of the British Crown our home is not Calcutta or India, but the British Empire? It is upon that standpoint that the Britisher and the Indian must look to their common Government and to the common Crown.

My friend on the other side tells us that India is our home. I welcome that statement, but let him not deny the consequence which that statement leads to. If India is to be the home of the Britisher, let the Britisher admit that the Indian has equally the right of settling down in any part of the British Empire. This, Sir, is a basic principle; this, Sir, is a fundamental law. Can my friends deny it; can my friends assert that, while they are free to settle and enjoy rights of equal citizenship, and even shake—as my friend on the left has shaken—the pagoda tree in this country, we the people of this country, are to be denied the elementary right of making a decent living on the highlands of Kenya. Mr. Winston Churchill said that that was a country that needed development. I ask the Honourable Members whether it is not the case that we, the people of this country, have been the pioneers of Kenya, who have populated it, who had settled there before the British appeared upon the scene, and who have, by reason of their priority, the greater claim.

We appeal, Sir, not only to the Indian Members of this House, but we appeal to my friends, who are the sponsors of the British interests in that Colony, to reconsider that view and not deny the people of this country the rights of common British citizenship.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma (Revenue Member): Sir, the House has had a very good opportunity of hearing the views of non-official Indian, as well as European Members, and I am particularly glad that Sir Frank Carter and Mr. Spence have put forward before this Assembly what they considered to be the views of the European community in Kenya, and supported them by such arguments as appeared to them to be just and reasonable. I say, I am glad they have done it, because it would have been a useless debate if the House had not an opportunity of hearing both sides of the question threshed out and had not an opportunity of arriving at a reasonable decision.

I shall not deal at any great length with the original Resolution, because, from the attitude of the Assembly, it is clear that they have concentrated their attention, not so much upon South Africa, as upon Kenya. The Honourable Mover of the original Resolution has dealt with the ancient history of the whole question of South Africa. He has charged the British Government with breaches of promise, or at any rate with lukewarmness in carrying out promises: charged the Indian Government with negligence in defending the interests of the Indian community in South Africa, and, finally, asked for a recognition of the full rights of citizenship in South Africa for all Indians settled down there. It is unnecessary for me at this juncture to go into the ancient history and to show how His Majesty's Government have tried, amidst numerous difficulties, to uphold and preserve the interests of the Indian community in South Africa; and how the Indian Government, with equal ardour and zeal, tried to uphold, against odds, the position of the Indian community; and, if they have not succeeded to the fullest extent possible, it was by reason of overwhelming forces confronted against them and the spirit of compromise which must naturally guide the deliberations of an Empire where the interests, not of one, not of two, not of three partners, but of numerous partners, have to be taken into consideration. But it is useless now to take up the old tale because every one knows full well and recognises that the Indian Government are fully at one with the aspirations of the Indian people with regard to the rights of lawfully domiciled and resident Indians in South Africa. Recently, we sent a despatch to South Africa, explaining the position of the Indian Government with regard to this particular matter and chiefly dealing with the several proposals made by the South African Inquiry Committee, and we have every reason to hope that prejudice will be slowly conquered and that the Indian will come into his own in the not distant future in that Commonwealth of the British Empire. (Hear, hear.) Well, while matters are in the stage of negotiations, it is unnecessary for me to dilate at any great length upon those negotiations, and we shall leave it at that.

Now, coming to the Kenya question, Honourable Members have in their hands the despatch which the Government of India submitted to the Secretary of State on the 21st of October, 1920, giving a reasoned exposition of their views on the subject, and to every one of those views the Government of India does adhere without any equivocation or without any departure therefrom, either in word or in spirit. We said there:

'There is no justification in a Crown Colony or Protectorate for assigning to British Indians a status in any way inferior to that of any other class of His Majesty's subjects.'

We pleaded there for a common electoral roll and a common franchise on a reasonable property basis *plus* an educational test, without racial discrimination, for all British subjects. We have protested against segregation of any type or form and stated that the whole position can be met by the enactment and enforcement of proper and strict sanitary and building laws; and, with regard to the acquisition of land, we said that we were unable to agree that the Indian claim to acquire agricultural land anywhere in the Colony is either unjust or unreasonable. It is useless now, and it would serve no purpose, to argue the point as to whether the Kenya Colony owes more to the Indian settler or to the British settler, as to whether either of those communities has acted

[Mr. B. N. Sarma.]

recently with due regard to the interests of the Empire as a whole or have not, for this simple reason that, where there are two partners, it is just possible that one partner does a little more work than the other. It is recognised that both the European as well as the Indian have built up that Colony, and it is idle to suggest, as some people seem to do, that the Indian alone is mainly responsible for the present prosperity of the country. I think Sir Frank Carter was perfectly right in saying that, although the Indian might have been the pioneer and have considerably assisted in enterprises there, although it may be true that but for him the progress which has been achieved might not have been achieved, still there is no gainsaying the fact that British enterprise, British labour, British capital and British *personnel* were equally, if not to a larger extent, responsible for the result. But I deprecate any comparison as to whether one party, or the other party has done a little more or a little less in bringing about the existing state of things, for we feel that the country would be incapable of any great progress in the future unless both the British and Indian communities work together in harmony, mutual co-operation and a spirit of goodwill; and the Empire itself as such, as it stands at present, cannot be preserved unless equal status for all British subjects of His Majesty is maintained, with the reservations the Government of India agreed to at the recent Conference, namely, that, so far as the Dominions are concerned, the Government of India do recognise the right of those communities living in these Self-Governing Dominions to say with whom they will associate, whom they will admit into partnership with them; but subject to this provision that, so far as British Indian subjects settled there are concerned, they shall possess and enjoy absolutely equal privileges with the rest of His Majesty's subjects. (Cheers.) Therefore, Sir, I do not think that there need be any very great dissection of original principles. The real difficulty comes in when these principles have to be translated into practice. The outstanding differences with regard to Kenya appear to be with regard to the highlands, with regard to franchise and segregation, and more recently immigration laws. With regard to the highlands, there seems to be a great deal of misconception. It is unnecessary to say whether any legal pledge has been given to Europeans in Kenya promising them the whole of the highlands or not; but a course of conduct spread over a number of years is stated to have induced the European community settled there to believe that such a pledge has been given, and that is the position which His Majesty's Government had to face and which Mr. Churchill had to face. The problem, according to the Government of India, in so far as that aspect of the question is concerned, is not of very vital importance, because, either under a free gift policy or a policy of purchase and sale, practically the whole of the land in the highlands has passed into the hands of the European community and there is no longer any question of a gift or sale of land by the Government to the Indian community.

Dr. H. S. Gour: They want to sell all that land: the Europeans are hard up.

The Honourable Mr. B. N. Sarma: But the essential point of difference is whether an embargo need be put upon the European community prohibiting them from alienating the land to Indians or to any other community, that they please.

I shall not try to prejudice the position of either party, except to say that certain prominent reasons seem to urge a reconsideration, even

from the European point of view, of the position that they have assumed. As I said on a former occasion, it is only uncultured, ignorant, weak communities that have to be protected by legislation of this type against individual members of that community doing things which are prejudicial to that community; and I have not heard of any legislation preventing such strong civilised cultured men as the Europeans from doing such foolish things which they consider to be prejudicial to the interests of their community as alienating lands to the Indian community. I mean, it is a privilege of the weak or a defence of the weak to have such laws on the Statute Book or recognised in practice, and we have every reason to hope that the European community themselves will soon recognise, if they do not recognise it now owing to prejudices or passion, that it will pay them to have the right of free sale in order to be able to realise the best price for their farms in case any one of them happens to sell or lease his farms to outsiders. A wider market would promote enterprise, would promote investment of capital in land and it will, I am sure, be very soon recognised that it is so; and I am hopeful that, even without any persuasion from the Indian Government or the Indian people, the problem will solve itself. But I ask Honourable Members to be patient and not to look to this alone as an acid test and to recognise also the difficulties of His Majesty's Government, when they are confronted by strong prejudices and passions of such a powerful community as that settled down in Kenya. I am not for one moment weakening in the position which the Government of India is assuming; I am only putting it to this Assembly that the Indian public also, on their part, should have patience and recognise the difficulties in which His Majesty's Government is placed on this question. But we shall convey to His Majesty's Government the views of this Assembly, which are our views, that there is no justification whatsoever for this restriction being placed upon the Indians being able to purchase lands in the highlands from the Britishers, or, in other words, a disability being imposed upon the European community there in their present supposed interest which is really detrimental to them as well as to the interests of the whole Colony.

On the other important questions of franchise and segregation, we have every reason to hope that the recommendations made by the Government of India would be substantially agreed to, and that there would be no reason whatsoever for any dissatisfaction being felt with regard to the decision of His Majesty's Cabinet upon this point. Before passing further, I may state that we have reason to believe that Mr. Churchill's pronouncement on the outstanding differences on important points have not yet been decided by the Cabinet and I may say affirmatively that it would be unjust to state that the Cabinet or any members of the Cabinet are using Mr. Churchill as a feeler to see as to whether there is really any indignation in this country on that point. That is so far as the segregation and franchise questions are concerned. With regard to immigration, I feel sure that the present policy of His Majesty's Government would be adhered to. As I have said, there is no justification in a Crown Colony or Protectorate for assigning to British Indians a status in any way inferior to that of any other class of His Majesty's subjects or for restricting their entry into it for lawful purposes, and I do not think that could have been the meaning of Mr. Churchill's statement. If Mr. Winston Churchill, as an individual, hoped for a particular future with regard to East Africa's constitutional development, we have no reason to quarrel with him, and I am sure, if he stated that he looked forward to a federation of the type existing in

[Mr. B. N. Sarma.]

South Africa being established in Central and East Africa, he could have been expressing, not the views of the Cabinet, but only his own views as to what he felt was the proper course. I am not minimising the importance or significance thereof by suggesting that the views of a Minister in charge of the Colonies are not entitled to weight, but at the same time individual members cannot altogether be fettered in giving expression to their personal views in post-prandial speeches as to what they hope would be the state of the country under their charge. I think we must leave it at that.

Then, with regard to immigration also, we have made representations to His Majesty's Government to protect absolutely the existing privileges of Indians entering East Africa, and we have no reason to suppose that our representations would not be acceded to.

Then, there are one or two statements made by Sir Frank Carter which I think I might deal with roughly. (Laughter.) By 'roughly' I necessarily meant 'generally' and not in great detail. The Honourable Member may perhaps be in possession of information of which we are not, as to the state of the feeling of Indians in East Africa. But we have received numerous representations from East African Indians with regard to their attitude on the several questions which I have mentioned now, and I may state to the House that it was with considerable difficulty that we were able to persuade the East African Indian Community to comply with our wishes and not to make the position of His Majesty's Government or of the Secretary of State difficult by any obstinate behaviour on their part. Well, I am only mentioning that for the purpose of correcting any misapprehension that may arise that I have not stated what I knew or rather what we have reason to believe is the state of things in East Africa. Sir Frank Carter may be right in his statement that the vast majority of those people are merely following one or two leaders who take a particular view of the whole question, but so far as can be judged, they seem to follow rather solidly their leaders, and the opinion seems to be all one way, and there is a sharp tension which the Government of India is trying as far as possible to soften and smooth down.

As regards the attitude of the East African Indians with regard to the war, I think we need not expatiate upon that. They have done what they could. It is possible that some of them might not have come up to the mark. There is no gainsaying the fact, and I think that it is recognised by all, that the Indian community has done yeomen service in preserving that part of His Majesty's Dominions for the British Empire and I think that was one of the reasons why the British sentiment so strongly veered round in favour of Indians when Mr. Montagu elaborated his proposals for conferring self-governing institutions upon India.

I come now to another part of Sir Frank Carter's statement which has very great force in it; and that is, that the present political troubles in India are making it difficult for the Government to defend their interests to the same extent as perhaps they might have done but for those troubles. I am not saying that this is an adequate reason for not treating the Indians in the way in which they ought to be treated or for denying them equal status, which is their due. But I am only putting it to the House that the view that sometimes prevails, that the greater the agitation the greater the benefit, is not a correct view, and that Mr. Montagu will feel necessarily

embarrassed when he finds his hands weakened by the unrest prevailing in India. I, therefore, appeal that on this point we should do all that we can to strengthen the forces which are fighting for the Indian cause in the British Cabinet and in the Empire generally, and that we should not *pooh-pooh* or set at naught or treat lightly the statement made by the European representatives here that this unrest is having a disastrous effect upon Indian aspirations in the rest of the Empire. I feel sure that, as we grow stronger, both politically, economically as well as socially, by the removal of racial restrictions which exist amongst ourselves, and, as we evince by action, thought, demeanour and word that, with the growth of our strength, also grows our attachment and allegiance to the British Throne, and the British connection, any racial differences and discriminations and misunderstandings which may exist are bound to disappear, if we only have patience and recognise that, there is not the slightest doubt that these troubles which are confronting the statesmen in the various parts of the Empire will find an easy solution, and a satisfactory solution. Therefore, I ask again, that the Members of this Assembly, while perfectly entitled to express their indignation or rather their dissent, should have some consideration for the difficulties of Mr. Churchill and others who have to uphold the privileges of the other subjects of His Majesty in Kenya, in conformity with, and without invading, the rights and privileges of the Indian community. We have not got a full text of the speech of Mr. Churchill authoritatively published. The 'ifs,' 'buts,' and the 'alsos' may have a significance. The whole report is not before us. It is just possible, speaking for the Colonies and speaking as Colonial Minister, and having particular regard, I suppose, to the dinner he was participating in and the society, he was addressing, emphasis was laid on certain aspects of the question which prominently rushed to his mind. At any rate, we should not, with the information that we have, come to any decision or any hasty conclusions, and all that may be done now is to proceed on assumptions and give expressions to the Assembly's views, so that the Cabinet may know exactly the strength of Indian feeling here. Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas has asked me as to whether the Government of India would put themselves at the head of the people and identify themselves with their cause in this respect or would treat the matter in a lukewarm spirit. I have no hesitation in answering for the Government of India that the policy which has earned the commendations and plaudits of the Assembly and the people is the policy of the Government of India, and will be the policy of the Government of India, and, if they fail temporarily, it will only be a temporary failure. There is no doubt whatever that, in adopting that policy, the Government of India are not adopting a selfish policy on behalf of India but are adopting a true Imperial policy (Hear, hear), a policy which would weld the Empire into a strong and indissoluble whole, which would keep in check and subdue the various disintegrating forces, and there is no hesitation, as I have said, in giving an answer, the only answer that can be given to such a question as that. But that does not mean that the Government of India may not have to consider any reasoned statements of the difficulties of the Colonial Office with regard to the position of Europeans there, or any compromise which may have to be entered into, without coming into essential conflict with the principles which are guiding our policy and whittling down really in substance the things for which we stand out.

Mr. President: The question is that the following Resolution, as amended, be accepted :

' That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do represent to His Majesty's Government that any failure in His Majesty's African territories to meet the lawful claims of Indians to equality of status with all other classes of His Majesty's subjects, will be regarded as a serious violation of the rights of Indians to citizenship, which were recognized and affirmed so recently as at the Imperial Conference of 1921; and further, that he do cable to the Secretary of State for India and, through him, bring to the notice of His Majesty's Government the emphatic protest of the Assembly against the pronouncement reported to have been made recently by the Right Honourable Winston Churchill at the East African Dinner in London.'

The motion was adopted *nemine contradicente*.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock, on Saturday, the 11th February, 1922.