

13th February, 1924

0

**THE**  
**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**

**(Official Report)**

---

**FIRST SESSION**

**OF THE**

**SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1924**



**SIMLA**  
**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS**  
**1924.**

1/2/24

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
<b>Monday, 11th February 1924—<i>contd.</i></b>	
✓ The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee ... ..	446
The Indian Criminal Law (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ...	447-448
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee ... ..	448-449
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee ... ..	449-455
The Indian Passport (Amendment) Bill—Withdrawn ...	455-467
<b>Tuesday, 12th February, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	469
Questions and Answers ... ..	469-482
Unstarred Questions and Answers ... ..	482-484
Resolution <i>re</i> the Vesting of the Revenues of India in the Governor General in Council—Not moved ... ..	484-485
Resolution <i>re</i> Muhamnadan Representation—Not moved ... ..	485
Resolution <i>re</i> Questions put by Non-official Members on subjects over which the Governor General in Council has control and superintendence—Adopted ... ..	485-494
Resolution <i>re</i> the provision of conveniences for Indian Railway passengers—Adopted ... ..	494-512
Exercise of Mr. President's discretion under Standing Order 8(4) ... ..	512-515
<b>Wednesday, 13th February, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	517
Message from the Council of State ... ..	517
✓ The Central Board of Revenue Bill—Referred to Select Committee ... ..	517
✓ The Indian Coinage (Amendment) Bill—Constitution of the Select Committee ... ..	517
Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands ... ..	518
Resolution <i>re</i> the grant of full Self-Governing Dominion Status to India—Debate adjourned ... ..	518-582
<b>Thursday, 14th February, 1924—</b>	
Member Sworn ... ..	583
Questions and Answers ... ..	583-588
Unstarred Questions and Answers ... ..	588-594
Statement of Business ... ..	595
Message from the Council of State ... ..	595
Election of the Standing Committee for the Department of Education, Health and Lands ... ..	595
Resolution <i>re</i> the approval by the Indian Legislature of Government Contracts—Adopted ... ..	596-620
Resolution <i>re</i> Transferred Subjects in the Provinces—Consideration adjourned ... ..	620
Resolution <i>re</i> Tenders for Government Stores—Adopted as amended ... ..	620-648
Resolution <i>re</i> Greetings of the Assembly to the Labour Party—Adopted ... ..	648-655

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 13th February, 1924.

---

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

---

## MEMBERS SWORN:

Mr. Robert Duncan Bell, C.I.E., M.L.A. (Bombay: Nominated Official), and Lieutenant-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney (Nominated: Anglo-Indian).

---

## MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

**Secretary of the Assembly:** Sir, a Message has been received from the Secretary of the Council of State which runs as follows:

"I am directed to inform you that the Council of State have at their meeting of the 12th February, 1924, agreed without any amendments to the Bill to amend the Indian Cotton Cess Act, 1923, for certain purposes, which was passed by the Legislative Assembly on the 4th February, 1924."

---

## THE CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE BILL.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member): Sir, I beg to move that the Bill to provide for the constitution of a Central Board of Revenue and to amend certain enactments for the purpose of conferring powers and imposing duties on the said Board, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mr. E. G. Fleming, Mr. Harchandrai Vishindas, Mr. N. M. Joshi, Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Mr. L. S. S. O'Malley, Mr. K. C. Neogy, Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum, Mr. A. R. L. Tottenham, Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao, and myself, with instructions to report on or before the 29th February, 1924.

The motion was adopted.

---

## THE INDIAN COINAGE (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas** (Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau: Indian Commerce): Sir, I beg to move that the Select Committee, to which the Bill further to amend the Indian Coinage Act, 1906, for certain purposes, has been referred, do consist of the following members, namely: Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Baba Ujagar Singh Bedi, Mr. H. Calvert, Dr. H. S. Gour, Dr. L. K. Hyder, Sir Gordon Fraser, Seth Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Sardar V. N. Mutalik, and myself, with instructions to report on or before the 29th February, 1924.

The motion was adopted.

STANDING COMMITTEE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND LANDS.

**Mr. President:** The Assembly will now proceed to elect Members of the Standing Committee to advise on subjects in the Department of Education, Health and Lands. The following gentlemen have been proposed for election to the said Committee. There are 14 names on the ballot list, namely:

Haji Wajihuddin.  
Kumar Ganganand Sinha,  
Mr. Sadasiva Bhat,  
Sardar Bahadur Captain Hira Singh,  
Raja Raghunandan Prasad Singh,  
Maung Kun,  
Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum,  
Mr. Abdul Haye,  
Maulvi Muhammad Yakub,  
Dr. L. K. Hyder,  
Sardar Gulab Singh.  
Khan Sahib Ghulam Bari,  
Mr. Venkatapatiraju, and  
Captain Ajab Khan.

The said Committee is to be of 9 Members and these nine will be elected from the 14 names I have just read out. Members will now receive their ballot papers.

(Ballot papers were then distributed and Members proceeded to record their votes).

**Mr. President:** The ballot is closed and the result will be announced at a later date.

---

RESOLUTION RE THE GRANT OF FULL SELF-GOVERNING  
DOMINION STATUS TO INDIA.

**Mr. President:** Before we resume debate on Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar's Resolution I suggest to the Assembly that at a comparatively early moment in to-day's proceedings we should take a decision between the amendment standing in the name of Pandit Motilal Nehru and that standing in the name of Dr. H. S. Gour. After that the debate will still be open upon the main proposition, but in order to give the two amendments standing in the names of Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal and Mr. K. C. Roy a reasonable opportunity of debate I must take a comparatively early decision on Dr. Gour's amendment.

The original question was:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to take at a very early date the necessary steps (including if necessary procuring the appointment of a Royal Commission) for revising the Government of India Act so as to secure for India full self-governing Dominion status within the British Empire and provincial autonomy in the Provinces."

Since which an amendment has been moved :

“ That the following be substituted for the original Resolution :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps to have the Government of India Act revised with a view to establish full responsible Government in India and for the said purpose :

- (a) to summon at an early date a representative Round Table Conference to recommend, with due regard to the protection of the rights and interests of important minorities, the scheme of a constitution for India; and
- (b) after dissolving the Central Legislature, to place the said scheme for approval before a newly elected Indian Legislature for its approval and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute.’ ”

Since which a further amendment has been moved :

“ That for Pandit Motilal Nehru’s amendment the following be substituted :

‘ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps to establish full responsible Government in India and for the said purpose to summon at an early date a representative convention to prepare, with due regard to the protection of the rights and interests of important minorities, a scheme of a constitution for India, and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute.’ ”

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas** (Indian Merchants’ Chamber and Bureau : Indian Commerce): I rise to support the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru. So great is the importance attached to this discussion that I crave the indulgence of this House when I read out my speech which I think should be heard and put on record in the accurate terms in which I propose to put my views before this House.

Sir, the Resolution before the House is not of the usual character. It does not refer to any detail of administration. It refers to the basis of the constitution and is thus of supreme importance. There is no wonder that unusual interest attaches to this and, therefore, all eyes are turned towards Delhi to-day. No one is more conscious than I am of the many deficiencies in several directions that India has still to make up, before she can attain the stature of a full fledged nation. But all the same I trust the singular unanimity of Indian opinion on the subject of constitutional advance will not be lost on Government or on those for whom the Honourable the Home Member spoke. Whatever hairsplitting may be done by those that revel in nice points of constitutionalism, to me, as a businessman speaking for the Indian commercial community, there is no mystery about the issues involved in the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru. And the clear issue is that the whole of India is dissatisfied with the existing constitution; and the assurance for improvement of that constitution, and the rate of progress promised in the existing Act, no longer suffice either for the practical exigencies of the situation or, for meeting the legitimate aspirations and claims of the people of this country.

The machinery now wanted is for the expansion of the constitution; for increasing the financial and other powers of the Legislatures; for enforcing the responsibility of the executive to the will of the representatives of the people; and, for securing ultimately sovereign powers for this Assembly to be exercised without let or hindrance in the same manner as they are exercised by the various Dominions in the Empire. So far as it is provided in the Government of India Act of 1919, it is most inadequate and the amendment before this House asks for a substitution of that

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

machinery, which would secure the end in less time and with more satisfaction all round.

The experience of India in connection with Commissions which have come out hitherto has not been particularly happy and it would be impossible to blame anyone who is not prepared to pin his faith to them for the future. Nor is there any sanctity in the ten-year period, even if it happens to have been specified in the Act of Parliament. When things are moving so rapidly as the experience of the past few years has shown, it would be an act of statesmanship to readjust the speed of political progress to the situation which confronts Government to-day in India.

The constitution hitherto prevalent has failed because it was conceived as a compromise between the various contending parties, and, even in the period of transition it bore all the impress of the hybrid, pleasing neither those who understood a benevolent, but undiluted autocracy, nor those who were fired with the enthusiasm of nationalism, and anxious for political freedom, disdaining all restraints. It was imposed from the top and was not the natural growth of any institutions then existing in the country. From the universal condemnation, which has been heard from all sides of the reforms including the system of dyarchy in the Provinces the fact emerges not only that the reforms have failed, but that the Government, who were entrusted with the task of working them in India, failed to accommodate themselves to the new order of things. In view of this, I am surprised that my Honourable friend Sir Campbell Rhodes should at once fix the responsibility for the failure of the reforms on the people of India. He has stated that Members of Council did not support their Ministers. Apart from the fact that the Ministers were nominees of the Governor, they were also fettered with an unreal idea of collective responsibility by which their freedom of speech and criticism in respect of items of reserved departments did not exist, and they were allowed no power to influence those departments directly or indirectly. Nor have I heard of the growth of the convention of Ministers and Executive Council Members meeting together in a conference and conducting the Government as a whole. It appears to me that under the reforms all the support and co-operation that the people of India could give were requisitioned from them without transfer of corresponding power to their representatives. Such a scheme was doomed to failure and was bound to be found wanting. Even those who honestly believed in the possibility of securing genuine political liberty through that machinery and who were working it for the future good of their country, and who stoutly withstood all ideas of non-co-operation, have been disillusioned by the reforms. The disappointment arising from this state of affairs became so acute that those who were actuated even at great sacrifice to accept office under Government soon found themselves being looked upon with considerable suspicion by the best part of the public. This was the fate of everyone who accepted office, including men who were held in great esteem and who were popular. What is the explanation? Was it the spread of non-co-operation? Was it the mere blind hatred of the Government? I strongly feel that it was neither the one nor the other, because such distrust was not confined to that section of the public from which recruits to popular political movements are drawn. But it spread amongst the ranks of the strictest co-operators, and of those who had hailed the reforms without reservation. The origin of such feeling is to be sought in the conviction borne upon every thoughtful Indian, that in the existing system no Indian, however determined he may be for

securing the good of his country, could achieve much under the unnatural and artificial limitations under which he had to work. A continuance of the present state of affairs deprives the state in India of the services of the best men in the country, who under present conditions prefer to remain outside the machinery of Government, which would only stultify them and render them at once useless and unpoplar.

My Honourable friend the Mover of the Resolution has referred to the reluctance of public men in India to give evidence before the Public Services Commission. And yet there has been an overwhelming amount of evidence before that Commission pointing out the impossibility of working the reforms until there are some fundamental changes made in the character of the Indian services and in their powers.

In particular the evidence of Ministers and of members of the Services working under them has brought out clearly that the real cause of the difficulties between them has been neither racial nor merely economic, but must be sought in the different outlook of each. Ministers wish to control the services as their instruments for carrying out their policy. The services on the other hand wish to deny the Ministers that control as being derogatory to their prestige and detrimental to their tradition and interests. The net result has been an *impasse* from which the amendment before the House is an attempt to find a solution.

The Honourable the Home Member instead of meeting the clear issues involved in the Resolution has shown some of the difficulties which would confront those that are out to frame a new constitution.

I have every confidence that the representative conference which is suggested in the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru will not neglect any of the difficulties mentioned by the Honourable the Home Member, but I feel called upon to deal with one aspect of the question that he has definitely raised. The Home Member spoke of vested interests of European Commerce in India. No one who deals with political matters in India can possibly forget them in so far as British rule in India finds its origin historically in them.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey** (Home Member): I am very loath to interrupt the Honourable Member. Could he refer me to the passage in my speech in which I spoke of the vested interests of European commerce.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas**: The Honourable Member mentioned, among the matters that require particular attention, before the Government move on to a further stage in the reforms,—European Commerce, Indian States and minorities.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey**: If I may correct the Honourable Member, I was particularly careful in what I said on the subject: I merely said that those who had invested capital and were investing capital in India would be interested to know our decision. That was not one of the four problems which I stated as needing solution.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas**: I am very glad of this explanation. I dictated my speech from what was my impression about it and I hope the Honourable Member will hear the rest of my speech subject to the correction which he has made and which I accept.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** I merely noticed that impression before, and I merely wish to correct it. The Honourable Member will, I hope, acquit me of any discourtesy in interrupting. I merely did it in order to make the point clear.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** I have, Sir, a copy of the "Pioneer" of the 13th February, which quotes the Honourable Member as having said that "European commerce will desire to know." These are the words which you will find reflected in my remarks. It is a peculiar irony of fate that even at this time, when the future political constitution of India is being discussed, the existence of these very vested interests should be advanced as an argument to induce the Government of the day to reject reasonable proposals for finding a natural line of advance. What I fail to understand is the ground for entertaining any apprehensions that under a self-governing India, interests of English merchants and others in this country would be unsafe. Nothing that has till now been done or suggested in any Indian Legislature could have given grounds for uncertainties or danger to the interests in India, not only of British merchants but of the nationals of every country in the world, through the establishment of responsible government. Their interests would be scrupulously safeguarded and adequate machinery will be provided by the Indian Legislatures to secure this end. I am quite sure the Japanese merchants, who are engaged in a very large commerce in India each way, could not be interfered with, because we fully understand that any interference with them would lead to international complications. The possibility of any talk of English commerce or industry or vested interests suffering by granting responsible government to India is altogether imaginary, except under one condition, and that is, that there are no special privileges, no exclusive rights, and no monopolies enjoyed by the British merchants here at present. I presume that the representatives of British commerce in India are prepared to-day to declare that none of the privileges that they enjoy are unfair or exceptional. If that were so, the distrust of the Indian Legislature indicated in such comments is altogether unworthy of the attitude which one great country should have towards another. I am not averse to suitable guarantees being given to representatives of these interests all of whose rights would, I am sure, be scrupulously respected. No one will try to do our friends of British commerce out of the just rewards of their labour or the legitimate expectations of their activities, in the same way that their countrymen are trying to deprive the Indians in Kenya of their bare rights and claims in the development of a colony, to whose prosperity they have made valuable contributions. The white population in Kenya have invented the plea that they are the trustees of the black natives of Kenya. Whatever else India may do in future, I am sure I voice the general feeling of every Indian in this House, when I say that we shall not invent any such excuse to pounce upon the property or the liberty or the rights of nationals of any country, who may choose to come and settle inside the borders of India as peaceful workers or as merchants.

Sir, If I have expressed myself with a certain amount of freedom with regard to commercial interests other than Indian, it is because the occasion demands a frank statement. What I have said represents what I know to be the views of my constituency. As for the maintenance of law and order and of security in every direction, these are as necessary to Indian trade and industry, which I represent, as they are to British trade and industry in this country. If there are any in India or outside who have any doubts as to our real attitude towards these requirements, let me assure them

that we yield to none in appreciating the benefits of stable Government and a settled order of things for the promotion of trade and the well-being of industry and of all engaged therein. It is because many of us feel that the danger to these very ideas will be greater, if the feeling of nationality and political discontent amongst the people were not adequately met before it is too late, that the proposals contained in the amendment should be carried through.

The next item that loomed very large in the discourse to which the Honourable the Home Member has treated this Assembly is that which refers to the services. Ever since the question of a liberal constitution for India has come up for discussion, the question of the services has been brought up and discussed, with such seriousness that the impression was often conveyed, that the services did not exist for India, but India existed for the services. Such an inference would be certainly justified after hearing the "steel frame speech" of Mr. Lloyd George, and after reading some of the evidence which has been laid by the zealous members of the services before the Lee Commission. The Government of India Act of 1919 provided for a Royal Commission to examine the workings of the reforms and the method of expanding them as well as the condition of the services. If it has been considered desirable to have the Lee Commission sent out in the teeth of universal opposition from India, may I ask why so much resistance was offered by Lord Peel to the Indian demand for a Royal Commission to examine the question of reforms simultaneously? The popular reply, as I said before, is that India exists for the services and not the services for India. Perhaps the greatest obstacle to political reform in India has been the desire of the services to retain in their hands the powers that they have enjoyed in the past, but which is altogether inconsistent with a popularly elected Legislature and with Ministers in charge of departments responsible to such Legislature. Members of the services would be always welcome in India to serve this country, but the seat of power in the future must be in this Assembly consisting of representatives of the people. No one will deny that the services have done magnificent work in the past. No one desires that there should be any breach of contract with any member of the services who has come to this country. It has been even provided that, if there is any sentimental distaste on the part of any member of the services to accommodate himself to the new ideas which must in future prevail, such officers could resign and leave the country on the scheme of proportionate pension. Notwithstanding all this, the existence of the services is being made by inference the ground for opposing our legitimate and just demands. Whilst the finances both in the Provinces and in the Central Government are showing deficits, the Secretary of State continues recruitment to the services in England as usual and that in the name of efficiency and of the necessity of maintaining the British character of the administration.

The Honourable the Home Member in the course of his speech made pointed reference to the existence of minority communities in India. There was no reason to suppose that the existence of these minorities had escaped the notice of those who had moved the amendment or who were supporting it. On the contrary, the proposal for a representative conference in itself indicates that opinion had to be elicited from numerous directions and in particular a constitution had to be evolved in consultation with the representatives of these minorities, who may have anxieties for the future. I would go further and say that the mention of these minorities as an argument against the political advance of India appears to me to be

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

an attempt to create unnecessarily an atmosphere of uncertainty and doubt. I say this because I have not come across any protest from responsible representatives of these minorities against the character of the Indian Legislature being altered and against their being made sovereign Legislature with full power of control over the Executive. In this connection my Honourable friend Sir Campbell Rhodes read out an extract from a speech by Mr. Montagu regarding the British Government being trustees of such minorities. The Honourable gentleman from Madras, Mr. Moir, also spoke with considerable feeling with regard to the undesirability of handing over the trust which they had shouldered all these years. I must say that all this indefinite talk about self-imposed burdens of one nation concerning the interests of another nation or community can only impede rather than hasten the solution of the very difficult problem before us. We heard lately another mention of trusteeship, and this time it was the trusteeship of the white man in Kenya on behalf of the black natives of Kenya, and directed against the intruders in the shape of Indians. This desire to take advantage of any apparent conflict of interest between the various sections of the population ought not to form the basis for the maintenance of the Empire. Nor should it interfere with the purpose of British administration, which, as the Honourable the Home Member assured this House, was high, and the aim of which he assured us was noble. We have often heard it said that the British Government in India are responsible to the British Parliament as trustees of the masses of India. Have these trustees been able to save such of the masses as have chosen to emigrate, because they found no suitable means of livelihood in their own country, from humiliations and deprivations of a most obnoxious character in places like Kenya and South Africa? If it is a trust, by whom was it given? If it is a guardianship, is it never expected that the ward will grow up and ask for what is his own? Sir, universal opinion so far as this trust is concerned with regard to such people as have chosen to seek an honest livelihood outside their own country, is that the trust has miserably failed. As the Right Honourable Sastri declared at Bangalore, the British Government in the United Kingdom are unwilling to coerce the white settlers of Kenya under any conditions and will therefore tolerate not only the injustice which has been already done, but any further series of injustices which may be done hereafter. This trust has been grossly betrayed so far as the position of Indians in other parts of the Empire is concerned. If it is a trust, I maintain, Sir, that it has been handed over mercilessly to South Africa, which has assumed the position of dictator to the Empire to-day, and before whom not only India is helpless, but Britain herself seems to have no power to secure the right end. The less therefore said of the trusteeship of the masses against the educated classes, of depressed classes against the higher classes, of minorities against the races of India, of Indians as a whole against the rest of the Empire, the better is it for the reputation of British statesmanship. There is however one kind of trust which England holds for the people of this country and which it would be difficult for anyone to dispute, and that is in the matter of defence. It is possible that for many years to come the defence machinery of India will not be altogether indigenous and adequate to deal with any invasion either on the land frontiers or on the sea frontiers of India. India will cheerfully bear the burden of the expenditure, but would expect Britain to stand by her while her own army and navy, manned by her own people are in course of creation.

Sir I wish to draw the pointed attention of this House to another stock argument which my Honourable friend Sir Campbell Rhodes has brought out rather inadvisedly, and has disturbed, by doing so, the atmosphere of mutual tolerance, which has been established by the exchange of assurances between the Honourable the Home Member and Pandit Motilal Nehru, that no threat of any kind was either involved or understood and the assurances were accepted.

**Sir Campbell Rhodes:** On a point of order, Sir. I never used the word "threat."

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** Let the Honourable Member hear me out please.

In this atmosphere comes the Honourable gentleman from Calcutta and throws a bombshell. He asks naïvely whether those, who are supporting the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru, want a military dictatorship? I hope the implication of this question will not be lost on the Members of this Assembly. Is it a threat to us that by seeking legitimate expansion of political rights and of the growth of the powers which this Assembly has over the executive, in accordance with the will of the people, we shall bring India into such confusion that the British Government will be obliged to establish martial law in this country and to put in the Honourable the Commander-in-Chief as the supreme authority? A mild and perhaps more insidious echo of the same notion was attempted to be conveyed by Mr. Moir from Madras, when he said in a manner that left no doubts on the minds of anybody, drawing a parallel from conditions in China, that there would be anarchy if the demands contained in the amendment were granted. Why are such words of caution delivered to us by these friends of India? A reference fell from someone about conditions in Russia. Sir, I will not dilate on that subject which is painful to me, but it shows the distrust of the people of this country and of their capacity to look after themselves. Sir, it shows the distrust of this Assembly and of its capacity to adjust itself to improved conditions, which could be brought about in due course by the method which the amendment advocates. I have every confidence that the constitution which would be evolved by the wise men of this country, including officials if you like, sitting together in a conference, will be one which will be well balanced, which will be laid on a solid foundation, which will have guarantees and checks sufficient to meet emergencies. And, if it is suggested that there is a certain margin of risk after all this has been done, I would cheerfully accept that risk, because I do not know of any nation, or any confederation that has come into existence without going through a period during which this risk existed. Is it suggested that there will not be found men to help the country, wise men who will watch out for the least little sign of disruption, and who will mobilise all the forces of the nation to set matters right? Sir, the greatest school for responsibility is responsibility itself, and I must say that the negative arguments, the insinuations, the bogeys, which are being raised in this debate are out of place and are likely to be seriously misunderstood. If instead my English friends took up an attitude of sympathy, of encouragement, of promise to stand by India during this period of transition, would they have any cause at all for those very vested interests for which they appear to be, as I have said before, unnecessarily anxious?

Sir, I must confess that I am disappointed at the statements which the Honourable the Home Member made in the earlier stages of this

[Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas.]

debate on behalf of the Government. It took this House a certain amount of effort to elicit the nature of the concession which he was making to what has been acknowledged to be the universal sentiments of the country. And after that, when you come to examine what he proposes to do on behalf of the Government, it amounts to nothing more than a mere interchange of opinion between the several groups of officials. And, if the executive Government, then find that there are any recommendations to make to the Secretary of State, these recommendations would be made and they would be available for this Assembly and others outside to criticise. Did he seriously expect this to satisfy anyone in this House? Knowing him as I do, I am inclined to think that this halting and imperfect concession, leading nowhere, is the result of limitations from which the Government of India themselves suffer to-day through the control of the Secretary of State. The British Parliament and their Executive, the Cabinet, never know,—have perhaps not the time nor the patience to know, the large mass of facts or the overwhelming evidence of opinion in this country from which alone a more statesmanlike solution of this intricate problem could be evolved. It is in order to secure a machinery for placing before Parliament, with reasons wherever necessary, a complete scheme to get over the *impasse*, to replace a system which has been pronounced a failure from so many quarters, that a representative Committee suggested by the Honourable Pandit becomes absolutely necessary.

**Mr. President:** I must remind the Honourable Member of his time-limit and must ask him to bring his remarks to a close.

**Mr. Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** It remains for me only to deal with the hackneyed complaint of communal differences in India. I am not one of those who believe that this deplorable feature of national life in India has disappeared or will disappear in the near future.

**Mr. President:** I cannot allow the Honourable Member to embark on a large subject like that after he has already exceeded his time-limit.

**Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:** I will only deal with the last two paragraphs.

Sir, if there are any Honourable Members on the Government Benches who are surprised that everyone to-day is trooping into the political lobby, if there are any of them that cannot understand why I, representing the commercial community, not only take this part in politics, but am also willing to stand by the demand which has been formulated in the amendment of the Honourable Pandit, for their benefit, may I explain the situation as I understand it? There was a time in my first youth when I heard serious discussions as to whether social reform should not precede political reform. I recollect earnest men pointing out to their fellowcountrymen in India, that the caste system had to be ended before we could think of any constitutional improvement politically. I also remember in those days, during the earlier sessions of the Indian National Congress, parallel propaganda on many a noble object of national improvement, such as social reform, temperance, and industrial advancement, for each of which there was an organised institution and an annual conference. So far as the commercial community was concerned, in my youth I was instructed by elder businessmen in Bombay that it was not for the businessman to bother about politics, and we had the example of an eminent man,—whose efforts have materialised in wonderful industrial achievements.

for this country in so many directions,—the late Mr. Jamsetjee Tata, who till the last day of his life, abstained from political activities and political gatherings of any kind. From this ideal which involved leaving alone the political field, how is it that to-day everyone is bent on asking for improvement in the constitutional machinery governing this country and for a very large chunk of improvement without any considerable delay? Sir, the explanation is not very far to seek. All those who desired achievements for their country in the various fields mentioned before, made their best efforts and found after a little time that they could not go further, that after they had gone some distance they were faced with a big wall which they were unable to scale, that the co-ordination of national efforts in different directions, which could only proceed from a co-ordination imposed from the centre, was lacking. Many men honestly believed in utilising every method that was available to secure a little more elbow room for those lines of national activities which they considered good for their country, and they could not secure very much. Representations were made, efforts were made in the Council after the Morley-Minto reforms. In the subsequent constitution, I have personally known a good many earnest minds exert themselves very much to secure this, that, and the other national end, but they have all come back and reported that, until there was a more radical change at the centre, nothing could be secured. Sir, every one who wishes to see this country great and self-sufficient in one direction or other, has come back with the general slogan that Swaraj is the only solution, and those of us who were brought into the political field, with which we did not start, can only wish that the changes which are necessary in the constitution should be secured in the best atmosphere and with the largest amount of give and take and with general satisfaction all round.

Sir, I wish to conclude the remarks that I have offered on this occasion by reading before this House the memorable words which were uttered by Lord Macaulay as early as 1833, and which in their application to the present situation are, in my opinion, very apt and thought-provoking not only for Indians but for the countrymen of Lord Macaulay also. These words are:—

“We are told that the time can never come when the natives of India can be admitted to high civil and military office. We are told that this is the condition on which we hold our power. We are told that we are bound to confer on our subjects every benefit which they are capable of enjoying—no—which it is in our power to confer on them—no—but which we can confer on them without hazard to our own domination. Against that proposition I solemnly protest as inconsistent alike with sound policy and sound morality.”

“It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system; that by good government, we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to overture to retard it. Whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in English history.”

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya** (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, I rise to offer my cordial support to the amendment moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru. The Resolution which has been proposed by my friend, Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar, asks the House that it should recommend to the Governor General in Council to take steps to secure full Dominion status to India at an early date by a revision of the Statute of 1919. The amendment

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

supports that view, but desires to add that, in order that that purpose may be achieved, Government should be pleased to invite a conference, a representative conference, and the object of the conference should be to prepare the ground for a revision of the Statute. Sir, that the country has been demanding an advance towards Dominion status is a fact which is known to us all Indians, but the Honourable the Home Member did not think it was so, at least he tried to make us believe, to make the House believe, that this demand for Dominion status was a rather later thought. He scanned the speeches of the Mover, referred to those speeches made on earlier occasions, he referred to the evidence given by various gentlemen before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, and to the Resolutions passed by the National Congress from year to year, and he showed that full responsible government, was not what Indians had asked for, much less the Dominion form of self-government. (*The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey*: "Asked for at once.") Asked for at once. Now, Sir, the

12 NOON. Honourable the Home Member is mistaken. He seemed to think from the manner in which he spoke of the question and of the difficulties which surrounded it, that India was a primitive country which had never known any civilisation, which had for the first time under the tutorship of England learnt about civilised administration, and that Indians therefore required to be taken from stage to stage in the art of self-government. The Honourable the Home Member referred to the Preamble of the Statute which lays down that progress towards responsible government has to be made stage by stage. I wish, Sir, at the outset to say that the question of giving a constitution to a country is a question of statesmanship and the Honourable the Home Member suffered—I say it with great respect to him—from the fact that he had all his life been associated in the day to day administration of the country and that naturally—not unnaturally—his views have been largely affected by that association as a permanent official in this country. In order that he should be able to appreciate the point of view which we urge, in order that he should be able to advise the Government, to be the mouthpiece of the Government, on an important question of constitutional advance like this, he would need to refer to the ancient civilisation which has been handed down in India; and I would, in order that this memory might be refreshed, draw attention to only a few facts which show what the condition of India was before the English Government assumed the administration in this country. Mr. Elphinstone says:

"All the descriptions of the parts of India visited by the Greeks give the idea of a country teeming with population, and enjoying the highest degree of prosperity . . . The numerous commercial cities and ports for foreign trade, which are mentioned at a later period, attest the progress of the Indians in a department which more than any other shows the advanced state of a nation . . . Arrian mentions with admiration that every Indian is free . . . The army was in constant pay during war and peace . . . The police is spoken of as excellent . . . Megasthenes relates that in the camp of Sandracottus, consisting of 400,000 men, the sums stolen daily did not amount to more than about £3 . . . The fields were all measured, and the water carefully distributed for irrigation; taxes were imposed upon trade, and an income-tax levied from merchants and traders. Royal roads are spoken of by Strabo and mile-stones . . ."

Then:

"Their internal institutions were less rude; their conduct to their enemies more humane; their general learning much more considerable; and, in the knowledge of the being and nature of God, they were already in possession of a light which was but faintly perceived, even by the loftiest intellects in the best days of Athens."

Now, Sir, coming down to the Mughal period, Bernier, who visited India during the reign of Shah Jehan, gives a glowing description. He speaks of his "immense treasures, gold and silver and jewellery, a prodigious quantity of pearls and precious stones of all sorts" and describes how the administration was being conducted.

This was before the British took over the administration of this country. What do we find a British officer writing after many years of British administration? Sir John Malcolm in a letter to Lord William Bentinck, dated 20th February, 1830, says:

"I am sickened with that mawkish morality that argues upon the sin and inhumanity of our tolerating abuses and misrule, which we have the power to correct, and in which from possessing that power and not exercising it we are said to become in a degree implicated; I neither admit the facts nor the deductions. I could mention provinces in every part of our territories in which over-assessment, the forms of the *Adaulat* and insufficient police have produced more discontent, degradation and suffering to the inhabitants than I ever knew under native Governments."

That would remind the learned Home Member that India has inherited a civilisation and it is merely by a stroke of misfortune that she lost the right of governing herself when the British came into this country. The Muhammadans and the Hindus had settled down to government and administration and, if it were not for the advent of the British to-day, Hindu and Muhammadan rule would have been going on in India. Even now, one-third of India is under Indian rule and I do not think that even the Home Member would say that that portion of India is being worse governed than British India is. In some respects it may be that British India has some advantages. In other respects Indian India has advantages which are unknown to residents of British India. (*The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey*: "No Reforms.") No Reforms. I will come to that. I will at once answer that. The British Government who have been responsible for the training of our Indian Princes have not done their duty faithfully by them. If they had trained them in the right way, there would have been more Princes of the type of His Highness the Maharaja Gaekwar of Baroda and His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore and there would have been representative institutions in every Indian State by this time.

Now, Sir, the Honourable the Home Member referred to the Preamble of the Statute of 1919, and he pointed out that what is now asked for is opposed to the Statute. Now, I submit that this is a very poor argument to advance. We know that it is opposed to the Statute. We do not like to go on under the Statute. We never accepted the Statute as it was, many of us did not. He said the Mover was among those who did accept, but the Mover did not constitute the whole of India. There was a large body of public opinion which regarded the Reforms as inadequate and unsatisfactory. The Honourable the Home Member did the honour of quoting me also among those who said that they would be content, if even a period of 20 years would be fixed for the establishment of full responsible government. Now, Sir, it is a very unfair thing to quote one sentence from a paragraph and base an argument upon it. What I said on that subject was this:

"As regards the Government of India, they are not prepared, without experience of the results of their proposals relating to the provinces, to effect changes in it. I cannot reconcile myself to these views."

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

This was in 1918 upon the publication of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report:

"I think the needs of the country demand that provincial Governments should be made autonomous at once and that a period of time should be fixed within which complete responsible government is to be established in the Central Government of India. Even if twenty years were fixed as the outside limit, we shall know where we stand. Among Indians many will regard it as too long a period; among Europeans, many will consider it too short. But twenty years is in all conscience a long enough time within which to prepare this country, with all the progress that stands behind it, and with all the advantages of a well-organised and well-established administration, to bear the full burden of the new responsibility. The history of other countries supports the view that in this period education can be made universal, industries can be developed, so as to make India self-sufficient both in respect of the ordinary needs of the people and also in respect of military requirements, and Indians can be trained in sufficient numbers to officer the Indian Army and to take their proper places alongside of their British fellow-subjects in the service of the country and the King-Emperor."

That was what I said and still think that from the day the British Government declare full responsible government established in India it will take us 20 years to train all the officers we want to officer the Indian Army. That means, Sir, that the cardinal step, the important step, should be taken, namely, the declaration that full responsible government is established in India, subject to the period which must elapse in order to prepare the military service to carry on the burden which the declaration will enforce upon the country. This is not the first time that we ask for this since the Reforms were published. Ever since 1885, the Indian National Congress has been asking for the establishment of self-government in this country. When this Act was passed many of us were not satisfied. Many of us urged that there should be responsibility introduced in the Central Government in India; but it was not so introduced. Many of us did put all the arguments that we could before Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford and many of our friends gave evidence before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, but the House of Commons and the British Government, upon the advice of the Government of India, were so obstinate that we could not get them to accede to our request. I therefore pointed out in the pamphlet which I published on the publication of the Montagu-Chelmsford report, where they said that they would limit the Reforms to the Provincial Governments:

"This means that for 15 years the Government of India should continue to exercise all its powers as at present and that the representatives of the people should have absolutely no share in it. Owing to the war the next 10 to 15 years will be most fatal years in the history of India. It oppresses my soul to think that during this period the Government of India, which, as I have shown above, has failed to build up the strength and prosperity of the people to the extent it should have done, should continue practically unchanged, and that the representatives of the people, anxious to promote the good of their fellowmen, should still have to bear the pain and humiliation of having no determining voice in the government of their country. In the highest interests of humanity, as it is represented by the 320 millions of this land, and for the good name of England, I earnestly hope that this will not be so, and that the statesmen of England will see that the Government of India is brought to a reasonable extent under the control of the people whose affairs it administers."

Now, Sir, there were many others who expressed the same view. We were not satisfied with the non-introduction of an element of responsibility in the Government of India. At the Congress at Amritsar in 1919 it was with great difficulty that Mahatma Gandhi and I and some others could induce our friends, Mr. Tilak, Mr. Das and Lala Lajpat Rai and others to accept the Reforms for the time being. Even then we said that, while we

should accept the Reforms so far as they went we should endeavour from that day onward to try to have responsibility introduced in the Government of India. Sir, the three years that have passed have added much to our experience and wisdom. Even if no demand had been made for the establishment of full Dominion status at that time, there is abundant reason in the history of the last three years for the said Reform being introduced. And what is that history? In the first instance, law and order were reserved to the Government of India and to the Provincial Governments. How has law and order been administered? I have got heaps of files with me here which give the list of persons who were imprisoned under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, or imprisoned or prosecuted under section 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, and they were persons who were as Honourable as any Members sitting in this House and they were imprisoned for no other reason than that they held opinions which were not acceptable to the Government. Law and order was never mismanaged during any time of British administration as it was during the last two years. That is one experience which we have gained. I am afraid time will not permit me to read even the general summary of the reports of these prosecutions, which are a disgrace upon the British administration of this country. The facts are very well known to the Members of this House and the country also knows them full well. The experience that we have gained in respect to law and order is that it should not be left to be administered by an irresponsible Government.

The second thing that we have learnt from experience is the utter unwillingness of the Government of India to act in the spirit in which the Act was passed. The Government of India have made no progress in the many directions in which progress should have been made, if they meant only to give effect to the policy which was embodied in the Statute of 1919. In England, finance has been well administered after the war. Taxation has been reduced. The national debt has been reduced. Industries have been fostered. What is the picture that we have to look at here? Forty-one crores of new taxation have been added since the Reforms were introduced. Since 1913-14 53 crores of new taxation have been added to our debt which is heavier to-day than it was at that time. No endeavours have been made to reduce this taxation. Education has been starved. Sanitation has received no sustaining support. General progress has been arrested. Ministers have been appointed to portfolios, but they have been wasting their time in sorrow because they have not the wherewithal to promote the Reforms with. The country has gone back; it has not progressed. The Government were expected to show that they would adopt the policy of responsible government, but they have taken no step worth the name to Indianise the services. A certain number of persons have begun to be examined in this country. Not a single college has been created where members for the Civil Service might be trained. In regard to the military, even the needs of the situation have not been recognised. The military expenditure was 27 crores in the year 1913-14. In 1922-23 it stood at 64 crores and 47 lakhs. We have urged for a long time past that expenditure, both civil and military, should be reduced. We have found that these three years have gone, and they have added enormously to the burdens which the poor people of this country have to bear. This is in regard to finance. Banking has not been developed. In a country like Japan in the course of 20 years they have built up a system of banking by which their national trade has been promoted to an enormous extent. Here the banking facilities are still poor. Our Gold

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

Currency Reserves are still held in London. Not a single step has been taken which would indicate to us the decision of the Government of India to look at the day when Indians would be administering the affairs of their country. I do not however overlook that small college which has been established at Dehra Dun to give training to Indians, but that is a paltry measure when you consider the needs of the country.

In the matter of industries, Government have taken no steps in order to promote indigenous industries on a large scale. That is the experience which we have gained during the last three years. Every Indian asks himself the question: How long have we to wait if we proceed at the pace at which we are going? His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief told the predecessors of this Assembly as to what progress was being made in the matter of training Indians as officers for the Army. A calculation was made which showed that a very long time would elapse—perhaps a hundred years—before the Indian army could be Indianised at the pace which was adopted by the Government. Now, Sir, this is the experience which has led many of us to revise our opinion regarding the pace at which progress should be achieved. We believe that it is a conviction which has gone like steel into our hearts that the British bureaucracy in this country will not even take the measures that are necessary to enable the Indians to get actual responsible government in this country so long as they are in power; and we ask that they should cease to be in power. If that arrangement is to continue during the period of transition, necessary safeguards should be provided for the satisfaction of all parties concerned. We feel that that very decision has now to be arrived at. We will be satisfied if the decision is arrived at that responsible government must be established now in India which may take 10 years or probably 20 years to complete the arrangements when we will be in a position to say good-bye to our English officers and administrators so far as the responsibility for the administration of the country is concerned. We do not wish to part with them, we are not in a hurry to part with them. We want that they should still be with us as public servants and as commercial men with experience to help and advise us in many national pursuits. But we do want that it should be decided now that the power of administering the affairs of this country shall be passed on to the Indians.

Now, Sir, there are two ways of acquiring freedom. One is by the process of negotiation and understanding, the other is by arms. The process by arms has not been countenanced by Indians because, in the first place, the Government have deprived us of arms, and in the second place we have not had the military training. It is wholly discountenanced by us because we feel as human, humane, men that we are disposed to achieve our object without shedding the blood of a fellow-man. We should endeavour to the utmost of our power to achieve that by non-violent means. But, Sir, we have shed blood. England will remember it: many Englishmen will remember it. We have shed a great deal of our blood in the late war, in effect so ruinous, and we had hoped that the shedding of that blood would secure to us the liberty that we have a right to enjoy to administer our own affairs. Speaking at the Imperial Conference of 1921, Mr. Lloyd George, the Prime Minister, said:

"India's achievements were also very great. Her soldiers lie with ours in all the theatres of war, and no Britisher can ever forget the gallantry and promptitude with which she sprang forward to the King-Emperor's service when war was declared. That is no small tribute both to India and to the Empire of which India is a part. The

causes of the War were unknown to India; its theatre in Europe was remote. Yet India stood by her allegiance heart and soul, from the first call to arms, and some of her soldiers are still serving far from their homes and families in the common cause. India's loyalty in that great crisis is eloquent to me of the Empire's success in bridging the civilizations of East and West, in reconciling wide differences of history, of tradition and of race, and in bringing the spirit and the genius of a great Asiatic people into willing co-operation with our own."

**Mr. H. Calvert** (Punjab: Nominated Official): What about passive loyalty?

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya**: What is passive loyalty?—loyalty must be active. There is no such thing as passive loyalty.

**Mr. H. Calvert**: That is what the Honourable Member preached during the war: passive loyalty.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya**: Passive loyalty? The Honourable Member is speaking in ignorance, Sir. He does not know that we advised our own children to join the army. My own son was in the Indian Territorial Force. I do not know what he is talking about. I can tell the Honourable gentleman that, if we, educated Indians, had not advised our young men to join the army, recruitment would not have been one-fourth of what it was.

Now, Sir, another English Statesman, Lord Curzon, in his introduction to Colonel Merewither's book relating to the history of the work done by the Indian Army in France, said that the Indian Army had reached there just in the nick of time to save civilisation. Now, Sir, that was our contribution to the war and I thought that, when our soldiers had shed their blood, when I find that a million Indians left these shores to serve abroad, of whom more than 60,000 gave their lives in the Empire's cause, I thought that the shedding of blood in the cause of liberty would purchase for us our own liberty. That is one of the things that have happened, but we are still far from that position, and we are told that we must wait and proceed stage by stage. I submit, Sir, that is unjust, that is cruel.

Now, the next point to which I will invite attention is some of the objections raised by the Honourable the Home Member to the proposal. He said: "What will the Princes say?" The Princes have said. When the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms were introduced, the Princes were consulted. They gave their assent to the introduction of the reforms and recently not one but several Princes have spoken. His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner, who attended the first Imperial Conference, His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala, who attended the second, and His Highness the Maharaja of Alwar, have all spoken in favour of granting the desire of Indians. Recently, to quote only from the last, the Maharaja of Alwar, speaking at the Conference of 1923, said:

"It is injustice to them, speaking not as their representative but as one of them that I therefore do not wish to say anything behind their backs 7,000 miles away, which I would not gladly say to their face . . . ."

Is everything going to be done to accelerate our progress, or is our progress under various pretexts to be restricted and delayed? Have we a long number of years before us of the great furnace to pass through from which Ireland has only just emerged? . . . .

If India had some more definite proposition before it than having to wait every ten years for its destiny to be enhanced, if it had a reasonable assurance of rapid but progressive advancement, I believe that self-government, which is the goal of us all for two-thirds of India, would be achieved early and smoothly."

I venture to say, Sir, that, if the Princes are consulted, they will not only not object, but support the demand for the establishment of full Dominion

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

status in India at an early date. I venture also to say that, if that status is established, our treatment of Indian Princes will be not less satisfactory but more satisfactory than it is at present. They will be more consulted. Their dignity will be better consulted, their interest will be better considered, and altogether our relations with them will be better than they are at present.

The next point made by the Honourable the Home Member was with regard to European commerce. European commerce need have no fear if Dominion status is established in India. The reforms do provide for the protection of Europeans engaged in commerce in this country. The suggested conference will go into this matter as well as other matters and I am sure that we will be able to arrive at an arrangement which will create more confidence than exists at present in the minds of European commercial men. Similarly with regard to the Services. The Act itself has provided safeguards to protect the interests of the Services, and we shall certainly when we meet in conference provide safeguards.

Lastly, he mentioned the minorities, and I was surprised that the Honourable the Home Member, being an experienced officer who has spent nearly all his life in this country, should raise such a question. It seemed to me that his memory had not served him correctly or rather that his judgment had left him for the time being when discussing this question in his anxiety to oppose this Resolution. Will the Honourable Member tell me who it was that settled the differences between the Hindus and the Muhammadans before the reforms were introduced? Was it the Government or was it the Hindu and Muhammadan Conference which met at Lucknow and came to a settlement among themselves which formed the basis upon which the reforms were passed? Will the Honourable the Home Member tell me if he has heard of any differences between Hindu and Muhammadan Ministers in the different provinces, except unfortunately in the province from which he comes?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** Will the Honourable Member tell me what he said about the settlement himself? Or shall I read it to the House?

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** I am going to say what I said and I wish you to read it to the House. If you read it, I shall comment upon it. Does the Honourable Member want to read it?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** The Honourable Member is in possession of the House. Let him read it himself.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Now, Sir, this is what I said about the religious differences in the pamphlet which I had published on the publication of the reforms. I will not read the whole of it—it will tire the House—but I will read some small portions. I said:

"Here again it ought not to be forgotten that India is not the only country which has known the trouble of religious differences among her sons. England herself has not been a stranger to it. Her history contains a sad record of the evils which she experienced owing to bitter differences between Protestants and Catholics. The long-lasting persecution to which the latter were subjected by the former, particularly in Ireland, is a matter of not very remote history. 'When the House of Lords, the House of Commons, the Magistracy, all corporate offices in towns, all ranks in the army, the bench, the bar, the whole administration of government or justice, were closed against Catholics; when the very right of voting for their representatives in Parliament was denied them; when 'in all social and political matters, the Catholics, in other words the immense majority of the people of Ireland, were simply hewers of wood and drawers of water to their Protestant masters'".

Then, Sir, in another passage, I said:

"Before I leave this subject, I should like to say further, that the difficulty arising out of our religious differences, such as they are, is much less serious than was that which arose out of the enmity which prevailed between the French and the English in the two provinces of Canada in 1837, when Sir James Craigh wrote that 'the line of distinction between us is completely drawn; friendship, cordiality are not to be found; even common intercourse scarcely exists.'—and when Lord Durham said, in his memorable report in which he recommended the establishment of responsible Government in Canada,—'I found two nations warring in the bosom of a single state. I found a struggle not of principles but of races.' It is encouraging to note that the existence of this deep-seated and widespread animosity between the two large sections of the people was not held to be a bar to the introduction of responsible government there, but rather a strong reason for and an effective remedy against it."

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** That is not the passage I was thinking of.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Then I do not know which it is.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** May I read it to you—this is the one. This is what the Honourable Pandit said, since he has challenged me to read it, as to the solution which he said the two communities had arrived at:

"Our brethren of the Moslem League have, by their sectarian agitation at a critical period of our history, thrown back the national progress which we have been endeavouring for years to achieve. It is painful and humiliating to think that this has been so."

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Will you give me the date of it?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** 1909, Indian National Congress, Lahore.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Sir, I am thankful to the Honourable the Home Member for having unearthed that passage and placed it before the House. I also have told the House that encouragement was given by one of his predecessors in office to some of my Muhammadan countrymen to wait in deputation upon the Government of India and to ask for those very concessions, the granting of which was the subject of my complaint and the granting of which by the Government of India the Home Member now reminds me of. It was the Government of India's encouragement to some Muhammadan Members that created the trouble for us. But, notwithstanding that, we were able in 1916 to settle our differences among ourselves and I guarantee—I speak with confidence—that we shall yet again settle our differences among ourselves, Hindus, Muhammadans, Christians and Parsis.

Now, Sir, the next point to which reference was made by my friend was the question of the Army. He says "After all that you have said and done, what about the Army? So long as you are not able to defend your country, how can you have full responsible government?" I myself said in the passage to which I referred that full responsible government will be established in India when we are able to take charge of the entire administration of the army, and in order that we should be able to do so, those who wield the power just now must allow us the opportunity to train ourselves for the work. How have the Government treated us in the matter? Since 1885, when the first Indian National Congress met, we have been agitating, urging, petitioning that the Government should admit Indians to the ranks of the army. How far have the ranks been opened to us? I hear that about 12 young men are receiving training in Sandhurst—I speak subject to correction—and I hear that 70 young men are receiving training at Dehra

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

Dun. Is that the way to train an Indian army? A previous speaker on this debate referred to what Mr. Montagu said that it was unfair to twit us with not being able to defend our own country when you have not let us have the opportunity of preparing ourselves for its defence. That we are capable of doing it, that we can defend our own country, is undeniable. One Englishman, a retired member of the Indian Civil Service, writing in 1906, said on this subject that there was no question of Indians being able to defend their own country. This is what Mr. Thorburn, I.C.S., retired, in an article on "An Indian Militia for India's Defence" says:

"On this preliminary point of quality, I think the preponderance of expert opinion favours the belief that Sikhs, Pathans, Goorkhas, and after them the best classes of Hindu Jats, Rajputs, and Punjabi Musalmans, are as good fighting men as any in the world. Only a few months ago, Sir Ian Hamilton, in the scrapbook on the first part of the Russo-Japanese War, recorded: 'Every thinking soldier who has served on our recent Indian campaigns is aware that for the recruitments of such operations a good Sikh, Pathan, or Gurkha battalion is more generally serviceable than a British battalion'. In the next page he wrote: 'Why, there is material in the north of India and in Nepal sufficient and fit, under good leadership, to shake the artificial society of Europe to its foundations'".

This is about the quality of the Indian soldiers. I ask every honest Englishman to put himself the question "Have Indians been trained for the defence of their country? Have the pledges given by the Parliament and the English Sovereign to India that her sons would be admitted to all offices and all ranks irrespective of any distinction of race or creed been carried out in practice?" Would it not have been possible for us to see the spectacle of the entire Indian Army officered by Indians and able to take charge of the defence of the country? You have kept us out most unfairly from the ranks of the Army. You have jealously guarded the doors of the Army against us. You have not admitted us to several branches of the Army. You have not admitted us even as officers in the Army in the ordinary ranks. And now you turn round and say, "You want responsible government; you are not prepared for it." I ask Englishmen to be fair and to be true to themselves in answering the question and to acknowledge that they have not treated us fairly. And yet what are we prepared to do? Give India full Dominion status to-morrow and leave us to take charge of all the affairs. We shall not argue the matter with you. You fix a time and say that you want to remove all your officers and all your soldiers in the course of such time as you may think fair, and I guarantee that we shall arrange to keep up the defence of India even as it is kept up to-day at much less cost.

**Mr. President:** I must ask the Honourable Member to bring his remarks to a close now.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Very well, Sir.

The next point to which I will refer is why we prefer a conference to a Commission. The Commission will consist of some gentlemen who will come out from England and some who will be appointed in India. We want that we Indians should be given the opportunity of framing our own constitution to deal with the problems that you suggest are difficulties in the way of granting her self-government and to help you with our recommendations. You cannot be aware of all the difficulties of the question as we are. There is also precedent for this course. The Belgium constitution was framed by 200 delegates called to a National Congress in 1831. The South African constitution was framed by South Africans after a convention which sat for several months. The Australian constitution was

framed at a conference which sat for a long time. So also, give us the chance of framing our own constitution so that we shall be able to give you all the necessary help and really facilitate the task of Parliament. How will gentlemen coming from England for a few weeks be able to do so? What can be the objection to our offering you all the help we can? You say you will consider the proposal in a Committee. That is really trifling with the matter which is before the House. An executive inquiry is not asked for at all. Nobody has asked for it, and nobody wants it. This is a matter where policies will be considered, where the future policy of the administration of this country will be considered. That can only be decided by the British Parliament as matters stand at present and we want that a conference of representative Indians should be called for in order to place before Parliament the materials upon which such a decision should be arrived at. Lastly, I will conclude by reminding the House and the Honourable the Home Member of what was done in the case of Canada. In Canada there was a rebellion in 1837. The British Parliament sent out Lord Durham, a liberal statesman of great ability to act as Governor General and High Commissioner for determining certain important questions. The instructions given to Lord Durham were, in the first place, to assert the supremacy of Her Majesty's Government, next to vindicate the honour and dignity of law and above all to know nothing of a British, a French or a Canadian party, and to look on them all alike as Her Majesty's subjects. I ask that the Government of India should recommend to His Majesty's Government that they should send out a Lord Durham again, a broad-minded statesman, who would not think of the Hindu or the Muhammadan or the English or the Sikh in this country but who would look on them all alike as His Majesty's subjects and endeavour to do his duty by all of them—endeavour to do justice between man and man.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Example is better than precept.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya**: I request, Sir, that the Government should reconsider its opinion and adopt the Resolution which has been put in the amended form. If this Resolution is adopted, there will be peace and goodwill in all parts of the country. If the Resolution is treated in the manner in which the Honourable the Home Member has sought to treat it, it will embitter feelings further and it will lead to no good result. A new Government has come into power; Ireland has received her freedom; Egypt has received her freedom; other nations of the world are enjoying freedom and prosperity. How long shall India be kept out of her freedom? India longs for it; India will not be content, India will not be happy, until she receives it. It is due to Englishmen, it is up to Englishmen, to help India to obtain it by friendly goodwill as fellow-subjects of one King, to whom we all owe allegiance. If this struggle is continued, if resistance is continued, it will only embitter relations between Englishmen and Indians, and, instead of Englishmen having earned the gratitude and goodwill of Indians, they will have created a feeling that, so long as it was possible for certain Englishmen in this country to do so, they obstructed the road to freedom, they stood in the way of Indians enjoying domestic self-government in their own country. What is the good of Englishmen talking of the love of liberty in every other matter and in every other concern and land when they are opposing the Resolution for the establishment of full Dominion status in this country? All the Colonies enjoy it. India

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

must enjoy it. India will enjoy it. The only question is whether Englishmen will help India to receive it early or whether they will stand in the path of her receiving it and thereby embitter relations. I hope they will take the wiser, gentler, the more humane and the more honourable course and co-operate with us wholeheartedly as honest men to establish full Dominion status in this country and to win the gratitude and goodwill of us all, their fellow-subjects.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member): Sir, I do not propose to follow the last speaker in the history of Alexander, of Chandragupta, of Hercules and such great names as these. I do not think that it is for the good of this debate that we should be side-tracked into an argument as to the condition, the historical condition, of India a thousand or two thousand or even a hundred years ago. What we are concerned with is a question of to-day. It is necessary, however, to make one or two remarks in regard to some of the statements that were made by the last speaker. He said that it was a very unfair thing to fix on a particular sentence and base an argument on it. He quoted figures for the increase in taxation that has been imposed in this country since the end of the war and since 1913, respectively. I think the figure was 53 crores since 1913 (*Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya*: "41 crores since the Reforms".) That is correct. He compared the position of India with the position in England. The increase—I have not got the exact figure, but it does not matter if you are £50,000,000 out—the increase in England since 1913 is something over £600 millions, or something approaching one thousand crores of rupees as compared with our position here.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya**: And the increase in national income?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett**: The increase in national income in England during the war is certainly not greater in proportion than the increase in India. On the whole, during the war England suffered and her net income in terms of what that income will buy has been largely reduced, not increased. The opposite is true of India. I only quote that as an illustration. I do not want to follow the Honourable Member, but I cannot resist making one quotation from his friend, Monsieur Bernier, who, according to him, found such a happy state of affairs in India in the time of the Mughals. Bernier says:

: "But of what advantage are good laws when not observed, and when there is no possibility of enforcing their observance? Have not the provincial tyrants been nominated by the same grand vizier and by the same king who alone have power to redress the people's wrongs and is it not a fact that they have no means of appointing any but tyrants to rule over the provinces? Either the vizier or the king has sold the place to the governor. And even admitting that there existed a disposition to listen to a complaint, how is a poor peasant or a ruined artisan to defray the expenses of a journey to the capital, and to seek justice at one hundred and fifty or two hundred leagues from home? He would be waylaid and murdered, as frequently happens, or sooner or later fall into the governor's hands, and be at his mercy. Should he chance to reach the royal residence, he would find the friends of his oppressor busy in distorting the truth, and misrepresenting the whole affairs to the King . . . He is in his own person the intendant of justice, the parliament, the presidential court and the assessor and receiver of the king's taxes . . . the weak and the injured are without any refuge whatever; and the only law that decides all controversies is the cane and the caprice of a governor."

(*A Voice*: "That applies to-day I suppose?") That would apply possibly if you had Swaraj to-morrow. (*A Voice*: "That is untrue.") I will not enter into an argument on that point which will be an entire waste of time and will not at all be useful for the purpose of arriving at a decision. I think that, if we try to get the debate on to a different plane and consider

even the change between five weeks or so ago and to-day, we shall see that our differences are not so enormous and are not such as we should quarrel about. Five weeks ago there was an unbridgeable gap, there was an ocean, we were not in the same world as it were. To-day, Sir, we are all Swarajists. We are all agreed as to the goal, full responsible government for India within the British Empire. We are agreed that it should be brought in as soon as possible. We are agreed, if I may judge by what was said on Friday by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru and it has been repeated to-day, that it cannot be brought in at once, that Swaraj cannot be handed over tied up in a bundle to-day. We are agreed that it must be by progressive stages. We differ as to the stages. The last speaker made a very interesting suggestion. He suggested that it should be announced here and now that full responsible government is going to be introduced within 20 years.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Not 20 years from now.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** Fifteen years?

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Well, it is no good arguing that. I want a declaration now.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** That a declaration should be made now that full responsible government shall be given within 10 years. Well, Sir, I am not at all sure that in fixing the number of 10 years we may not be so cautious that you would get the thing quicker by other means. He also suggested that an Englishman should be sent out as a Commissioner in the way that Lord Durham was sent out to Canada. I think we have already had Lord Durham's Commission. The Montagu-Chelmsford Commission has been here and we have His Excellency the Viceroy who has been sent out to carry through the report of the Commission. (*A Voice*: "Not to introduce new Reforms.") [The introduction of self-government, which Lord Durham's appointment led to, has begun. So, we are all Swarajists to-day, but we differ as to the pace at which Swaraj is to come into force, and we differ as to the method by which it is to be considered at the present time, as to the practicability and desirability and the extent of the advances which are possible at an early date.] The Government, as stated by the Honourable the Home Member on Friday, have been considering and are prepared to consider in consultation with the Local Governments the defects in the working of the Act as it stands. The difference between us is mainly as to whether we should tear up that Act, reconsider the whole structure and lose the base from which we are at present advancing. As a speaker who spoke this morning said, there has been a tremendous advance in the last three years, things have moved very quickly. If those who gave evidence before the various Committees and Commissions of 1917, 1918 and 1919 will throw their minds back, they will see the vast change that has occurred between that time and to-day. Our differences cannot be minimised, they are there, but they are not, I think, so great as to make us despair. We could almost visualise our differences by studying the difference in our costumes. We all want to cut our coat according to our cloth. [Those who appear here in sober morning garb, the conventional morning dress, want to proceed safely and steadily along well marked tracks, along well built railroads and good macadam roads. They want to be protected during their journey against attacks from the hills on the Northern side of the track. They want to be protected against highway-men and bandits in the wilder regions through which they pass and they want to see that the bridges and culverts and

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

embankments along which their road lies are secure against thunderstorms during the journey.) On arrival at their destination they want to have sufficient supplies and a well trained staff in order that they may settle down comfortably. And what is perhaps even more important, they want to have time during the journey to conduct properly the every day business of life. If I may vary the metaphor, they do not want to move the Government of India bodily to Raisina before the New Capital is ready for occupation. That is the attitude of most of those who are dressed in sombre morning coats. But, Sir, there are some of us here whose loins are girt and whose feet are shod for a speedier progress, and they are impatient at the slow march that is necessary for the moving of a multitude. I think they forget that there is a multitude to move. The whole army has to go along. They themselves may be fit for the advance in which they believe, but are they fit to carry the whole army with them and have they got the fleet of aerial transport that is required? I am afraid that nothing short of the fabled witch's broomstick will take them there so quickly as they desire. Their imagination takes them there. They themselves may be fit to make the journey. But have they got the means to get the rest of the army there? Sir, for the Government it is the steady and the safe course that appeals, and it appeals not because we believe any less than the most ardent Swarajists in this House in the ultimate goal. We have faith in the ultimate goal and are determined to get there, but we believe that the only possible means of getting there is by steady and regular progress. It is not unnatural that there should be many who are impatient at the slowness of the progress. Some of them, I believe, hold the view that it is necessary continually to remind the driver of their desire to go at a greater speed in order to make the car go at all. It is a natural and a human instinct. It is quite understandable, but it should be remembered that the driver also is human and that he is doing his best and that he cannot be expected to go on doing his best if all the time he is upbraided for his slowness and suspected, and indeed roundly accused to his face, of malingering. That is not the way in which to get the best out of any man. For the purpose of the Swaraj for which we are all working it is not only necessary that there should be unity between Hindu and Muslim. Understanding and mutual confidence are necessary between the Indian and the Briton.

Mr. Moir on Friday made a very relevant speech in regard to the attitude of British public opinion. I am going to venture on a subject on which Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas warned us not to tread, the subject of the trusteeship of Britain for India. Although it is very easy to talk ~~can~~ on that subject, it is none the less a subject which has an immense importance and touches the Englishman in a sentimental spot. The phrase about the brightest jewel in the British Crown was quoted. Sir, it is not easy for Englishmen to give expression to their deeper emotions. But that phrase invariably for countless Englishmen and Englishwomen does arouse deep emotions. The chances of history have made them responsible or given them power of a very real kind to affect the lives of hundreds of millions of the peoples of India and with that power there came a tremendous responsibility. They have felt that responsibility and I think they are rightly proud that they have brought to India peace and order and justice and a unity which would otherwise have been hard of attainment. They feel that strongly. India has become something more than part of the British Empire to countless Englishmen and Englishwomen. It has become an inspiration and an aspiration. The aspirations

of a nation are seldom fully realised in practice. The instinct of self-preservation, even the duty of self-preservation, sometimes intervenes. It is easy enough to say that in this direction and in that England has belied her professions. It is easy enough to scoff at any claim to altruism and point to the undoubted fact that England has not been the loser by her connection with India. But I do not think that India has been the loser by her connection with England. Is England's stewardship to be condemned because it has been advantageous to both countries? It is from that point of view that Englishmen and Englishwomen are watching what is happening in India to-day. They have found themselves by the chances of history involved in a responsibility. They have become enmeshed in that responsibility and cannot get rid of it whether they wish it or not, and for more than a century, as the quotation from Lord Macaulay which Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas gave us showed, the conviction has been fully fixed in the conscience of England that her presence in India required her to govern India for the benefit of the people of India. From her experiences in India England has learned to see a vision of a world order in which the conflicting problems and antagonisms of colour and race and creed could be resolved without armed struggle under a reign of law freely accepted by all. India has become the symbol and the test of that vision: and because of that England has realised that it is not enough to govern a country for the good of the people of that country even with the consent of the governed, and she has set before herself and India the goal of full responsible self-government for the Indian peoples as a full and free partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations. The desire to reach that goal has become for many people in England almost a passion—something more than a mere desire; it has become the absolute test of the position of the British Empire in the world.

But the English are a practical people none the less in spite of the sentiment to which I have been giving expression. They are a practical people and they see that there are enormous difficulties in the way. They are very conscious of those difficulties and they are all the more conscious of them because for a century they have felt this responsibility for good government within India. That responsibility makes it impossible for them to blink the difficulties, and that is why, when the Honourable the Home Member speaks on this subject, he finds it necessary to draw attention to the difficulties. I am sure that the discussions that have been going on for the last three weeks in Delhi must have brought home to many Members here the reality of those difficulties. If, as the Honourable Pandit Malaviya says, Sir Malcolm Hailey has suffered from the fact that he has been associated from day to day with the machinery of administration and if he is sobered in his vision by that fact, it must not be forgotten that those who have not been associated with the machinery of the day to day administration of a country are apt to overlook the mere weight of the problem. They do not see that to effect a big change it takes something more than good will or good words. It is a problem of administration and for that reason I rather regret that we did not have the discussion yesterday on the particular side of this question which relates to finance. I quite recognize that there were real difficulties in bringing such a piecemeal discussion on when we had the general debate in progress, but I think that debate might have been useful in elucidating some of the particular difficulties which have to be faced and in drawing attention to the fact that within the area of the ground that has been conquered by the Government of India Act of 1919 there is a large tract still to be made good before we can really

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

go on and advance to attack the next line of trenches. There is, I believe, a possibility of very considerable advance within the Act; indeed that is what the Act itself contemplates: whether by the use of particular sections such as 19A, or, as I believe is possible, by the natural growth of administrative conventions and the natural re-orientation of the Government of India towards its responsibility to a Parliament.

I was glad to note that on the whole none of the speeches that have been made hitherto have really questioned the *bona fides* of the British people in this matter. The countless Englishmen and Englishwomen of whom I have spoken are conscious of their sincerity, and while they regard it as quite natural that there should be impatience at the rate of progress—indeed they realise that impatience itself shows that the self-government in which they themselves believe is fully appreciated in India,—they are pained and surprised when they hear their country vilified, when their motives are called in question, when they find malice and hostility and obstruction from the very people with whom they were hoping to work in securing the goal in view. I welcome also the complete disclaimer of any desire to threaten. Threats may sadden but they never convince, and, I say it in all earnestness, obstruction cannot move us from our course. It is a common accusation against the Englishman that he fails completely to understand the Indian character. There is no doubt some truth in the charge. But is it not possible that the Indian sometimes fails to understand the English character? That is a difficulty, the difficulty of mutual understanding, which is at the root of many of our troubles. It is a difficulty which we have to recognize and a difficulty which we have to fight against by a plentiful spirit of good will firmly founded in that faith and hope, of which the poet speaks:

“ That faith which, in all distant parts,  
Has always fired English hearts,  
That colour, race and creed conceal  
One universal weal.  
That hope, which England dared profess,  
That open-hearted trustfulness  
Would knit the corners of the earth  
And bring new life to birth.”

**Pandit Motilal Nehru** (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I thank you for allowing me this opportunity to speak, as I understand that you are going to put the proposition of Dr. Gour at an early stage of the debate. I would beg your permission to deal with it after I have made a few general remarks.

Sir, when I rose to make my opening speech, I congratulated my friend, the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar, for having unconsciously admitted that he was a Swarajist. I am to-day in the happy position of being assured in unmistakable language by my friend, Sir Basil Blackett, that we are all Swarajists here. Well, that is a sign of encouragement and of hope. We find that there has been a considerable change in the view point of the Government Benches during the last five weeks and I hope and trust that, before we come to the end of this debate, there may be a still greater change in that view point and differences may be minimised. I shall not enter, Sir, into an unprofitable comparison between past administrations and the present administration. I shall content myself with uttering what is a truism, namely, that India is thoroughly discontented at this moment.

It will serve no useful purpose to lay the blame in any particular quarter and to protest innocence for some other quarter. The fact remains that discontent is there, and that this discontent is political in its nature. It may have for its foundation, for its origin, economic and other causes also, but mainly it is of a political nature. Now that being so, and it being admitted that we are all for establishing responsible government in this country, the only difference being that of degree and method, the question resolves itself into whether the stages which the Government of India Act provides and upon which the Government Benches rely are the proper stages, or those which I have submitted to this House in the shape of an amendment to the Resolution of my friend, Mr. Rangachariar. Sir, it appears that in this matter the ordinary course of things is being reversed. We find that the sober morning coat is for delay (*A Voice*: "Unreasonable delay") while the more sober, if somewhat cumbrous *dhoti* is all for expedition. (*A Voice*: "Unreasonable expedition.") I hope that we shall soon come to an understanding upon that point too. Now, Sir, the great point which has been made by the previous speakers and which has been referred to by Sir Basil Blackett in his speech arises out of the theory of "trust" and "trustee." I have often wondered as a lawyer as to what that may mean. Who is the author of this trust? Where is the appointment of the trustees, and who are the trustees? We find that the English people came to this country as tradesmen; they thought it would be a good thing to remain here; the climate did not then so disagree with their constitution as it seems to do now. Well, then they thought they might as well try their hand at governing the country; they did so and they succeeded. Now, Sir, I do not know by what process this can be said to have brought into existence a trust. Is it a legal trust? Is it a moral trust? What trust is it? If they say it is a trust reposed in the hands of the English people by Providence (*A Voice*: "Does Providence speak in whispers?"), if they say that the ways of Providence are inscrutable, I do not claim to pry into the secrets of Providence. I, as a human being and an ordinary mortal, can only look at the ordinary ways in which trusts are created, and I find that this extraordinary trust is foreign to all those ways. But let us for a moment take it that it is a trust. The whole question is, what is the best and the most honest manner of discharging the trust at this particular moment? The manner that I have suggested in my amendment is that the trustees should hand over the trust property to the *cestui que* trust, and that is the most honest thing in the world to do. That is the only way of terminating the trust honourable to both parties, and in a manner which cannot be taken exception to. The other methods are of course those which have been followed in other countries, and which, as my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has just said, do not commend themselves to us.

Now, Sir, the next thing to consider is, what are these stages? It has been variously estimated that those stages would cover 15 to 20 years. Well, Sir, whatever may have been the estimates made previous to the war, whatever may have been the conditions then prevailing, we have it now declared by the highest authority that the whole world—and I imagine India is a part of the world—that the whole world has progressed, has made the progress of centuries within as many weeks. However that may be, we know that there has been a great change in the aspirations of India. There is, I admit, a certain amount of impatience also, but the proposition I have laid before the House is a compromise, I submit, between the two extreme views. You say that we are in the first stage, and that

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

the first stage has been granted to us by Parliament. I ask in all seriousness and in all earnestness, what does this first stage mean? What can we do to-day under the constitution as it stands that cannot be undone to-morrow under some act, some Executive act under the Statute itself? Is there the least little thing that can be done by this House and by the authority of this House which this House has the right to enforce if the Government is not disposed to agree to it? I submit that my study of the Act has revealed no such power in us. There is no element of real responsibility in this first stage that has been so much talked about. Autocracy, Sir, will not cease to be autocracy if it is merely clothed in the garb of parliamentary forms, and yet my study of the Act and my study of the rules and what I know of the working of the reformed constitution during the last three years convinces me that all that has been done is to invest autocracy with parliamentary forms. That, Sir, is not the thing we want. It may be that you may find some little power here and there in the rules or in the Statute with the aid of a microscope; but, Sir, that is far removed from what I take it is admitted now to be our just claim and what it is now admitted we are fully entitled to. At any rate it is very far from what my amendment asks for. That, I submit, is after the maturest consideration put forward before this House as the minimum demand that we, as the representatives of the people, can put before the Government on their behalf. Now, Sir, some time ago, I made a note which by a happy accident I happened to turn up only yesterday. That was a note taken from Baring's "Russia." It says:

"On the 30th October 1904 the Czar promised, first, the creation of a deliberative and legislative Assembly without whose consent no new laws could be passed. Secondly, full rights of citizenship, the inviolability of the person, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, the right of organising public meetings and founding associations."

That is at page 14 of Baring's "Russia." I have not got the book but my note shows that the passage occurs in the introduction. Then we find at page 123:

"Coupled with this free grant of the right, there was a retention, a reservation, of unlimited autocratic powers in the Czar and his Government."

We all know—it is a matter of history,—what happened after this. There were indiscriminate arrests and terrorism in the land. On a representation being made, what was the reply of the Czar? He said:

"The Emperor has not withdrawn anything he has given. He has merely not done what he never said he would do, namely, voluntarily abdicating his autocratic power."

Now, Sir, I do not for a moment mean to suggest that it was the intention or that there was the remotest idea of giving us a reply like this in the minds of those who framed the present Act or of anyone who was concerned with it in any degree. But, looking at it as a business man, as a lawyer, as one accustomed to interpret language according to the meaning it can bear and not according to the pious purposes and objects which may have been in the minds of the person who used the language, I say that there is nothing to prevent the British Government or anyone on its behalf from saying that the power—the autocratic power—being there, you withdraw nothing that you have given. This power—if you do not like to call it autocratic, we will say the power of veto, the power to override, the power to undo all that we do—being there, you withdraw nothing and thus during the first stage both autocracy and reform go on working merrily together. That is the first stage of responsible Government. Even at

the last stage, I submit, if we follow this procedure, we shall, unless real responsibility is transferred to the hands of Indians, still be in the position in which we now are, and at any moment something may be done by His Excellency the Governor General or by other executive authority which will have the effect of doing away with our most valued privileges and rights, just as was the case in the matter of the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act. However, I will not go further into that question. All I need say is that the stages which are laid down in the Government of India Act or which have been contemplated by the rules are not the stages which are acceptable to the country at all. Sir Basil Blackett has referred to tracks, bridges and roads well used and well understood. May I ask Sir Basil Blackett if he can tell me whether any two nations have ever travelled along the same road for arriving at their freedom, and attaining full responsible Government? Each nation, Sir, has gone its own way and, as my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya put it, we, under the compelling necessity of the case, have chalked out a way for ourselves.

Then, there is the old question of the British Parliament being the sole Judge. I dealt with it in my opening remarks, and I shall not detain the House by repetition. But in regard to the Royal Commission which is contemplated by the Act, I will only say that a Royal Commission will not be acceptable. What we want is either a round table conference or a convention or something of that sort. As I said before, there is nothing in a name. You can give it any name you like. But a Royal Commission, we know what it is. There have been Royal Commissions before, and there is one in our midst at the present moment. What are the materials which the Royal Commission would put before the sole judge, the British Parliament? It will take evidence. What will be that evidence? It will be official evidence and non-official evidence. One will cancel the other, and we shall remain where we are. We do not want it, Sir. We do not think any case has been made out, after the admission that there must be an advance, that the Royal Commission should come at a huge expenditure to explore the avenues of further advance. In fact, Sir, I think, so far as the British public and the British Parliament are concerned, my Honourable friend the Home Member and his Colleagues with a few important personages out here and in England, if they so desire, can bring about a change in the view point of Parliament, and they can, if they so desire, make Parliament see very differently to what it has been seeing so long. It is the persons who advise the Crown that count, and Commissions and Committees and conventions do not count with a House of Parliament, 7,000 miles away, but they will count with us who are personally concerned.

Now, Sir, I am afraid I cannot deal with all that has been said about my amendment by the gentlemen who have preceded me, but I will say this that the offer my amendment makes is an offer made on the square without any mental reservation. It is for the Government to say whether they would accept it or not. It affords an opportunity, I submit, to the Government to right itself with the people, and to the people to right themselves with the Government. We know that in December 1922 the very thing I am asking for the Government was willing to grant—at least His Excellency the Viceroy was willing to give it to us if certain conditions had existed or rather if certain conditions had not existed. Well, those conditions do not exist now and I ask the Government whether the demand that is now put forward on behalf of the people is less opportune

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

than it was in the year 1921 minus certain conditions which then existed. Now, Sir, this is an opportunity which I would beg the Government Benches to bear in mind ought not to be thrown away. Opportunities like this do not occur every day. So far as we are concerned, Sir, we cannot do what we have been doing. There is nothing else in our power. We cannot make you see things as we see them except by inviting you to give us a chance of explaining things to you and of having things explained to us. As I sat down to-day in my seat, my Honourable friend Mr. Calvert reminded me of the inevitable result of Swaraj. He said it would bring anarchy, and he cited the instances of Russia, China, Italy and other countries where there has been anarchy. (*A Voice*: "The same was the case with Australia and Bulgaria.") There may be a dozen other countries. But what I ask in all seriousness is: Are we pursuing the same methods for our Swaraj as those other countries did, which resulted in anarchy? Are we not merely asking you for a convention or a round table conference? Are we doing anything which is going to lead to anarchy or disorder of any kind? Is it not, Sir, the fact that, if there is anything in the world which is likely to restore old relations and to obliterate the sad memory of past events, it is the sort of conference which I suggest?

Then, as to the special interests. Every interest, as I have already submitted, will be fully represented. A conference is not a Parliament. It is not going to enact a law straight away which will affect British capital, or the Muhammadan interests or the interests of other minorities. Every minority will have the fullest opportunity of putting forward its case, and the Government itself will be the most important party to this conference. Those who say that they are safe in the hands of the Government and accept the guardianship of the Government for all time will have the guardians to look after their wards.

Then, as regards anarchy. There may be anarchy, if the present system of administration is continued and if our voice is not heard, or if the remedies—supposed remedies—which are now being adopted are continued to be adopted. You may talk of revolutionary crime. But what is that, Sir, except an outward symptom of the real disease. Treat the disease and not the symptom. And the only treatment, by far the best treatment, for the disease, is suggested, I submit, by my amendment. If this offer is spurned, then, as I have said, we can only depend upon ourselves. We have tried to obtain justice by means of so-called constitutional and proper ways but we have miserably failed. The one lesson that we have learnt is that we have to depend upon ourselves. Sir, we find ourselves in a position in which there is nothing for us but to follow the teachings of our faith and offer ourselves for a sacrifice to appease the wrath of the gods who have laid us low. But anarchy is not the thing for us.

Now, Sir, with your permission, I will say one word on the amendment of Dr. Gour. I find that he has now come here. The sole argument advanced by Dr. Gour against a re-election, against the new Legislature, is that you have got so many uncertain elements in the case. First of all, he asks what is there to show that a round table conference would be a success, that we would come to a unanimous conclusion or decision in that conference. Then, he says, if we do come to a unanimous conclusion, what is there to show that the electorate will accept it and, if the electorate accepts it, what is there to show that this House will accept it.

Then, finally my friend said: What is there to show that the Parliament will accept it and pass the Statute in terms of the draft.

**Dr. H. S. Gour** (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, I am very sorry to have to interrupt my learned friend. I never said that the Parliament will refuse it. What I did say was that if the re-elected Legislature passed the scheme and the Parliament placed it on the Statute-book, it will again involve a fresh election for the third time.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru**: Then the whole thing resolves itself into a personal equation. It is the trouble which my friend will have of standing for two more elections. (Laughter.) Now, I do appeal to the patriotism of Honourable Members and request them to discard the personal element altogether. We know from our personal experience that it is most troublesome to contest a general election and, if it were only possible to maintain the principle of my amendment, I would have been glad indeed, Sir, to delete clause (b) to satisfy my friend Dr. Gour and others who do not like to risk a general election again, or perhaps two general elections. But, without clause (b) of my amendment, the very reason for it disappears; the very principle upon which it is based is entirely eliminated. I say that no Swarajist can agree to delete that clause without committing a serious breach of faith with his constituency. He has been elected and offered himself to his constituency as a Swarajist, as one who was going to secure Swaraj according to the wishes of the people. My friend, Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, yesterday said that the Swaraj he was looking for was the Swaraj of the poor man, the poorest man. I am in entire agreement with my friend. But are not the persons whose Swaraj we are striving for entitled to have a say in the matter? So far as we, Congressmen, are concerned, I repeat again that it will be nothing but a breach of faith on our part to arrogate to ourselves the privilege of framing a constitution for all our countrymen outside this House. Then my friends say that we are representatives of the people who have sent us here. I say, so we are. But we have come here for a definite purpose. And we must not in all honour do a thing which really amounts to trespassing upon the rights and privileges of the people. I do not think there is any public man either in this House or outside it who has ever said that the Swaraj that he wanted was any other than the Swaraj of the people. You will remember, Sir, most Honourable Members will remember, that, when asked by the Anglo-Indian press, and by other critics, times out of number, to define what he meant by Swaraj, Mr. Gandhi refused to do so. He said:

"It is not for me, it is not for anyone to say that. It is for the people to say what is the form of Government they are going to have."

And, if I am not mistaken—I am sorry I have not got the extract here—in his Cambridge speech, I think Mr. Montagu said that all these transitional stages are meant as experiments and that the real form of Government no one can determine except the Indian people themselves, according to their genius and according to their traditions. Now, Sir, it is that form of Government which my amendment asks to be established in this country and I submit that no one is a better judge of that form than the people themselves. We cannot, therefore, arrogate to ourselves an authority which we do not possess.

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

And now one word, Sir, in regard to the doubts of some of my Muham-madan friends about the communal proportions there will be in the representation at the round table conference to begin with and then in the Legislature which is to be elected, and afterwards in the administration of the country. Well, I can only say that these are the very questions for which I have asked for a round table conference or a convention. Honourable Members who have such doubts will do well to read the Report of the Irish Convention. I was looking into it yesterday. I have a copy with me and I can lend it to them. They will find that in Ireland, although the nature of the differences was not the same as here, the number or the intensity of the differences was not less than we see prevailing here at this hour. And yet, while those differences existed, while there were the Ulster Unionists, the Southern Unionists, the Nationalists, and Labourites, all separated, as far apart as the poles, they all came together in the Convention. It was not once but more than a dozen times that they came to the breaking point, and it was only by the statesmanship of the British Cabinet and of the Irish patriots who were engaged in the Convention that all crises were passed over. They ended at last by arriving at certain conclusions which were afterwards adopted in a Statute of Parliament. I simply invite them to do the same,—no one will commit himself in the least to anything by agreeing to this. I invite all interests, all minorities and all individuals to come and join us in a Convention and think out our own salvation for ourselves.

**Mr. K. C. Roy** (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): I move, Sir, that Dr. Gour's amendment be now put.

The motion was adopted.

**Mr. President:** The original question was:

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to take at a very early date the necessary steps (including if necessary procuring the appointment of a Royal Commission) for revising the Government of India Act so as to secure for India full self-governing Dominion status within the British Empire and Provincial autonomy in the Provinces."

To which an amendment has been moved:

"That the following be substituted for the original Resolution:

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps to have the Government of India Act revised with a view to establish full responsible Government in India and for the said purpose:

- (a) to summon at an early date a representative round table conference to recommend, with due regard to the protection of the rights and interests of important minorities, the scheme of a constitution for India; and
- (b) after dissolving the Central Legislature, to place the said scheme for approval before a newly elected Indian Legislature for its approval and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute."

Further amendment moved:

"That for that amendment the following be substituted:

'That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council to take steps to establish full responsible Government in India and for the said purpose to summon at an early date a representative convention to prepare, with due regard to the protection of the rights and interests of important minorities, a scheme of a constitution for India, and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute.'

The question I have to put is that the Amendment No. 2 (Pandit Motilal Nehru's amendment) be amended in the sense proposed by Dr. Gour.

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Ten Minutes to Three of the Clock.

The Assembly re-assembled after Lunch at Ten Minutes to Three of the Clock, Mr. President in the Chair.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao** (Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett in answering some of the points raised in this debate warned us not to go to the centuries behind us but to deal with the problem from the point of view of the present day. Sir, in referring to some of the points which have been raised both by the Honourable the Finance Member and the Honourable the Home Member, I shall be as brief as possible. The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett himself violated his own warning to us by referring to Bernier's Travels. Sir, it is rather dangerous to refer to some of our ancient books. I am reminded of an incident that occurred in one of our recent debates in the Madras Legislative Council. The Finance Member relied upon *Kautalya's Artha Sastra* for his financial canons. Sir, that debate really became a *Kautalya* debate, as everybody began to make references to it. I myself referred to other portions of the same book where I came across a particular paragraph which stated that any Finance Member who raised more revenues than are needed for the country should be punished by his head being cut off. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, I brought to the notice of the Finance Member in the Madras Legislative Council this particular paragraph because in Madras it was our complaint that more revenues than were needed for our requirements were raised within the last two or three years. I will therefore give this advice to my Honourable friend, never to refer to our ancient books, for, there may be much in support of his propositions, but he would find also much against his own contentions.

Sir, the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett went on to remind those of us who took part in the negotiations which culminated in the reform scheme to turn to ourselves and to examine the defects that have been revealed by the working of this Act during the last three years. Sir, both the Honourable the Home Member and the Honourable the Finance Member said that a good deal of ground has been covered during the last three years. I venture to challenge that proposition. I think that the fundamental conditions of reform with which the Reform Act was put into operation have been entirely forgotten, and, if the reforms have become a failure to-day, I would lay the blame entirely at the door of those authorities which are constitutionally known as the Home Government. Perhaps Honourable Members who are familiar with the constitutional aspect of this question and with the discussions that took place for nearly three years before this Act came into operation would remember that the first condition of reform is the devolution of power from the Home Government. Mr. Montagu was anxious to promote the conditions of reform as much as he could, took care to appoint a Committee, known as Lord Crewe's Committee, for the purpose of advising him on the steps necessary to secure

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

this devolution from these Home authorities. Sir, the constitution and functions of the Home Government under the Government of India Act of 1858 is practically the same at the present day. The Home authorities, namely, the Secretary of State in Council, are seized of all funds and, if any authority in India, whether it is the Central Government or whether it is the Local Government or Heads of Departments or any other authorities, exercise their powers and functions under the present system, it is by way of delegation from the Home Government. The present position has been stated so recently as 1913 before the Royal Commission on Indian Finance in these words by the Permanent Under Secretary of State:

"The extent of this control is unlimited except in so far as by general or special orders it has delegated powers of sanction to Indian authorities. Large powers have been so delegated. They are collected together in various Codes, such as the Civil Service Regulations, the Indian Army Regulations, the State Railway Code and what is known as the Audit Resolution of the Government of India. Expenditure proposals that are not covered by those delegated powers have to be submitted by the Government of India to the Secretary of State in Council for his sanction and questions inevitably arise from time to time as to the exact extent and limits of those delegated powers. Every important administrative project, it may be said, involves expenditure beyond the sanctioning authority of the Government of India and has to be considered by the Secretary of State in Council in its financial as well as in its administrative bearings. Proposals in the Military, Public Works and Railway Departments in particular affect large sums of money. The Budget estimates of the Government of India and the ways and means provision of the year also raise large questions of financial policy. Thus, in one way or another, a large amount of intricate and important financial work necessarily comes from the Indian Government to the Secretary of State in Council."

That was the position in 1913, and since the reforms I have been wondering whether this dominant position of the Home Government has in any way been reduced. I have done my best to acquaint myself with the further devolution that I thought did take place from the Home Government to the Central Government and to the Provincial Governments, and I

have in my hand, Sir, papers which have been kindly furnished  
 3 P.M. to me by the Finance Department—papers which show the position to-day of the Central Government and the Provincial Governments in this respect. I may say at once that on a perusal of these papers I am convinced that there is absolutely no progress in this respect. I have already referred to Lord Crewe's Committee. I may perhaps draw the attention of the House to the statements made by that Committee. They have stated that the fundamental position is that a new era should be initiated in India by an understanding between the Secretary of State and the Government of India, and that the basis of devolution should be one of consultation in the place of sanction. As I have already stated, one of the financial restrictions placed on the Central Government is that appointments in all the all-India services carrying pay over and above Rs. 1,200 a month should be submitted to the Home Government for their sanction, be it an addition or an abolition. I am mentioning this as only one aspect of the case. Therefore, Sir, the Crewe Committee recommended that the first condition of success of the reforms was that these sanctioning powers, financial and administrative, of the Home Government should be considerably cut down, that they should be replaced by an understanding, that the Home Government should only be consulted by the Government of India in important matters, that the class of subjects in which such consultation should take place should be revised from time to time and that in this manner the process of devolution should be

expedited so that we may reach the final stage of full responsible government. I maintain, Sir, we are profoundly disappointed in the working of the reforms. The Secretary of State has practically done nothing in the direction in which Lord Crewe's Committee have asked him to proceed, and I maintain that there has been no disposition on the part of the Secretary of State or the Secretary of State's Council to divest themselves of the powers which they now possess. I should like to ask the Honourable the Home Member whether under these conditions there is in the present Act any power of developing the Indian constitution.

### **The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Power?**

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** There is the power but no disposition. The Honourable the Home Member referred in his speech to the proposals that he has made on behalf of the Government, namely, to proceed under sections 19A, 45A and 96B for the development of the constitution. I am rather surprised and amazed that he should have put forward such a proposition in this House. In a previous debate in this House, some time in July 1923, the Honourable the Home Member spoke as follows :

"Secondly, there is the process which can be achieved by the making of rules under 19A and the like. But mark the constitutional implications of these two processes. While under a convention of non-interference, the statutory control of the Secretary of State, and therefore of Parliament still remains (though it may be in abeyance); the effect of making rules under 19A differs in this, that it is a statutory divestment of control. What is the theory of our constitution, or indeed of any constitution? The theory of every constitution which is not explicitly autocratic, is that whatever some of our critics may say about us and about the character of our administration, however autocratic it may be in intention and in spirit, in point of constitutional form it has not that character, for the reason that our Executive is under the control of the British Parliament. In other words, it is under the control of a Legislature. Under what circumstances then can Parliament divest itself of that control? Obviously only in circumstances under which the Executive would come under the control of some other Legislature. Therefore, if Parliament is to be asked to divest itself of control over any particular subject, it seems to me that it can only do so when we have responsible government within the Central Government, that is, when certain subjects are transferred to the control of the Indian Legislature. We should then have a process exactly parallel to that which has been followed in Provincial Governments. There you have certain subjects transferred; that is, they are under the control of the Legislature, in so far that their administration is in the hands of Ministers who are responsible to the Legislature . . . if I may continue my point, the proper time for the Secretary of State to divest himself of statutory control over any particular subject in the Central Administration is when that subject is itself transferred to the control of the Indian Legislature. I maintain, therefore, that if we are to be correct in the maintenance of constitutional form, the Secretary of State should not divest himself of authority under section 19A until we have made that change in our constitution as a consequence of which certain subjects can be handed over to the control of the Indian Legislature; in other words until they are administered by Ministers."

Now, Sir, my Honourable friend has ransacked all the previous proceedings in which the opinions of my Honourable friends, Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Tilak and various other gentlemen, have been recorded. He even referred to some statement of my Honourable friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, made in 1909. I now ask my Honourable friend whether in view of the statement which he has made so late as July 1923 he still regards a process of devolution under section 19A as a process which is compatible with our wishes. Does he mean to suggest that under section 19A the Home authorities should divest themselves of their present administrative and financial functions, not to a responsible legislature, because I do not understand the Honourable Member's speech in that way, but to the Government as it is now constituted and thus make it more autocratic

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

than before? Therefore, Sir, I am unable to understand the line which the Honourable Member has taken in this debate in view of his own previous statement.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley:** Does the Honourable Member himself maintain that there cannot be any devolution under section 19A?

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** I am quoting the Honourable Member against himself. The Honourable the Home Member is not prepared for the process of devolution under section 19A until responsible government is established in this Legislature. I am trying my best to understand the line of action which has been proposed, that is, to institute an inquiry to explore the ground for further devolution under section 19A, or 45A or 96B. I should like to have an unequivocal statement as to what it is that this departmental Committee, which my Honourable friend proposes, should do. Is it to exploit the ground which he himself has declared in July 1923 as absolutely barren and not leading at all to responsible government but only to a more autocratic form of government in this country? I am, therefore, absolutely unable to accept the suggestions made in the concluding portion of my Honourable friend's speech.

There are two other aspects of the problem to which I should like to invite the attention of the House. During the last three years attempts have been made to induce the Government of India to undertake a policy of training Indians for Commissions in the Army. Sir, in some of the previous debates, the then Home Member said that, if he had been a non-official Member, the one consideration that he would have persistently pressed upon the Government would be an Indian army officered by Indians themselves. This was some time in March 1921. Since then, my Honourable friend, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, tabled a number of Resolutions and with the weight of his authority, influence and experience he tried to persuade Government to undertake the Indianisation of the army on a much wider scale than had been thereto done. What was the result? My Honourable friend himself was greatly disappointed in the matter and came back to the Assembly some time in July 1923 expressing his dissatisfaction. During a recent visit to England some time in 1921 in connection with the Indian Students Committee the one request that we heard from a large number of Indian students was for training in departments dealing with national reconstruction, relating to military efficiency, the Air forces and the Navy, and one of the matters that was specifically referred to us was whether any facilities could be provided for training in any one of these subjects. Sir, we went into this matter and we found that more than 35 lakhs of rupees is being contributed from the Indian exchequer to various military institutions, naval colleges, military colleges, colleges of gunnery, artillery and various other institutions from which Indians, as Indians, have been specifically excluded under the orders of the Secretary of State or the Cabinet or the Military Authorities, whichever it is does not matter. How can you now say, if, notwithstanding the request of Indians both in England and in India, no steps have been taken for our military efficiency being promoted, that any satisfactory steps have been taken? I am quite aware that some steps have been taken, but I ask, is it right that, owing to this policy of suspicion, Indians should be excluded from the air force, from the navy, the military establishments, training and educational establishments both in England and in India?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey's suggestion that we should wait till our military efficiency is fairly established to shoulder the responsibilities of Dominion status is certainly an argument that will not appeal to anybody in this House. There seems to be a lack of understanding of the fundamental conditions of Indian advance. This has also arisen in regard to the civil services. We have heard statements made to the Royal Commission on the Indian services that the European services require guarantees from Parliament and that they are not satisfied with the word of the Indian authorities. It seems to me, Sir, that under these circumstances we must go back to the fundamentals of Indian constitutional advance which are still in doubt. Doubts have been raised by the speech made by Mr. Lloyd George, a speech with which every one in the House is familiar, and the phrase used then about the "steel frame" has become classical. After the Irish Convention what did Ireland do? I saw a statement in the papers quite recently that they confined the recruitment to their civil service to the native-born Irish. Is it wrong on our part to look forward to the day when the civil and military services of this country should be manned by our countrymen? Therefore, Sir, I think that the purpose of this debate is to secure an examination of the fundamental propositions. We think that Dominion status should be first conceded and that further steps in the direction of national training in all the departments should be undertaken, and that every aspect of this problem should be looked at from the national standpoint. In regard to the army there are many questions in which we are at present entangled and, if once the Government accept that our aim and objective is Dominion status, various questions relating to the organisation of the army would have to be settled. The army would be on the Dominion model. The commissions and the expenditure would also be on the Dominion model.

This Resolution is one which ought to be accepted in this House unanimously. I only wish to say one word in conclusion. The Honourable the Home Member said that the best of India should co-operate with the Government in regard to our work of national reconstruction leading up to Dominion status. I am sure that that appeal will not be in vain, but I submit that, on the part of those who are associated with the government of this country, there should be an equal disposition to identify themselves with the national movement in this country and to get into our skins and to feel as we feel and to take such steps as are necessary in promoting the object which we have in passing this Resolution. Until there is that disposition, we shall certainly be at cross purposes and nothing will be gained by the passing of Resolutions or the rejection of Resolutions. Finally, I should like to say a word about the political situation in England. I think this is about the best time in which this question of Indian advancement should be considered by His Majesty's Government. There are now, I feel, in the councils of the government men who have been in India, who understand the Indian national movement, who have given some thought to this subject, and I feel this is just about the most suitable time when this whole question should be tackled. I heartily associate myself with the mover of this Resolution and I hope the amendment moved by my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru will be passed without a dissentient voice.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qayyum** (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-Official); I cannot make a long speech after the eloquent speeches that I have heard on the subject in this House to-day and the other day, and I will therefore confine myself to one or two points that

[Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

confront me as a Mussalman and as a resident of the North-West Frontier Province. It is in that capacity only that I want to draw the attention of the House to one or two things. This Government of India Act has now been in operation for the last three or four years but I do not think it has been given a fair trial. I see that we have got quite a good representative Assembly this time but that was not the case last time. There are, however, some people in this country who would not come to the Assembly even now. I do not know by what nomenclature they are called, no-changers or what, but there are some who would not come to this Assembly even now. From the very beginning there has been an idea in the country that the reforms given by this Act are not adequate. Unfortunately, I have not gone into the Act myself as I ought to have done; but why? Simply because the Act has not been extended to my unfortunate province. We are still out of it, Sir. As regards India, I am not an authority to say much on this subject. But I hope I will not be misunderstood when I say that it is only the extent of the reforms and the stages of the reforms that there is some difference of opinion about. As regards the goal (Swaraj) itself there is no difference of opinion that that is the goal of the country and that it has to be achieved. That goal has been recognized by the British nation and the British Parliament in one of its Statutes, and no Member of the Government in this House has denied or can dare to deny that that is the goal. It now only remains to decide how to achieve that goal, by what process, in what time and in what manner. As I have said just now, there is the Government of India Act to which, in my humble opinion, no fair trial has yet been given. It is said that it is not adequate, that it does not provide sufficiently for the attainment of that goal. But it may be tried I think just a little longer with the new Assembly and the very representative Assembly that we have got now and perhaps, later on, there will be more unity in putting forward the demand for its revision. The Honourable the Home Member pointed out certain difficulties in the way of its immediate revision. I cannot deal with many of those difficulties, but I will refer to only one and that, Sir, the one which concerns my community and myself as an individual Mussalman representing the views of the Mussalmans of the Frontier Province. That difficulty, Sir, is about communal differences. They are there; nobody can deny it, and anybody who has the pluck to deny it has only to go to the Punjab and see how they are fighting amongst themselves over those communal differences. One of the speakers this morning, one of the foremost leaders in this House, said that "it is we who make up those differences; it is we who ought to remove them". But I will only humbly ask him, what is there to prevent him from making up those differences? Why is there any delay about it? Have we not tried a thousand and one time—not myself, as I do not call myself a leader, I am referring to the speaker—has he not tried more than once to remove those differences and has he not failed or has he not himself objected to some of those pacts that have been arrived at in provinces other than his own? Has there not been an attempt to undo what has been done in some quarters? I am sorry to say that those are very clear and distinct facts. And, if the majority are in such a hurry to revise the Government of India Act simply because they do not believe in the *bona fides*, as it is called, or the honesty of the present Government, the minority may have the same doubts about their own interests and rights. If those differences can be removed before any further action is taken, I think it will satisfy the

Mussalmans and there may then possibly be a united demand for the revision of the Act. And possibly when those differences are removed, you may see, Sir, the whole of the House dressed in one simple dress and one simple cap and there will be no distinction of races or dresses, at least to any great extent. I hope no other motive will be attributed to my remarks than a wish that those differences might be removed before the revision of the Act. If such important matters can be settled within a few hours at a private meeting of the two very important parties of the majority in this House, as the modification of their propositions and their Resolutions by talking together privately, there is no reason why a meeting or two should not be held to remove those differences which are really troubling the minds of the majority of my co-religionists. I need not refer to the instances which have occurred. They are too obvious and too recent.

That is one point, Sir. The second point to which I would draw the attention of the House is particularly about my own province. I do not know, Sir, why the provisions of this Government of India Act, or some of them, have not yet been extended to my poor province. Are we not part and parcel of British India? Are we going to be left out as untouchables? Are we going to be used as a catspaw or as watchmen? They are utilising the services of my countrymen on watch and ward duties in Bombay and Calcutta. We are paid for that but we are not paid for the watch and ward duty that we are rendering the rest of India in that corner, the north-west corner, of India. And that corner, Sir, is a very important corner. Its importance has come down from ages and ages. All the land invasions of India have been effected through that corner and it has played a very important part in the evolution or devolution or whatever you like to call it, of India. (Laughter.) If is a very important province, Sir. We have our commonsense, "our commonsense" I must call it because the Mover of this Resolution was so kind, after taking my evidence on an Inquiry Committee with which he was associated, and I was the first witness examined before that Committee, to observe that I had a very robust commonsense. I do not know what 'robust' means; I say that I have got every sense that anybody else in his country possesses. We have got a very good education of our own, not the speech-making education of the down countries, but we have got practical education in practical affairs, Sir, and when the Inquiry Committee came, we hoped that our voice was going to be heard; and will you not be surprised, Sir, to know that so far as I know, the very Mover of this Resolution who wants further reforms for himself refused the existing reforms to us? Is he not contradicting himself now by asking more of what he will not allow us under the old Act.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar** (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan, Urban): I am sorry, Sir, my Honourable friend is quoting from a confidential Report, which he ought not to do.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum**: From what I understand of his reasons, I do not know what his reasons were, I am only guessing the thing, the report is not published, but I can refer to his own conversations with me on this subject long after he had written his report, and may I say that I am justified in quoting himself. I do not know what his reasons could be. I hope they were not communal, religious or anything of the sort; at least I will not distrust him in that respect. But what his reasons were, they could only be either some defective educational standard over there or some physical, political or other defects connected with the

[Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

frontier. If his objection to reforms was about education, I will not admit that we are behind hand of many other parts of India in that respect, especially when we look to our neighbours in the Punjab, on the southern side of the Indus. There is a large portion of the Punjab as big as the Frontier Province or at least the settled districts of the Province, which is not higher at all in education. If we take education, we are much superior to them. If there were other reasons of policy, such as economy, then I do not know if he expects every corner of the Indian Empire to be self-supporting. Sir, even this House is not in all its corners self-supporting. They will themselves find the south-western part of it more expensive than the northern or the eastern part of it, and, similarly, many of the districts of the Punjab are very poor in the way of producing revenue; so I do not know where the question of economy comes in, Sir. I may point out with respect to that economy that most of the expenses are incurred for Imperial purposes, that is for all-India purposes, not for our provincial purposes, Sir, they are Imperial concerns, and I do not know why that should fall under the budget head of my poor province. If the House will compare the education allotment or some other medical or sanitary allotments in our province with similar allotments in similar districts of other provinces, it will at once understand that these are not more expensive as compared with other parts of India. I cannot understand, Sir, why there should be any hitch about the extension of those reforms; and, as long as those reforms are not extended to that corner of India or to any other corner of India out of the bounds of the reforms, such as Baluchistan or, God knows how many other corners there may be, I can not support the proposition that the present Act should be revised. There is an Urdu or Hindi proverb about it:—“*Agé dour, piche chaur*”. Are we going to be left behind while the rest of India simply gets into a fast train and runs away to Bombay or Delhi and never asks what is going to happen to its poor comrades who are left behind at the station? This is my observation, Sir, and, if we really want the speed with which to get the Act revised, we had better first attempt these two things: the removal of our communal difficulties, which as I have said before can be managed in no time if the angle of vision of the majority is changed, and the extension of that Act to my province. Before finishing, I may just point out one little thing to you, Sir, and it ought to appeal to the hearts of this House. The Afghans, our kinsmen, have started reforms. They are going very very fast in the direction of the improvement of their government and their administration in that neighbouring country. We thought that we were the better of them because we were under a benign, world-wide Government and were already in the exercise of a good many privileges appertaining to that Empire. But suppose, if within the next five or ten years they improve things so fast as to tempt us to be aggrieved and to approach the benign Government with grievances and blame and make accusations of all sorts, we will not be—what shall I say?—I hope we will not be blamed for it. We will be justified if we go to the world and say, “Here we are who have been under a Government and a world-wide Moslem Government for nearly a century and we are unable to go forward and compete with the advancement which has been achieved in a neighbouring country in a very short period.” And it is to that very point that I would draw the attention of the House. I need not prolong my remarks, but I hope that my views will find support.

**Mr. V. J. Patel** (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, the last speaker made two points. His first complaint is that the Government of India Act has not been applied to his province and that the people of his province are treated as untouchables, and he wants to know the reason why. Perhaps the Honourable the Home Member will explain why his province has been treated as untouchable. So far as I am concerned, I would advise my friend to join the great non-cooperation movement and there will be an end of it. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) If he joins the national movement, I promise him that there will be no difficulty in seeing not only that the Government of India Act is applied to his province but full responsible government is conceded to his province. (Laughter.) Let him therefore join us.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum**: I never said anything about the Home Member. I only had a little friendly complaint against one of the leading members of the Inquiry Committee who has dissented from the rest of the members of the Committee in allowing us those reforms.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar**: My Honourable friend has been referring to a report which he has not read carefully. I do not know if he has got a copy of it, and if he has, I do not know how he got it, for it has not been published as yet. In any case I will advise him to read it very carefully. On the other hand I have advocated most warmly that the Pathan nation should come and join the rest of Indians and they will make us more fit for self-government than we are now. (Hear, hear.)

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum**: After losing our identity.

**Mr. V. J. Patel**: The second point that my Honourable friend made was regarding communal differences in which he deferentially followed the Home Member and he pointedly drew attention to the speech of my leader, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, if I understood him aright. He asked the Panditjee why are these communal differences not being settled although Pandit Malaviya has been trying to do for ever so long. Well, I also ask why these communal differences are not being settled. We find no very serious differences between the Hindus and the Muhammadans in the territory administered by Indian rulers. Why, I ask, do these differences arise and are not settled in British India? The question answers itself. Have responsible government, and the differences between the Hindus and the Muhammadans will be settled in no time. Let us settle these things for ourselves. It is because there are others who say 'We will settle these things for you' that the differences grow. It is our business to settle these differences. We want the right to settle these differences. We do not want the interference of other people to settle these differences, and I beg of my friend to join with us in having responsible government and he will have no difficulty whatsoever.

Now, Sir, before I come to the amendment, I would like to know from my Honourable friend the Mover of this Resolution whether he adopts the amendment or whether he sticks to his Resolution, so that I may proceed accordingly. It would facilitate discussion if we know exactly what the position of the Mover of the Resolution is. If he says that he adopts the amendment, then we might confine our criticism to the amendment itself. If my friend Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar has no objection, he will kindly tell the House whether he has any objection to adopt the amendment of my friend the Honourable Pandit.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar:** I may say that I am waiting to hear my Honourable friend to make up my mind. (Laughter.)

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** That means my friend Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar has an open mind. He has not made up his mind yet. Perhaps he has heard my friend the Pandit say that he does not want any Commission, while the Resolution asks for a Commission, if necessary. So, there is that difference, main difference, between the proposition and the amendment. Now, as regards the amendment, the main point that this House has got to determine is regarding the method proposed. We want a conference, a round table conference, and why? My Honourable friend, Sir Basil Blackett, told us that he was glad that no one questioned the *bona fides* of Government. Well, here I am to question the *bona fides* of Government. He does not know that there is a certain institution called the Indian National Congress that has been questioning the *bona fides* and the intentions of the Government for the last three years.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** May I explain that I said that no one hitherto in this House had questioned the *bona fides* of the Government.

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** No one in this House. Here I am to question it and it is because the people of India question the *bona fides* of the Government of India and the British Government, if I may be allowed to add, and it is because the authorities do not put themselves right with the people, that all this trouble has arisen. Why, why all this trouble? Why all these difficulties? I cannot understand. The position is absolutely clear. The intention of the British Government—the professed intention of the British Government—is expressed in the Announcement of 1917. It is to establish responsible government in India. The Indian National Congress wants the establishment of Swaraj in India. All that the British Government says is that it should be by stages. We say “No, immediate.” Why can we not sit together, discuss the matter and come to some understanding? I fail to see why all these years we have been wasting our time and energy, both Government and the people. It is because they do not trust us, it is because we do not trust them, that the difficulty arises. If we mutually trust each other, sit down together, discuss things in the right spirit, there would not be the slightest difficulty. My friend the Mover of the Resolution very rightly pointed out that the whole of the Government of India Act, particularly the Chapter relating to the division of subjects into transferred and reserved subjects, is based on mistrust. Why you regard us as fit to administer education, public works, medical department? Why could you not trust us to administer land revenue? Why could you not trust us here in the Central Government to administer the very subjects which are now being administered by my friends on the other side, the Honourable Sir Mian Muhammad Shafi, the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma and the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee? If they can administer these subjects, remaining responsible to an electorate 6,000 miles away, do you believe that they cannot administer these subjects remaining responsible to the electorate in India on the spot?

**Mr. N. C. Kelkar** (Bombay Central Division. Non-Muhammadan Rural): The electorate is the same.

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** I did not quite catch Mr. Kelkar. The electorate in England could not be the same as the electorate in India.

**Mr. N. C. Kelkar:** I mean that the electorate for the provinces and the Assembly is the same for the purposes of the Assembly.

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** That is true. But the point that I was making was this. When these Indian gentlemen who are now on the Executive Council could administer and be entrusted with the administration of such subjects as the Posts and Telegraphs, Excise and other departments, remaining responsible to an electorate 6,000 miles away, I fail to understand why these very gentlemen could not be trusted to administer these very subjects remaining responsible to the electorate in India? (Hear, hear.) That is distrust, nothing else but distrust. They do not trust us; Government do not trust us; and we do not trust the Government. (Hear, hear.) That is the whole thing.

Sir, four years ago, I was in England as General Secretary of the Indian National Congress and as a member of the Congress Deputation. I gave evidence before the Joint Parliamentary Committee, which my friend the Home Member quoted. I am afraid he has misread or misrepresented my evidence—I do not know which it is. But, before I come to that part of the evidence to which my Honourable friend has referred, allow me to read a paragraph from the speech of my friend Colonel Wedgewood which he delivered in a debate in the House of Commons. When the Government of India Bill was under discussion the Labour Party strongly opposed, strenuously opposed, the clause relating to an examination by a Commission at the end of ten years. They said we do not want this clause. We do not want to be bound or we do not want to bind any future Parliaments. Why should the Commission go at the end of 10 years? It may be that we might require to review the whole situation and grant further reforms at the end of two years. And Mr. Spoor, another Labour Member, moved an amendment to that clause. While speaking on that amendment, this is what Colonel Wedgewood said:

“This amendment itself requires only two words. The whole necessity of the amendment arises from the fact that the Labour Party may be in power in this country in four years' time.”

That was in December 1919. We are now in January 1924. He goes on:

“We wish to make our position quite clear. If that should be so, we hope we shall not regard ourselves as bound by this first sub-section. We wish to protest now that when and if we propose to send out a Commission to inquire into the working of the Act some 5 years from now that it will not be a sufficient reply to say that we have said we have already agreed to an Act which says that the Commission shall not be sent for ten years.”

My friend, Colonel Wedgewood, was silenced by the then Secretary of State for India, Mr. Montagu, by saying that all that the clause provides is that there shall be a Commission at the end of ten years. It does not mean that there cannot be a Commission before then. Well, Sir, the prophecy of Colonel Wedgewood has come to be true. The Labour Government is now in power. (Mr. N. M. Dumasia: “They are in office, not in power.”) My friend, Mr. Dumasia, corrects me by saying that they are not in power but in office. He is quite right. They have now ample opportunity to put their professions into practice if they want to. If they want to show their *bona fides*, here is the time. And, if the Government of India want to show their *bona fides* to the people of India, if they at all mean well by the people of India,

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

I believe this is the most opportune time for doing so. Let them stand by the people of India. The non-co-operators have come into this Assembly. The atmosphere has changed. The Labour Party has come into office and, if the Government do not at this most opportune juncture come to the help of the people and stand by the people of India, then there can be no other inference but this that they do not mean well by the people of India. My suspicion about their *bona fides* will be confirmed. Well, Sir, as I said, I was in England four years ago. The Parliamentary Labour Party, which was not in power or office at that time but which was in a minority took up the attitude which the Indian National Congress had taken up. In the Joint Parliamentary Committee their representative, Mr. Spoor, moved several amendments on the lines of the Resolution of the Indian National Congress passed at Delhi. All those amendments were based on the demands made by the Indian National Congress. What did the Indian National Congress want in 1918? They wanted full provincial autonomy. They wanted full control in the Central Government except in respect of the army, navy and foreign affairs. They wanted the abolition of the Council of State. (A Voice: "Council of the Secretary of State and not the Council of State.") Yes, the Council of the Secretary of State. But there was also an amendment moved by Colonel Wedgewood that the Council of State should be abolished. (Laughter.) Full provincial auto-

4 P. M. nomy, full control of the Central Government, except in respect of the army, navy and foreign affairs, the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State, and fiscal autonomy, and last but not least the inclusion in the Statute of the Declaration of Rights. These in short were the demands made by the Indian National Congress, which was held at Delhi, and on those demands, as embodied in the Congress Resolutions, the amendments were drafted and moved, not only before the Joint Parliamentary Committee by Mr. Spoor, but in the open House by both Mr. Spoor and Colonel Wedgewood on behalf of the Labour Party—not in their individual capacity—I want to make that perfectly clear because Mr. Ben Spoor was a representative selected by the Labour Party to be on the Joint Parliamentary Committee. There is another matter which I should like to make clear, and it is this. Although the Congress at Delhi resolved that the two subjects may not be included in the list of subjects in which responsibility is transferred in the Central Government, namely, the Army, Navy and foreign affairs, still the position the Congress had taken up was this. It was in the application of the principle of self determination that the Congress resolved that the people wanted that much then and that at the end of a certain period automatically the other two subjects should be transferred to their representatives. That was the stand we took up. Not that we had ever accepted the cautious and qualifying phrases of the announcement of August 1917. No. All that the Congress had accepted at Calcutta, at Bombay and at Delhi in December 1917 and September and December 1918 respectively, all that the Congress had accepted was the policy underlying that announcement, namely the establishment of responsible government in India. We have protested and protested very strongly against the imposition of any stages and we have protested and protested very strongly against the suggestion that the measure and time of each advance was to be determined by the Parliament or the British Government. The announcement was made in 1917 and two or three months after, the Congress met in Calcutta and we there considered the announcement and we said: "Well, it was all right, let us accept the policy of it, namely the establishment of responsible government

in India." But, so far as those cautious and qualifying phrases were concerned, we always thought that they were merely a commentary on the main portion of the announcement, because the Secretary of State said:

"I may add that the advance in this direction shall be gradual and that the measure and the time of each advance shall be decided by the British Parliament."

We regarded this addition as the commentary of the Secretary of State, and at the time that we met at the Calcutta Congress, we passed a Resolution. In this Resolution we clearly set out what the substantial steps towards the realisation of responsible government should be, and we made it clear that we were not prepared to accept any defined stages and that the time limit should be laid down in the Statute itself for the realisation of responsible government.

That Resolution reads:

"This Congress strongly urges the necessity for the immediate enactment of a Parliamentary Statute providing for the establishment of responsible government, etc., and this Congress expresses its grateful satisfaction, for the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Secretary of State for India on behalf of the Imperial Government that its object is the establishment of responsible government in India."

And who moved that Resolution? The Honourable Sir Surendra Nath Banerjea. And it was supported by my friend on the left, Mr. Jinnah. And what did Sir Surendra Nath Banerjea say in moving it? He said:

"I have no hesitation in saying that this proclamation is a memorable triumph of the Congress and it adds one to the series of such triumphs and you have rightly embodied it in the Resolution. But there is a rift in the lute. It is said that the measure of self-government and the time for its introduction are to be determined by the Government of India and the British democracy. We, the people who are most vitally concerned in the matter, concerned far more closely than either the British Government or the Government of India, we claim the right to have a voice in the matter. And here we take our stand on the dictum of the Prime Minister himself. He said in the course of one of his recent speeches that, when after the war, the question of resettlement was to be considered—mark the words—the wishes of the people are to be the supreme consideration. I am grateful to him for this admission and the Congress should be grateful for it. But he also added that the formula is not to be fettered by considerations of latitude and longitude and that it is equally applicable to the tropical climates. We therefore take our stand upon this dictum and press for the recognition of this formula in the coming readjustment of the Government of India."

This conclusively proves that, so far as the Indian National Congress is concerned, it has never accepted the position that the British Government and the Government of India were to be the judges of the time and measure of each advance and, when we met at Delhi, we adopted a Resolution demanding self-determination for India. The Resolution reads:

"In view of the pronouncement of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George and other British statesmen that to ensure the future peace of the world the principle of self-determination should be applied to all progressive nations, be it resolved that this Congress claims the recognition of India by the British Parliament and by the Peace Congress as one of the progressive nations to whom the principle of self-determination should be applied."

Such was the position of the Congress after the announcement by His Majesty's Government, and yet we are told that we have accepted the stages. Nothing of the kind. Before the Joint Committee, I gave evidence and I brought these Resolutions to the notice of Lord Selbourne and his colleagues and, if I may be allowed to refer to the relevant part of my

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

evidence, I will invite the attention of the House to what exactly I stated before the Joint Committee:

"The Congress holds that the people of India are ripe and fit for responsible government now. That is the position of the Congress. But the question naturally arises, if the people are fit, why do not we ask for it? Why do we not ask for full responsible government at once? It is true we have not asked for full responsible government, and my reasons are these. The announcement regarding His Majesty's policy in British India was made on the 29th August 1917. After that announcement was made we met in the Indian National Congress which was held at Calcutta and we considered the announcement in all its aspects. We considered it very carefully. The announcement, as Your Lordship knows very well, pledges His Majesty's Government to a policy of responsible government and it pledges His Majesty's Government to take substantial steps in that direction without delay. In this connection I may state that, in making that announcement, the Secretary of State explained that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages and that the British Government and the Government of India should be the judges of the time and measure of each advance. We considered the announcement in the cautious explanatory phrase from the Secretary of State in making that announcement. The Indian National Congress does not regard those phrases as a part of His Majesty's announcement."

That was, Sir, the position of the Indian National Congress before the Joint Committee and that is its position now.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** For 15 years?

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** Yes. The Indian National Congress at Delhi did pass a Resolution asking for the transfer of all subjects excepting the two mentioned by me and further stating that these two subjects should also automatically go to the representatives of the people without any examination, without any Commission at the end of a definite period and in pursuance of that Resolution I stated clearly and emphatically before the Joint Committee that in the exercise of our right of self-determination we say, "We want this. It is not for you to say 'You shall take this and be satisfied'. We say 'We want this' and yours is to give." That is the position we took up. In 1917 also we pressed for a time limit to be included in the Statute, but all that with a view to save time, as I said before the Joint Committee, which might otherwise be lost in controversy. We wanted to save time and come to some understanding as we always have been willing to come to some understanding, and therefore we pointed out to the Joint Committee that we were willing, if the following things were granted to us immediately, namely, full provincial autonomy, full fiscal autonomy, abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State, declaration of rights, and responsibility in all subjects in the Central Government excepting in the army, the navy, and foreign affairs,—we were perfectly willing to leave the two subjects to the Executive Government controlled by Parliament for a definite period at the end of which I said they should automatically come to the representatives of the people. That was our position. It is not that we recognised the stages. It is not that we recognised that the British Government and the Government of India were to be the judges of the time and measure of each advance. Nothing of the kind. It was in the exercise of our right of self-determination that we said "All right, we shall be satisfied with this. Let us have so much". Great stress has been laid by my friend the Honourable the Home Member on the question of defence. Yes, there is that question. Some of my friends do feel nervous about it. Speaking for myself and speaking as representing the Congress, I say here that we have fully considered the question and we find no difficulty whatsoever. Let us have immediate self-government. Let us have immediate responsible government. What is there in the army? Who controls the army at present? Does my friend who sits opposite to me . . .

**Mr. D. V. Belvi:** And who pays for it?

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** Does my friend the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma take no part in the deliberation of the Cabinet which controls the Indian army at present? Does not the Honourable Sir Muhammad Shafi take any part? Does not my friend the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee take any part? It is the civilians forming the Cabinet that control the Indian army. No one else. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is one of the Members of that Cabinet. But after all, the general policy is being dictated by the whole Cabinet and that Cabinet, instead of being responsible to the Parliament, we say, should be responsible to the people of India. That is the only difference. Where is the difficulty in having popular control over the army in India? I do not see any. There is no doubt that you require some time to have your own personnel in the army—for the army to be manned and officered by Indians themselves. There is no doubt about it. But in the transitional stage, we might take the control and instead of one Military College, we shall have half a dozen Colleges. We shall immediately send out a large number of our young and eligible men to all parts of the world to different Military Colleges. We shall invite foreign military experts from any part of the world to teach our young men in our colleges. I am absolutely certain that, if the control is left to us, then it will only be a question of two or three years to have the whole army to be manned and officered by Indians. There is not the slightest difficulty about it. It is only a question of control and nothing else. And I do not anticipate, as my friend the Honourable the Home Member anticipates, some trouble from the Afghans as soon as self-government is given to us. These are bogeys—Afghan invasion, Russian invasion and things of that kind. Supposing, however, that in the transition period some such thing does happen, supposing that while we are engaged as we are bound to be engaged—in fact that will be our first act in the new Parliament as soon as we get responsibility—in looking after the Indianisation of the Army, some such thing does happen; then the existing army is there. It is under our control. What is the difficulty?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** Are the British troops there also?

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** I do not for the moment believe that the British officers and the British troops are going to leave India as soon as we assume the control of the army.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** You want them to stay?

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** Certainly. But those who are opposed to the legitimate aspirations of the people of India and to their political freedom are not wanted. Let them go away. They are quite welcome to leave us and join the army of unemployed in England. There is no difficulty about that. But I do not think my friend the Honourable the Home Member has any idea of the military honour of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and those gallant British officers who are leading the Indian army today if he believes that as soon as we control them, as soon as the people who pay control the army, they would leave the shores of India. But, I say it is a question of time. Mind you, don't forget this. We in the Indian National Congress have not yet passed a Resolution for complete independence. Rightly or wrongly, our leaders have successfully opposed the idea. If India is going to remain a part of the British Empire, is it suggested that during this transitional period of two or three years, other parts of the

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

Empire will not come to our assistance if such a mishap does occur? What is it that is contended? I cannot understand it. Why, during the war, when England was in trouble, did not India shed her blood? Did not India come out handsomely with her men, money and materials and every other possible thing? And is she not entitled to expect that, if she is in trouble, Britain and other parts of the Empire would come to her assistance during the transition period? We have got the army. We have got the fighting races in India. We have got the material. Everything is ready. What is the difficulty? I do not know why some of my friends are still talking a little nervously when they come to the question of defence. Let it not be understood that we are fighting for Swaraj by stages. Nothing of the kind. I am perfectly clear in my own mind of what I want and what the Indian National Congress wants. We want complete responsible government all at once. There is no doubt about it. Let us not mince matters.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** And you want the army here?

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** Certainly, we want the army.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** I know it is wrong to interrupt you, but it will help us in a subsequent discussion if we get the point clear. May I ask you if you still stand by the statement you made in Bombay:

"Within a year, happen what may, we are going to uproot the British administration and substitute for it government of India by Indians themselves for Indians."

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** That is not my statement. I do not know whence the Honourable the Home Member gets hold of these things. I deny that I have ever made such a statement. I have always maintained that we want full responsible government as an integral part of the British Empire. We want to uproot the present system of government and substitute instead our own. If the British Empire does not want us, well, it is their concern. If you do not want us, say so plainly "We do not want you." Let us understand each other.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** Did I invent that statement, Sir? Or did the "Bombay Chronicle" . . .

**Mr. President:** I must ask the Honourable Member to bring his speech to a close.

**Mr. V. J. Patel:** You have got a Department that invents such statements. I will conclude my speech in five minutes if you will permit me. Let us understand the position clearly. The Government of India, as I understand from the speech of the Honourable the Home Member, is not in a mood to take up a wholesale revision of the Government of India Act. All that they say is, "Well, we promise to examine into the defects of the working of the existing Act, and if we find any defects we shall try to take remedial measures either administrative, or if necessary, legislative." That is the position of the Government of India. They are clearly of opinion, rightly or wrongly, that the time has not come for a second stage in the development of India. (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar:* "Are they?") They have stated so in so many words that the time has not come for a second stage yet. They want to examine into the working of the existing Act to see if there are any defects in that Act. In order to prepare us for the second stage, they want to touch up the Government of India Act if necessary here and there. If there are any difficulties in the working of the

first stage, they are perfectly prepared to meet you, but they are clear, of opinion, if I understand them aright, that the time has not come for the introduction of the second stage as the Honourable the Home Member has very clearly put it. Our position is equally clear and emphatic. We do not want a second stage. We do not want stages. We want a complete overhauling of the Government of India Act so as to establish responsible government all at once. That is our position and we want a conference. A conference for what purpose? My friend who preceded me just now said that this was a representative Council. At the same time he said that some people have not yet come into this Council. How could this Assembly be representative if some people have chosen to keep themselves aloof? A large number of people—let me tell you for the information of this Assembly,—a large number of people have refused to take part in this Assembly. They still hold that the Reforms are a sham, that these Councils are a sham, as I do hold that they are. And if they have not yet chosen to reconcile themselves with these Councils, how could you call them to be really representative? It is for that reason that we want a conference. I cannot think of a conference without Mahatma Gandhi, without the Ali Brothers, without Lala Lajpat Rai, without Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, without Hakim Ajmal Khan, and Dr. Ansari and other friends of mine. There can be no representative conference without the presence of these gentlemen, and they are not here. According to your rules and regulations, they cannot stand for the Councils even if they wish. That is the position. Therefore, it is in order to give an opportunity to Government to take counsel with these real representatives of the people and reconcile the Indian National Congress that my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru has moved this amendment for a conference. That is why we want a conference. We are not giving any threat to Government, nor are we afraid of any threat from Government. We know what we are going to do. We are absolutely clear. We are out here to tell you, "Here are our terms. Do you accept our co-operation on these terms? We are perfectly willing to co-operate with you. If you are not—I believe you are not going to—if you are not going to co-operate with us on those terms, then our course is clear. The whole world knows what our attitude is going to be". Let it be construed as a threat—some people might say, that we are giving a threat to Government, if we talk of offering obstruction and thereby wrecking the Reforms. **Are** the Reforms worth anything, I ask? Take them away by all means if you choose to. As I told you, it is only after three years working of the so-called Reforms that my Honourable friends, Diwan Bahadurs Rangachariar and Ramachandra Rao on my right have found out that they are defective, unsatisfactory and inadequate and that they have failed. The Indian National Congress three years ago decided so and here we are after three years to join hands with my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar and his friends to see that these Reforms are either mended, or if they are not mended, that they are ended. We do not want these Reforms. What is the use of these Reforms when you can, under them and in spite of them, imprison forty thousand of our countrymen?

**Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney** (Nominated: Anglo-Indians): Sir, I have listened very attentively to the various speeches that have been made to-day. It struck me that in this demand for immediate dominion or responsible government and its resulting disagreement we occupy a position somewhat similar to that between a doctor and a refractory and self-willed convalescing patient, the patient being the opposition party and the doctor being the Government Benches. The doctor is as anxious for the patient

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

to get well as the patient is himself, the difference between the two being the care and the line of treatment necessary and to be pursued. The patient says, "I want to get up at once and run and so I want and must have solid food now and at once". The doctor chides him and says, "You must start with milk diet first before you will be allowed solids. You must first of all learn to crawl, then walk before you can run. If you do not listen to me you will endanger your health and possibly kill yourself, so be patient". The patient says, "I am not satisfied with and I don't agree with this dietary and treatment; I therefore want to consult another doctor". Under the terms of my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar's Resolution the consultant he wants is a Royal Commission whilst my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru, whose amendment seems the most favoured one, says, "We do not want as our consultant a Royal Commission because as a physician he knows nothing about our disease, its symptoms and treatment. We have no trust or confidence in such a consultant. What we want and will have is a committee or a round table conference of our own wise and experienced countrymen each member a specialist in our disease *Swaraj* who will examine our symptoms and prescribe for us as 'we' want him to do. Otherwise we shall treat ourselves unmindful of all your advice, help or the dangers to our lives". I would call my Honourable friend, Mr. Rangachariar's Resolution, for want of a better term, the "*ek-dum*" i.e., "at-once" or "one-breath" *Swaraj* Resolution, and I would call Pandit Motilal Nehru's amendment the *dum-dum* or "many-breaths" *Swaraj* Resolution. In entering this discussion I do so with the desire to represent before this House as also the British Parliament the views and interests of the minority communities in India in general and of my own community the domiciled community in particular. The Honourable the Home Member, when he so ably replied to the original Resolution, stated in very clear and unequivocal terms that one of the four most important questions which the opposition party in this Assembly had to answer before asking the British Parliament to scrap or alter the provisions of the 1919 Government of India Act or to give them Dominion Government was the adequate protection and the safeguarding of the rights and interests of the minority communities. Let me now speak for my own community, the domiciled community, which forms a very important minority community in India. Quantitatively, it numbers but a quarter of a million, possibly a mere speck in the teeming millions of this country, but qualitatively it is one of the most important communities in India. It works the wheels, many of the delicate wheels of the machinery of the Government clock. It occupies positions, though mainly subordinate, in the various Government offices, of great importance. It still mans the various Railways to a large and important extent. And what is more? It constitutes two-thirds of the Auxiliary Force of to-day. It is, therefore, obvious that my community's interests must be adequately and for "*all time*" permanently protected and which I regret to say does not obtain to-day. I stand here in this House to-day as a *Swarajist*. (Hear hear.) I am afraid your "hear, hears" are a little premature and I must qualify my admission or call it conversion. I stand here—as my Honourable friend, Sir Basil Blackett, said, as a *Swarajist* in the generic sense of the term. I yield to no one in this Honourable House in my desire to see India march onward on well considered lines and in a constitutional manner step by step on a well laid road and all together to that *Swaraj* to which we are

all looking forward and by "we"—I mean all well-wishers of India including the Government of India and the British Parliament.

Swaraj is a term that has never been accurately defined and to do so Non-co-operators have taken refuge in cloudy metaphysics and have interpreted it to suit the multanimous views and interests of the various sects who constitute this party in India. Some consider the term Swaraj to imply a *Nirvana*, where all communities Hindus, Muhammadans, Anglo-Indians, etc., will live peacefully together like the proverbial lion and the lamb in absolute peace and together without any conflict. That Swaraj neither you nor I nor our great-great-grand-children will ever see except in our dreams because India with its heterogenous masses, its multanimity of castes and creeds which split it up into classes and communities divergent one from the other as are the two Poles cannot possibly get that Swaraj which my friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya wants and promises to give India if it is given Dominion Government. He says 'give us Dominion Self-Government and we will at once settle all our differences including the Hindu Mussalman feuds which exist to-day and which are only due to Self-Government being denied to India.' It reads well, Sir, but that *Nirvana* will not come to India in your life time, our life time, in fact it is absolutely impossible. (*A Voice*: "You are mistaken.") Although mine is a Government nomination I stand before this Honourable House and on this momentous occasion to speak as the elected representative of my community which views its future with the very gravest apprehension from a minority communal point of view, were the Government of India to accede to this Resolution. Notwithstanding the position that we now occupy and the not too generous treatment that we have received at the hands of Government after the working of the Reforms Scheme for the past 3 years—I say in spite of this and not on account of this that we do feel and appreciate this security of our position in this country with the British Government still in control—the devolution of powers to India not entirely complete and the steel framework of the I. C. S. still upright. It is for this reason I urge that the Reforms should not be accelerated by any term of years other than that laid down in the Government of India Act of 1919. What is the position of my community as well as other minority communities in India to-day as a result of the Reforms and what has been one of the chief results of the Reforms? Such an Indianisation of the services as to be detrimental to (*A Voice*: "Has it?") thousands of my community who before the introduction of the Reforms occupied secured positions in India and who to-day are left destitute on the streets of all the big cities actually begging for food and who though ready and willing to be employed even at Indian wages are denied employment, and are not only swelling the ranks of the unemployed but filling the Jails and many of these are men and women who gave their services to the army at their King and country's call. (*A Voice*: "Whose fault is it?") I would like to know whose fault it is. If this is the position my community occupies under the British Government, who is responsible, according to the Reforms Scheme, for our protection? Is it any small wonder that I am apprehensive of the position we shall occupy under a government which refuses to recognise minorities? We, with you, want Swaraj in India, but we want it with our future permanently adequately safeguarded. Give me the assurance that the interests and the future of the domiciled community will be adequately and permanently safeguarded and I am with you as far as your demand for Self-Government goes, even though I must differ in

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

the length of the transitional period for I have already suffered enough owing to this too rapid progress of Indianisation and which has placed my community in a most extraordinarily disadvantageous position. Let me explain it to you, and how and why I am so singularly apprehensive of this too rapid Indianisation and what it means and will ultimately mean to my community. I am of this country, which is my motherland and, so long as I wear the clothes of an Englishman, and claim England as my fatherland, so long as his language is my language, his customs, manners and mode of living, mine, so long, will the Indian regard me as a European for occupational purposes and desire me rid of this country as he does the Englishman. This is our disadvantageous position in the daily changing India, and it is for this reason I appeal to the minority communities to take the advice of our doctor,—the Home Member, and oppose this Resolution and amendment. I see my friend, Dr. Gour sitting there and in his usual way sneering in disagreement, but he is a Swarajist now. I admit that in the Government of India Act of 1919 there are many defects which you justly claim should be remedied. Undoubtedly, its financial provisions were badly thought out and were based on calculations which have been grossly falsified. Another—that the Secretary of State for India has in the past interfered too frequently with the Government of India in matters where the man on the spot is the better judge. Further the authors of the Reforms Scheme thought that under the mellowing influence of democracy Hindus and Muhammadans would like the proverbial lion and lamb lie down together and settle their differences easily and amicably. This has proved not to be so; but with all these defects the Act has certainly given India the opportunity to prepare for the next step. A few years ago when the British Parliament assented with unexampled unanimity to the Reforms Scheme who would have thought that within three years there would appear in this House a majority party who would treat with derision the opportunity which has been given them to prepare for ultimate Self-Government, a party the leaders of which who, though men of intellectual attainment, have up till now eschewed the Council Chambers to wreck the Reforms at its very inception. These very men have now decided to enter this House and openly threaten the Government and the British Parliament that unless their demands are acceded to in their entirety and at once—here and now, their policy will be one of open and hostile obstruction to paralyse the Government by refusing the demands for grants and kill the “evil thing” as Pandit Motilal Nehru calls the Reformed constitution. This is what we are witnessing in this House to-day and these are the very men who, while vilifying Government, and desiring that all Europeans should be turned out of the Services, and not only expect but demand that the army of that same Government should protect them whilst they complete their programme. They ask for complete Dominion status to be given at once. How can they have complete Dominion status without an army of their own? They don't want the Army or the Navy just now, because they realise and admit their inability and inefficiency to control it. How can they think that the British bayonets and machine guns will prop them up during the interval, and while preparing to turr every Britisher out of the country. Do they really believe that the British soldier or the British Parliament would or could consent to any such scheme of employment? It would not be worth the bones of even a single cockney soldier. Is it compatible with commonsense? My friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in his speech just said that there were two methods

in which to attain Swaraj. One is the method by peaceful negotiation and the other is by recourse to arms. I shall deal with this subtle threat later on. There are Members in this House who say that the present Government of India Act does not please them. It is not enough, the pace is much too slow. It must be scrapped and a new Act substituted. While making these demands they offer no suggestions other than that they have got a mandate from the country. I fail to see what legitimate claim they can have to such a mandate, for their electorates number but a few thousands out of a population of over 300 millions, mainly the Indian agriculturist. Go into the country and the villages and ask the Indian cultivator what he thinks and wants. He is the man who forms the masses and whom you think you are representing. He is quite happy and contented with the British Raj and to him Swaraj conveys nothing. The question we have to decide to-day is a very momentous one. We have the present Government of India Act which has been accepted by four successive Prime Ministers. The present British Government is one, which, I think, I am correct in saying, is more pro-Indian than has been any other. It is watching India to-day with a vigilant eye. So is the entire British public and if we are to obtain any concessions, it will be from that Government and that people. Do you think that by calling the Government of India Act an "evil thing" and by threatening a policy of obstruction saying "If you do not grant my demands I will obstruct you and oppose every grant you ask for and so paralyse the Government"—I ask you, as sensible and reasonable people, do you think that the British Government are going to listen to such puerile nonsense. Does this show the political mentality required of those who want to govern this country? Rather it savours of the political mentality of the nursery. This is not the political mentality one expects from men who say they are ready for and demand Dominion Status at once. Remember the British Government is anxiously awaiting the result of to-day's debate and by your decisions you will either make or break their faith in you. In my opinion you are running at a break-neck pace and are riding for a fall. It would be interesting to speculate what the fate of this country would be if Government to-day acquiesced in giving you complete provincial autonomy in the provinces and Dominion Status. What would happen? (*Dr. H. S. Gour*: "We would take it".) Yes, I have no doubt *Dr. Gour* would occupy one of the Benches there. But what "would" happen, I ask you? There would not be that much talked of harmony between Hindus and Muhammadans, which my friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, promises there would be the moment Dominion Status is given to India. I am afraid a fortnight would see the end of that "happy" regime, and the next fortnight would be spent in funeral obsequies. The members of that Government would end their short lived careers by taking very long leave on urgent private affairs. We are not ready for complete Dominion self-government. There is too much dissension in India. There are too many conflicting problems to face in our own country. Remedy these; remedy that very important problem of the depressed classes which faces you as one of your most serious social problems. Obtain and rectify a "pucca" Hindu-Muslim Pact and so show the British Government that you have effectually settled your own internecine conflicts and then demand a further step on the road to Swaraj. But meanwhile here are people who have in the past not taken any part in the Government, who have remained outside wrecking it, but who now come into this House, and capture those sane Members who were our co-operators before, and turning round and

**Pandit Shamlal Nehru** (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Colonel Gidney says that we have taken the place of the old sane Members. Does he mean that we are insane?

**Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney:** Political insanity is a different thing. To come into this House and now declare that they are fit for complete self-government is to me an astounding proposition. We are certainly not fit for complete self-government, and the sooner we realize that the quickest way of getting it is by actively co-operating and working with goodwill with the Government, the sooner will we attain what you and I want, Swaraj. I ask this Honourable House to consider its decision in this matter very carefully. Sir, I oppose the Resolution. I oppose the amendment and I readily accept the offer of Government to look into the defects of the Government of India Act of 1919; to consult all the Provincial Governments who will in turn consult their best men, to consult public opinion and, before presenting it to the British Parliament, to give this House, as also all Provincial Councils, an opportunity of a free discussion. What difference is there between this offer, and a round table conference? To accommodate a round table conference representative of all the communities in this country you would have to build a special room for that table. For these reasons, Sir, I oppose this Resolution as a citizen of this country; I oppose it on behalf of minority communities, and I oppose it particularly on behalf of my own community, the domiciled community.

*An Honourable Member:* I have been standing up about six times but have not

**Mr. President:** Order, order. Each Honourable Member has only to look round when he himself rises to see the reason why he is not called to speak at once. **Mr. Chaman Lal.**

**Mr. Chaman Lal** (West Punjab: Non-Muhammadan): I am very thankful to you, Sir, for allowing me this opportunity of stating my views before the House upon the Resolution moved by Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar and the amendment to it moved by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru. I must confess at the outset that neither the Home Member nor the Honourable the Finance Member have met the case as it has been put by us, the Swarajists in this Chamber. The case is a simple one and it is this. We, in India, representing as we do the people, we do represent the millions of India, the workers and peasants and the middle classes, claim that the time has come when the British Government should give complete Dominion status to India. It is said that we people have no mandate behind us. May I ask the Honourable the Home Member whether he or his Government have got a mandate behind them? They have the mandate, I dare say, Sir, of machine guns and howitzers and Lewis guns and aeroplanes. But we—we have the mandate of the people, the suffering people, behind us, and it is because of them and it is because it has been repeatedly expressed, not in one Congress, but during the last seven Congresses that the people of India are fit for Dominion status, that we demand that status for our country. Sir, there is no doubt that India to-day is in a state of revolution. My Honourable friend over there talks about anarchy being the result of the grant of Dominion status, but I assure him that anarchy is in existence in India to-day, and the anarchists are those who are responsible for the gradual, the continuing and unceasing impoverishment of this country. Sir, you have heard speeches which have

depicted before you the political condition of India. The Honourable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya has stated in very clear and strident tones that India, the real India has no part or lot in the administration of this country. He has told you that a great portion of our revenue is consumed in military expenditure. He has told you that we have no hand in the military machine of this country. But, Sir, I want to direct the attention of this House to the millions in the villages about whom Colonel Gidney spoke a little while ago. Their lot it has been said is a trust of the British Government in this country. But, Sir, the facts are that if British rule is a mere administration, I think it is a failure: if it is a Government, it has no sanction behind it: if it is a trust—I say it deliberately and sincerely—it is a fraudulent trust. Sir, allow me to draw the Honourable the Finance Member's attention to the actual facts of the situation. What is the average annual income of an Indian to-day? It has been computed by Lord Curzon that the average annual income of an Indian is barely three annas a day. It has been computed recently by Mr. Findlay Shirras that the average annual income of an Indian is somewhere nearer five annas a day. But, Sir, there are other competent authorities who have computed this annual income to be no more than one anna a day. Consider a country living on that income.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** Which income?

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** The average annual *per capita* income.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** Which, one anna or five?

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** One anna. I would refer him to a book which I think ought to be in the Library, a book called "Prosperous British India" by Mr. William Digby. In that book—it is a classic—in that book he states that gradually, during the course of the last century, India has been impoverished.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** How does she manage to feed more than double the population on the same production?

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** I have put down a question; the Honourable Member will have an opportunity of replying to it as to what the average annual agricultural and non-agricultural income of India is; if he gives me the correct figures and divides those figures by 247 million, he will find that the *per capita* rate is no more than one anna per day.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:** Does the Honourable Member really think that that is a correct figure?

**Mr. Chaman Lal:** That is a correct figure, and I shall not be prepared to withdraw my statement,—a statement which is corroborated by facts which I can place before him whenever he chooses. But, Sir, apart from that, what do we find in India? Is it not a fact that the gradual impoverishment of India is leading to constant and unceasing famines? (*Voices:* "No, no.") It is stated—if he will examine the point, he will also find—that from the 11th to the 18th century there were 15 famines in India, all local, 3 famines which were all general, and that in the hundred years which were covered by the 19th century there were 31 famines in India, all general, and it has been computed that nearly 30 million lives were lost through

[Mr. Chaman Lal.]

starvation during the last half of the 19th century. Is not that a fact worth considering? Is not this fact clear from what the Honourable Member who has just left the Chamber was saying concerning the peasants being swayed by Swarajists,—that what they need is bread but that what they get is speeches of the nature that we have been hearing in this House? Sir, I can assure you, if you will look into the industrial facts of the situation, you will find in Bombay it has been reckoned by competent authorities, not non-official but official authorities, that the average wage of a working class family is barely Rs. 52 per month. Imagine, any working class family being brought up in Bombay on Rs. 52 per month. Imagine, Sir, their lot, imagine the lot of their wives, their mothers, their children. Is there any country in the world where such horrible conditions prevail under which millions of our countrymen are living to-day? I challenge the Honourable Member to point out a single example of a single country in the world where the conditions are so horrible as they are in India. What is the result, Sir? It is said that 35,000 human beings sleep on the pavements in the city of Bombay. It is said by other competent authorities that 97 per cent. of the working class families in Bombay are living in one-room tenements in that city. If you look at the facts of other countries, Belgium, Germany, America, the average is four to five. Does that connote prosperity? Does that connote that British rule in India has been a rule under which people are living happy, heavenly, lives? Or does not that connote an utter bankruptcy both in statesmanship and in finance? Personally, I think, Sir, there can be no doubt about it, that the time has come when you should listen not merely to arguments but see the facts of the situation,—see the poverty, see the misery, see the starvation which you see all around you. Three Generals, Poverty, Hunger and Disease,—are taking their toll year in and year out. They are more dreadful, more powerful, Generals than any General Dyer that came to this country, and it is because we want to put an end to this state of affairs that I appeal to Honourable Members opposite to yield to the modest, the very moderate demand that has been put forward by Pandit Motilal Nehru. Sir, it is said that upon the walls of ancient Egyptian tombs of Egyptian kings there is inscribed the fable of a Monarch who, grown very feeble and weak, wanted to rejuvenate himself, and his elixir of life, it is described, was the blood of his slaughtered people, and it is stated that their crime was their disloyalty. Many were slaughtered to restore the failing powers of the king, and, when the people had been slaughtered, their blood had been shed, the king presently was bored with too prolonged an existence upon earth and he therefore mounted the Celestial Cow and rose to heaven and eternity. Sir, the blood of the Indian people has been shed, they have been slaughtered in their millions by hunger and disease, and it is time, Sir, that we offered you, in the shape of the round table conference, the Celestial Cow for you to mount to heaven and eternity. Sir, I appeal to Honourable Members opposite to remember that there are seven graves in the city of Delhi—they are the graves of vanished Empires. There is another grave, ready made, gaping wide, the eighth grave. Let that grave be the grave of this system. And across its ruins let us stretch out our hands—we, the common people of India and the common people of Great Britain, in friendship and fellowship bearing our message of the brotherhood of man and peace among the nations.

**Maulvi Abul Kasem** (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, it is with some diffidence that I rise to take part in this debate at this late hour. I feel diffident because I was unfortunately not present at the earlier stages of this debate, and I feel diffident because I am afraid what I have to say will not be palatable to the Members of this House. From what I have heard, Sir, I find that my distinguished and esteemed friend, Mr. Rangachariar, in his Resolution suggests the appointment of a Royal Commission to examine the Government of India Act and its working, and that the amendment of the *de facto* leader of the House, Pandit Motilal Nehru, suggests a round-table conference. But from the speech of another veteran leader, Mr. Patel, I understand that he wants immediate responsible government, and granted without a moment's delay. I cannot understand what a Royal Commission or a round-table conference is expected to do, if that is the absolute demand and it has to make no other suggestions or if no other considerations are to be accepted. But that is beside of the mark. The Resolution is of very great importance, and it covers a vast variety of questions which I neither have the ability nor the time to discuss. I will confine myself to only one aspect of the question which appeals to me, I mean to say the position of the minorities. I know it, Sir, that the minority to which I belong has expressed its opinion, so far as opinions are expressed, in favour of the majority. I do not claim, Sir, that here in this House or elsewhere I represent the opinion of anybody else but my own. I do not claim it. I feel that it ought to have been wiser and safer for me to be a silent listener than a speaker, but at the same time I feel that I will be shirking a responsibility if I do not undertake the present duty as I have now done. Sir, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya in the great eloquent speech of his has said that communal differences have to be settled and were settled by ourselves sitting at a round table conference. I admit that, Sir, and I say that we and we alone can settle our differences—nobody else can. But I would take the Pandit back eight years and remind him of the anxious hours which he and I had to pass at Lucknow to bring about a settlement. Is it not a fact that there were moments when everything was going to break up, and is it not a fact, Sir, that he and I had to get out of the pandal in order that a settlement could be arrived at? But that is another question. It was, Sir, on the motion of Sir Surendra Nath Banerjea (*A Voice*: "Two extremes".) But, Sir, I find here to-day only seven of those old men who sat at Lucknow at the round table—Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Mr. Jinnah, Pandit Motilal Nehru, Chowdhry Alimuzzaman, Mr. Muhammad Yakub and myself. But I submit, Sir, that there can be no possible settlement unless there is a change in the point of view. We have talked of a change in the angle of vision of the bureaucracy, and we ought to have some change in the angle of vision of our countrymen.

We have heard a good deal about Hindu-Mussalman unity. It was placarded all over the country. it was shouted from the house  
 5 P.M. tops that there was unanimity. I admit that there was unanimity on certain points brought about for certain reasons. But there has been no change of heart, not the feeling of trust and confidence between the one and the other. I will give you some facts which are better than arguments. There was a riot at Saharanpur, a Hindu-Muhammadan riot. Unfortunately for my community, the Collector of Saharanpur during the period of riot happened to be a Mussalman and some people, Hindus and Muhammadans, from various

[Maulvi Abul Kascm.]

parts of the country went over to Saharanpur; and one of the men who went there was no less a personage than Swami Shraddhanand, the great apostle of non-co-operation, one of the foremost leaders in the country, a gentleman whom the Muhammadans, at any rate of Delhi, did the honour of putting in the pulpit of the Juma Masjid of Delhi; what does he do? He wires to the Government of the United Provinces, and I believe to the Government of India, to send a European Magistrate to try the cases between the Hindus and Muhammadans. He will have no confidence in the Muhammadan Collector of Saharanpur, and this at a time when the Lee Commission was about to sit for the examination of witnesses. A gentleman of the position of Swami Shraddhanand must have known that his telegram would be used by the European bureaucracy as a trump card against the Indianisation of the services. The reason for the step was that he could not tolerate a Muhammadan to sit in judgment between Hindus and Muhammadans when there was a feud between them. That is exactly what happened at Saharanpur. I will give you the other side of the picture. A gentleman, a Hindu gentleman, is Collector of Barisal. There was a small dispute about a mosque in Barisal. The Muhammadans sent a telegram to the Government of Bengal to send a European Magistrate to replace Mr. Roy. I can assure the House that Mr. Roy, so far as his impartiality and fairness is concerned, so far as his prejudices are concerned, is as much a Hindu as I am, but the fact is that the Muhammadans of Barisal said that they had no faith in him. If this state of things continues, can you say and expect that any minority, however strong or important it may be, however intelligent it may be, will not hesitate to trust its fate and its destiny to a majority? Sir, I want to remind the House that the position of a community in a country depends upon its population, upon its education, upon its wealth and upon the share it has in the administration of the country. I say, Sir, numerically we are very weak and we are proverbially poor. I admit—and I admit with shame—that educationally we are very inferior, and, if I may say so, we have very little share in the administration of the country. Therefore, Sir, as long as we cannot come forward and share equally, at least according to the proportion of our population, if we are not able to stand by ourselves and hold our own, I for myself would feel nervous to take part in any measure which will place me in the hands of the majority. Sir, unequal combinations are always disastrous for the weaker party and, as long as I am the weaker party, I will not venture to place myself at the mercy of the stronger. I am one of those, Sir, who have suffered the tyranny of the majority over the minority. I am speaking here not of the religious minority, but of the political minority. We have told the people that bureaucracy does not grant freedom of speech and liberty of action and we found it to our cost that our own countrymen, if they are in power and in majority, will deny liberty of speech and liberty of action. If the bureaucracy has time and often charged us with bad motives, our countrymen have done the same. I can remind my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya that a man with a brilliant record and unblemished record of patriotism, even he was not allowed to address his own countrymen without sufferance. Mr. Jinnah also was not allowed to do so; he was shouted down.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** Where was I not allowed?

**Maulvi Abul Kasem:** At Nagpur.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** My Honourable friend is mistaken. I was lying ill with fever there. I could not attend the Congress. When I attended the Subjects Committee, they listened to me with as much kindness as they heard anybody else.

**Maulvi Abul Kasem:** I am glad. But I was told this by Lala Harkishan Lal. At any rate Mr. Jinnah was not allowed. These are things which I say cannot be cured. But these are facts and these are circumstances which raise a doubt and suspicion in my mind and I feel nervous, and this nervousness has to be removed. Reference was made, Sir, by the Honourable the Home Member to the much-talked of Bengal Pact. I do not know who authorised either the Muhammadans or Hindus to sign the compact, but a compact was signed at the house of Mr. C. R. Das between certain Muhammadan Members and Hindu Members of the Bengal Legislative Council. My view of the situation is that Mr. Das, in his anxiety to secure Muhammadan adherence to his party in the Bengal Legislative Council, offered terms which were favourable and if I may say so, I speak without any pretension to my judgment being sound—but I believe those terms were generous and favourable and alluring and tempting for the Muhammadans to come and join hands with him. That was the reason, but whatever it was this Pact was there. It had no sanction behind it. There was nobody to enforce it, and it was only a scrap of paper, if I may be allowed to call it so, but still it so much upset my Hindu countrymen of Bengal and elsewhere that a man who is as much a Hindu, as I am, Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, had to address a meeting and say that it was a preposterous thing. He denounced it as also did every Hindu gentleman in Bengal. Meetings were held all over the country and even meetings called to support the Pact were not allowed to proceed peacefully.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt** (Burdwan Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Not in your own district of Burdwan.

**Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal** (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): On a point of order, Sir, I opposed it openly, and it is on record, not as a Hindu, but as a nationalist, and I shall oppose every such Pact as a nationalist till I am on the other side of the grave.

**Maulvi Abul Kasem:** I am glad of this interruption, because Babu Bipin Chandra Pal says he opposed it not as a Hindu but as a nationalist. It has been my painful experience, Sir, to find that, whenever any justice is attempted to be done to Muhammadans, or whenever any appointment is to be given to a Muhammadan, or whenever any place is to be secured for him, opposition is raised by the members of the Hindu community and they always say that they oppose it not because a particular man is a Muhammadan or that they are Hindus, but they do it on national grounds and as nationalists. That is their stock argument, and reason, Sir.

While I oppose the Resolution as it stands and the amendment of our distinguished friend Pandit Motilal Nehru, I must say that I feel equally and as strongly as Pandit Malaviya over the situation under which we exist. The sufferings we have undergone and the miseries my countrymen have to undergo have been very considerable and I think that there is no justification at the present moment for the bureaucracy to carry on as they have been doing. Our unpopularity in the country is to a large extent due to the fact that our advice to the Government has been neglected on many occasions, and I believe repeatedly neglected. They have done it

[Maulvi Abul Kasem.]

because they found it expedient and thought that we were wrong. But whatever may be the case, the situation is grave and the only way to mend it is that the Government should take steps to remove this unrest, not by political concessions but by removing those grievances, indignities and injuries from which the people are suffering. In conclusion, I have to show to my friends who hold an opposite view that Swaraj or liberty or responsible government, by whatever name you may call it, can never be given. It is to be secured and the only way to secure it is not by going up to the British House of Parliament and asking for an amendment of the Act or by a Royal Commission or a round table conference, but by bringing about unanimity of feeling, tolerance for other people's opinions and for the minorities and for that preparation that is necessary for our people and our public men to take up the responsibility, and for the people of this country to realise that responsibility and to discharge it to the best advantage of the country. I feel, therefore, Sir, although I oppose the Resolution and the amendment, that I agree with every item of the grievances that have been mentioned. The only difference between Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya and myself is that I do not believe that the methods he has proposed for the removal of these grievances are the real methods. If there is a change in the angle of vision of the members of the community to which he belongs, and if your countrymen—I will not say your co-religionists in this country—lend a helping hand to the Muhammadans, if they educate them and make them fit, give them the encouragement and stand shoulder to shoulder with them and then march on, there will be no difficulty. I may remind you, Sir, of a memorable speech of a memorable orator which was delivered at Lucknow. She said that neither God will, nor man can, give you self-government unless you are fit for it, and God will not, and man cannot, withhold from you self-government when you are prepared and fit for it.

**Mr. T. C. Goswami** (Calcutta Suburbs: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Mr. President, may I most respectfully submit a remark to the Honourable Member who has just spoken. I shall submit it to him most respectfully, because he is a neighbour of mine in the Burdwan Division, and because I have grown up in the belief—a belief which I still cherish—that Mr. Abul Kasem is a great nationalist. I will submit most respectfully that he should coolly and at leisure think over and consider whether the speech which he has just delivered is likely to make the problem which I take it we are honestly striving to solve, any easier. I will not say anything more about it.

A reference has been made to the Bengal Pact. I noticed, when I was in Calcutta, that most of the people who opposed the Pact from public platforms were men who were notoriously actuated by personal jealousy of the great position of Mr. C. R. Das or were defeated candidates at the Bengal elections. That is a fact. I say, most of them and not, of course, all of them. But a very large number of these persons are personal or political enemies of Mr. C. R. Das or defeated candidates at the Bengal elections. I challenge anyone to dispute that statement. I myself was not a signatory to that Pact. (*A Voice*: "But how do you explain the Punjab attitude about it?") I am thinking of Bengal. I am not a signatory to the Bengal Pact. But I was present at the discussions, and I was present at the time when the Pact was signed. I say I am not a signatory to the Pact. But now I am prepared to stand by the Pact, because

it was concluded at the instance of a man, Mr. C. R. Das, who honestly tried to bring about a settlement of Hindu-Mussalman differences in Bengal. There is another thing I wish to tell you. I have travelled in the interior and rural parts of Bengal. There we do not hear of Hindu-Mussalman differences. And even if they do exist, they are very little. (*A Voice*: "They are a great deal.") It must be admitted that these differences, which exist mainly in the towns, are the creation of unscrupulous politicians, both Hindu or Muhammadan, aided by the Government of this country. That is however a matter which I should like to leave at that.

If we are to take Colonel Gidney at his word, I must say that his "Swaraj" is a joke or a bluff or a hoax or a fraud. According to the Honourable and Gallant Member, "Swaraj" is that remote Nirvana, which it is the privilege of all—officials and non-officials; Europeans, Indians and Anglo-Indians; Hindus, Moslems and Christians—to meditate upon. According to him, it is a *name* that is calculated to suit the fancies of all classes. That is the Swaraj to which he invites us. I say that is a hoax and a bluff. He tried to interpret the Honourable Finance Member's statement that he too was a "Swarajist" in the same light. I do not know if Sir Basil Blackett accepts that interpretation; but if he is a Swarajist of the same kind as Colonel Gidney, I am afraid his Swaraj is also a hoax and a bluff. I am sorry Sir Basil Blackett is not here, but I am tempted to refer to his poetic speech just for a minute. But I will not refer to his mixed metaphors. I wonder if it did not strike him as somewhat anomalous that, while he would have nothing to do with what ancient Megasthenes said about India, he would swear by the mediæval Bernier. He referred to his sane "morning coat" and all it stands for. I will just tell him that we have tried the morning coat in India and given it up. I feel some embarrassment in continuing on the lines of his metaphor. But I will just tell him this, that we have now taken refuge in our own Oriental gabardine.

I wish to refer also to the speech of Mr. Moir from Madras,—the speech with which the debate was temporarily closed on Friday. I am sure, we have derived great comfort from the assurance that the British people are interested in India. I say we are greatly comforted to hear of the sudden awakening of this unnatural interest of the British people in Indian affairs. We have been told very emphatically that not merely the British Parliament (which is not in the last resort the master of our destiny), but the British people (who *are* our masters) were anxiously watching events in India. This must be subsequent to the time when I knew England and the English people,—and that was not long ago. He spoke as if he was a representative of the British people. I would have accepted his statement if he had contested an election in England, if he had been returned to Parliament and then lectured to us in the manner in which he did. As it is, he represents neither the English people nor the Indian people, whereas, when anyone of us speaks, we can at least claim that we represent the Indian people.

There was a time, Sir, when, owing to my utter inexperience, I used to describe this august Assembly as a Parliament of Delhi. That was before I could look forward to coming here at an early date. But now that I find myself here and I find the Swarajists here, the idea seems to me so utterly absurd that I wonder how I ever cherished it at all. And now, Sir, I have become so respectful to the traditions of this House, that,

[Mr. T. C. Goswami.]

the other day, before sending in notice of a question, I went to one of the veteran Parliamentarians—one of those who had the benefit of training under you, Sir—and asked him if that question was admissible. He answered me in this way—“So far as asking the Government was concerned, there was no objection to asking the moon to be brought down”. I expect Government have taken up the attitude that in proposing this amendment—we are not exactly asking Government to bring down the moon—but we expect the Government to go a great deal beyond what they are able to do under the Government of India Act. After the two speeches of Pandit Motilal Nehru, I need hardly say that the amendment was drafted with great care and as the result of anxious deliberation. “There comes a time in the history of nations”—I will not quote, but I will merely refer to the Preamble of the Declaration of American Independence. There has come the time when the people of India, or at any rate the representatives of the people of India, mean to meet the representatives of the people of England and to come to an agreement; and we demand that the Government of India should help us to bring about this agreement. We make this demand of the Government of India, in the belief, firstly, that the secret of the great success of the British people in Imperial and foreign politics has been their inborn instinct of compromise, and, secondly, that it is to the interest of those who run the administration not to allow their Imperialism to be reckless, not to invite the forces of disorder and destruction by being heedless to those who seek a peaceful adjustment of interests. And, knowing its past, I have a suspicion, that, in this matter, Government will stoop to conquer. I do not know if in his wide and long experience the Honourable the Home Member has found that, if he scratched a moderate, he found an extremist. I hope in his long and wide experience he has not found that, if he scratched a Swarajist, he found a moderate.

Surely the Government of India Act is no bar—it ought certainly not to be a bar—to the settlement of differences between two great peoples. The issue and the interests at stake are, I venture to submit, more vital than even an Act of the British Parliament. If history has any lessons to teach, one of the lessons it does teach is that law, or a law, must know its limitations. Law, representing political and social phenomena which are constantly changing, cannot be absolute, and it has been claimed by our leaders that there is no finality in the case of the Government of India Act either. The social and political conditions being infinitely and continually variable, law is a vague and fugitive notion lying in the zone of the uncertain facts of life. “Everything”, says Pascal, “changes in time; just as fashion creates grace, it creates justice”.

Sir Malcolm Hailey, this morning, said that he had not pleaded for vested interests. But he referred to the Ruling Princes, and quite rightly. And that, I submit, is one of the most formidable vested interests that we have to contend against. But even more formidable than the Ruling Princes is the system itself, under which the present Government of India is constituted. That is the largest and most formidable vested interest, and I submit that the solution of our problem must necessarily mean the dissolution of that system. As for the Ruling Princes, I do not desire to minimise the fact that the question of the Indian States is a very difficult and delicate one. It is difficult and delicate from every point of view. International lawyers have given up the task of defining the posi-

tion of the Indian Princes. Fact and fiction, reality and theory, in regard to them, are hopelessly in contradiction. I am not here to cry down the Indian States. I will not even attempt to solve the problem. I am prepared to regard them as picturesque mediæval relics. As Pandit Motilal Nehru has said, if they wish to come into our federation, they are thrice welcome; if not, they are free, at least for the present, to maintain their present relations with the Imperial Power. And that statement, coming as it does from Pandit Motilal Nehru, is conclusive, so far as the Swaraj party is concerned. The question of the Ruling Princes leads us to think that in many of the India States educational facilities, the percentage of literacy, material conditions, put to shame the corresponding things in British India. That is a fact. Another fact is that the Indian States have sometimes been administered by Indians as capable as the greatest statesmen of the world. It is for the Ruling Princes themselves to choose. It is up to them to assume a leading rôle in the national movements, and not to hide behind the screen of false prestige. By their willing surrender in favour of a united India and their active championship of the Indian cause, they will justify their high place—by serving the common Motherland with all their resources and power and by making a final settlement easier of attainment. History will enshrine the memory of all the good their ancestors have done. It will recall the pomp and pageant of their seclusion, the feudal castle and the feudal court. Ungrateful posterity cannot be so ungrateful as to forget either the heroic deeds of past ages or the present sacrifices of the existing generation of Ruling Princes. But the highest tribute which history could pay to the memories of the present Rulers would be to record that not through fear but for duty they made the great sacrifice.

Then, a question has been raised as to whether India, considering her present conditions, is fit for those methods of government which have been tried in Europe,—whether India does not require to go through a long period of probation in Western institutions. We must very carefully note one fact in studying the so-called democratic system of government in the West and in the Dominions with a view to Indian adaptation;—and that is, that all these constitutions came into existence within a period of rather less than 150 years, beginning with the American constitution, which is the model of modern democratic governments and, in many ways, a martyr to democracy. England alone furnishes an exception, but only an *apparent* exception. For, the changes which were wrought in the working of the English institutions during the 18th and 19th centuries were so tremendous and so much in obedience to an almost new theory of government, that old names remain more as relics of a past, of which Englishmen may naturally be proud, than as evidence of *gradual* evolution. I think it is a safe assertion that there is nothing inherently "Western" in this experiment of representative government, which has been on its trial for the last one hundred years or so. It has often been claimed that the Western civilisations derive their distinctive, inimitable character from their Greco-Roman origins. I shall not deal with that now. It is a very doubtful historical proposition, which overlooks certain very big and very obvious historical facts. So far as the machinery of representative government is concerned, I daresay we shall have to borrow from Western institutions even in the new constitution which we contemplate. But I shall submit again that there is nothing inherently Western in the experiment in representative institutions, an experiment which, as I have just pointed out, has been on its trial only for the last 100 years or so.

[Mr. T. C. Goswami.]

Reference has been made to the diversities and communal strifes. I have already said something about them. But I cannot help referring to them again to say that, in my opinion, these diversities which we have in India offer splendid opportunities for a new democratic experiment. In framing the new constitution, we must strive to give an Indian interpretation of democracy, and I feel that, if we put our heads together, and frame a constitution, we will find that the diversities that there exist in India are not such great obstacles and that, in fact, they offer splendid opportunities for a new kind of democratic experiment.

We have had a declaration of the policy of the Swaraj party from its leader, Pandit Motilal Nehru. We have been accused of a desire to wreck and obstruct. We Swarajists have not come here for mere heckling-obstruction. When Burke said in 1771: "Posterity will bless the pertinacity of that day," he was referring to heckling obstruction which this great champion of constitutional methods and embodiment of English conservatism had indulged in calling for 23 divisions in the course of one sitting of the House of Commons. When we say: "Posterity will bless the obstinacy of the Swarajists" we mean that a grim determination alone will enable accredited representatives of the people to do anything in and through this Assembly. I am sure Government have gauged the situation—a Government against which the most untenable charge would be inefficiency. If we Swarajists fail, we are prepared to leave Imperial Delhi, to shake the dust off our feet and go back divesting ourselves of the amenities of office and the adornment of M.L.A.

There is an advantage, I think, in going beyond the Government of India Act—to the British people, our external earthly providence according to the Act. Sir, may I, in this connection, address you a few personal remarks? If I have understood the report of the Joint Committee aright, you were charged with the duty not merely of presiding in this House, but of teaching representative government to the people of India. Now, Sir, when your task is done, when your term of office expires, I would ask you, if I may, to be the bearer of a message from the people of India to your people. I would ask you to persuade your countrymen to believe that Indians and Englishmen must necessarily view Indian problems from different standpoints—in fact, from opposite poles; that our points of view—mind you, not our conclusions—can never coincide. It is only when we realise that our points of view can never coincide, that there is any chance, in the field of objective experience and practical politics, for us to walk hand in hand. There is another thing which I would like to tell the people of Great Britain. Before the War and during the War it was Germany's rôle (and monopoly) to talk about "bigness"—"*Deutschland über alles*", etc. After the War, I noticed, and noticed with pain and regret, in England well-known statesmen, both on the floor of the House of Commons and outside, paraphrasing in English *Deutschland über alles*. And that was done notably—well, I shall not mention names—when some of the most responsible statesmen of Great Britain were gloating over reprisals in Ireland, in the House of Commons. I hope this was a temporary phase. As a loyal and devoted, if not a very successful, student of your literature and of the history of your race, I am reminded of a passage which is the most patriotic in your literature,—of which Coleridge once said, that, if that passage was recited to an audience, no one in that audience, however mean, would go back without his

heart being filled with patriotism. I refer to the famous passage in Richard II:—

“ This royal throne of Kings,  
This sceptred 'isle  
This earth of majesty, this demi-Paradise.....”, etc.

I would like you to note the climax of that passage—

“ This *precious stone* set in the silver sea,  
This *little England*.”

I should like you, Sir, to remind your countrymen at the time when we meet in friendly consultation to settle our differences, that the greatest Englishman did not mistake bigness for greatness.

Sir, I have just one thing more to say. I have not made quotations from speeches of “ responsible statesmen.” Other speakers who preceded me have done so. It does not affect our position whether Mr. Montagu—our friend as he is, and one to whom we certainly owe thanks,—did or did not say something. As for testimonials for India, many have been quoted, and I daresay our moderate friends have made a complete collection of such testimonials. But I submit again that they do not affect our position. Our determination is firm; our purpose, God willing, shall know no defeat. And we look forward to a new birth of freedom, with confidence in ourselves and with faith in the destiny of our people.

(Several Honourable Members then rose and moved that the question be now put.)

**Mr. President:** I am quite prepared to leave the decision to the House, but in order to protect the interests of one important amendment the debate will have to proceed a little further.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** If it is the desire of the House, I will endeavour to find a date for the continuation of this debate. I notice that a very considerable number of Members still rise when opportunity occurs. I should of course like to reserve my own right of reply if it is decided to take the vote this afternoon.

**Mr. President:** In view of what has fallen from the Honourable the Home Member, I think we had better adjourn now because, as Members are aware, the moving of Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal's amendment and the reply to it, and the final replies at the end of the debate must necessarily occupy a considerable time. Therefore I propose to adjourn now.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya:** May we not sit for another two hours and finish the debate?

(Cries of “ No, no ” and “ Yes, yes.”)

**Mr. President:** I cannot say on what future date it will be set down.

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** I think there will be time either on Monday or Wednesday next.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar:** Do I understand the Leader of the House undertakes to give us either Monday or Wednesday next?

**The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey:** I think I can undertake to give you Monday; failing that, Wednesday. But certainly I will endeavour to give one or the other of the two days. I hope to be able to give Monday.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru:** Is there any difficulty in continuing it to-morrow?

**Mr. President:** It cannot be taken to-morrow as that is a day allotted for non-official Resolutions for which a ballot has already been held, and we cannot override the results of the ballot.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, the 14th February, 1924.