

10th March, 1924

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

FIRST SESSION
OF THE
SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1924



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1924

CONTENTS.

VOLUME IV, PART II—19th February, 1924 to 12th March, 1924.

	PAGES.
Tuesday, 19th February, 1924—	
Question and Answer	771
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee Presented	771
Resolution <i>re</i> Muhammadan Representation—Debate Adjourned <i>sine die</i>	772-786
Resolution <i>re</i> Constitution of High Courts—Withdrawn	786-790
Resolution <i>re</i> the Return to India of Mr. B. G. Horniman—Adopted	791-816
Wednesday, 20th February, 1924—	
Committee on Public Petitions	817
Statement laid on the Table	817-821
Election of a Panel for the Advisory Publicity Committee	822
Demand for Supplementary Grants	822-863
Thursday, 21st February, 1924—	
Questions and Answers	865-867
Unstarred Questions and Answers	867-870
Statement of Business	871
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	871-873
The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	873-875
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	875
The Indian Evidence (Amendment) Bill—Leave to Introduce refused	875-878
The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill—Introduced	879
Monday, 25th February, 1924—	
Member Sworn	881
Questions and Answers	881-922
Unstarred questions and answers	922
Motion for Adjournment—Leave refused	922-926
The Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	926-927
The Indian Coinage (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended	927-939
The Central Board of Revenue Bill—Passed as amended	940
Amendment of Standing Orders—Referred to a Select Committee	940-941
Election of a Panel of the Standing Committee to advise on questions relating to Emigration	941
Tuesday, 26th February, 1924—	
Member Sworn	943
Questions and Answers	943-948
Amendment of Standing Orders—Nominations for the Select Committee	949
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee presented	949

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Tuesday, 26th February, 1924—	
Resolution <i>re</i> the Grievances of the Sikh Community—Adopt- ed, as amended	949-992
Resolution <i>re</i> the Release of Sardar Kharak Singh—Adopted	992-1001
Resolution <i>re</i> the Release of Maulana Hasrat Mohani—Adopt- ed, as amended	1001-1015
Wednesday, 27th February, 1924—	
Questions and Answers	1017-1018
Election to the Panel of the Advisory Publicity Committee ...	1018
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Introduced...	1018-1019
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Introduced	1019
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amend- ed	1019-1043
Thursday, 28th February, 1924—	
Question and Answer	1045
Unstarred Question and Answer	1046
The Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—(Amendment of section 375)—Referred to Select Committee	1046-1056
The Hindu Religious and Charitable Trusts Bill—Motion to circulate for opinions adopted	1056-1060
The Adoption (Registration) Bill—Leave to introduce refused	1060-1063
The Indian Registration (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ...	1063-1065
The Hindu Coparcener's Liability Bill—Introduced	1065-1067
Friday, 29th February, 1924—	
Budget for 1924-25	1069-1095
The Indian Finance Bill—Motion for leave to introduce adopt- ed	1096
Saturday, 1st March, 1924—	
Member Sworn	1097
Questions and Answers	1097-1117
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1117-1118
Message from the Council of State	1118
Amendment of Standing Orders—Election of the Select Com- mittee	1119
The Indian Finance Bill—Introduced	1119
The Repealing and Amending Bill—Passed	1119
Monday, 3rd March, 1924—	
Member Sworn	1121
Questions and Answers	1121-1139
Resolution <i>re</i> the Separation of Railway Finance from General Finance—Discussion postponed	1139-1142
Wednesday, 5th March, 1924—	
Member Sworn	1143
General Discussion on the Budget	1143-1206
Thursday, 6th March, 1924—	
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Date for presenta- tion of Select Committee's Report extended and Mr. M. A. Jinnah nominated to the Select Committee	1207
General Discussion on the Budget	1207-1272

CONTENTS—*contd.*

	PAGES.
Saturday, 8th March, 1924—	
Questions and Answers	1273-1306
Special Session of the Assembly in Simla	1307
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1307-1315
Motion for Adjournment—Disallowed	1315
Messages from the Council of State	1315
Resolution <i>re</i> Separation of Railway Finance from General Finance—Consideration Adjourned	1316-1318
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1318-1319
The Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill—Passed	1319
The Criminal Tribes Bill—Passed	1319-1320
The Indian Tolls Bill—Motion for taking into consideration negatived	1320-1326
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Referred to a Select Committee	1326-1327
Resolution <i>re</i> The Ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of, and Traffic in, Obscene Publications—Adopted as Amended	1327-1338
Monday, 10th March, 1924—	
Members Sworn	1339
Questions and Answers	1339-1371
Unstarred Question and Answer	1371
Question <i>re</i> Cabinet Committee to consider Indian Affairs	1372-1375
The Indian Criminal Law Amendment Bill—Date for presenta- tion of Select Committee's Report extended	1375
The Indian Income-tax (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee presented	1376
Salary of the President of the Legislative Assembly	1376
The Budget—List of Demands	1376-1430
Tuesday, 11th March, 1924—	
Death of Mr. G. M. Bhurgri	1431-1434
Questions and Answers	1434-1443
Statement of the Position of the National Party in regard to the Demands for Grants	1443-1444
The Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1445-1518
Wednesday, 12th March, 1924—	
Message from the Council of State	1519
Report of the Select Committee on Standing Orders—Present- ed	1519
The Budget—List of Demands— <i>contd.</i>	1519-1605

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 10th March, 1924.

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

MEMBERS SWORN:

Mr. Allan Hubert Lloyd, M.L.A. (Member, Central Board of Revenue); Mr. Yacoob C. Ariff, M.L.A. (Calcutta and Suburbs: Muhammadan Urban); and Khan Bahadur Saiyid Muhammad Ismail, M.L.A. (Bihar and Orissa: Nominated Non-Official).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

INDIANS EMPLOYED IN THE SUPERIOR GRADE OF THE STORES DEPARTMENTS OF THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

660. ***Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer:** Will the Government be pleased to state the number of Indians employed in the superior grade of the Stores Departments of the Railway Department, drawing Rs. 500 or more.

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The information will be found in the Railway Board's Classified List and Distribution Return of Railway Establishment, a copy of which is kept in the Council Library.

MILITARY ACCOUNTANTS.

661. ***Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer:** Will the Government be pleased to state how many accountants of the Military Accounts Department have been drawing pay at Rs. 500 per mensem from 1st April 1920 and what was the total number of permanent accountants on 1st April, 1920 (except those subsequently promoted whose promotion was antedated)?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The total sanctioned strength of permanent accountants of the Military Accounts Department on 1st April, 1920, was 282 and of this number 227 accountants were in receipt of pay at Rs. 500 on that date.

APPOINTMENT OF *ex*-INDIAN ARMY RESERVE OFFICERS IN THE MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

662. ***Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer:** (a) What steps have been taken to Indianise the superior services of the Military Accounts Department? How many *ex*-Indian Army Reserve Officers were appointed and what is the total number of Indians appointed since 1st April, 1920?

(b) Why were ex-Indian Army Reserve Officers (British) appointed in the superior service when Indianisation was in contemplation? What were their educational qualifications? Have they appeared in any competitive examination? If not, how was their merit tested? How long do the Government propose to maintain these young officers when they intend to Indianise the superior service?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (a) The recruitment in England of Officers for the superior staff of the Military Accounts Department has been stopped since 1st April, 1922, except in special cases and the vacancies are filled by the direct appointment of Indians and by promotion of members of the subordinate service of the Department. Two ex-Indian Army Reserve Officers were appointed to the Department since 1st April, 1920, and the total number of Indians appointed to the Department (including those promoted from the subordinate service) since that date is ten.*

(b) The ex-Indian Army Reserve Officers mentioned above were appointed in vacancies which, under the then existing rules regarding the recruitment of officers, would have been filled by Europeans in England. They were selected on account of their experience of the work of the Department which they had gained during the period they were serving as attached officers in the Department during the War. They appeared at a competitive examination and before a Selection Board in December, 1919. The officers have been appointed to the Department permanently.

PAY OF ACCOUNTANTS AND CLERKS, MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

663. ***Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:** (a) Why are not accountants of the subordinate service of the Military Accounts Department recruited direct by competitive examination and their status raised, when their pay is quite attractive?

(b) What steps have been taken to revise the pay of accountants and clerks of the Military Accounts Department in conformity with the revised scale of pay of the Civil Accounts Department? Is it not a fact that the Government consider it reasonable that the pay of clerks and accountants of the Military Accounts Department should be more attractive than that of the Civil Accounts Department as the former have liability to proceed on field service at any moment and to frequent transfers? If so, when is the revised scale of pay likely to be sanctioned?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (a) As in the case of the Civil Accounts Department, it is the practice to fill a certain proportion of the vacancies among accountants of the subordinate service of the Military Accounts Department by direct recruitment by nomination of young men with high educational qualifications who are confirmed in the Department after they have passed the prescribed departmental examinations.

(b) The pay of accountants and clerks of the Military Accounts Department was revised in 1920 with reference to the revised scale of pay of the Civil Accounts Department after making due allowance for the liability of the former for field service and frequent transfers.

PAY OF CLERKS IN MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

664. ***Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:** Why was the "Next-below rule" not applied in the case of clerks of the Military Accounts Department who draw

* Excluding 5 statutory natives of India.

smaller pay, while expenditure was increased by applying it in the case of Accountants and other services of other Departments? Is it a fact that there is a great anomaly in the initial pay fixed for clerks serving in offices of different Controllers with reference to the length of service? Why was not this remedied?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The 'Next-below rule' has been applied in the cases of all permanent accountants and clerks employed in the Department on 1st April, 1920. The initial pay of the clerks employed in the various Controllers' offices has been fixed on uniform lines with reference to the orders issued by the Government of India and Government have no information regarding the anomalies referred to.

COMPULSORY RETIREMENT OF CLERKS, ACCOUNTANTS AND DEPUTY ASSISTANT CONTROLLERS OF THE MILITARY ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT.

665. ***Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:** Has it been considered advisable to transfer to the pension establishment the clerks, accountants and Deputy Assistant Controllers of the Military Accounts Department who have completed 25 years' service with a view to curtail expenditure as most of them are getting the maximum pay of their own grade? What will be the net reduction of expenditure if compulsory retirement is enforced?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: It is not considered advisable to transfer to the pension establishment all clerks, accountants and Deputy Assistant Controllers who have completed 25 years' service and who are getting the maximum pay of their own grade. Action in this direction is, however, taken in the case of men who are past good work.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY ACCOUNTS OFFICES.

666. ***Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:** What steps have been taken to give effect to the Inchcape recommendation regarding reduction of the Military Accounts offices, specially when the representatives of Military Accounts Department are now attached to each unit and formation and there is an elaborate system of Local Audit? Are not 3 or 4 Offices of Accountant-Generals' Commands quite sufficient as the Civil Department has by Provinces?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: No reduction in the number of Military Accounts offices has been recommended by the Inchcape Committee, nor did they suggest any immediate reduction in the staff of those offices. A reduction of about 1,000 temporary clerks has, however, been made during the current financial year and the question of effecting further reductions in the establishment will be taken up as soon as military expenditure has been stabilised. The reply to the second part of this question is in the negative.

STOPPAGE OF INCREMENTS OF PAY OF CLERKS AND ACCOUNTANTS.

667. ***Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer:** Can the head of an office stop increment of pay of clerks and even accountants without proper inquiry and unless a case is made out for inefficiency or misconduct. If the pay of clerks and accountants can be stopped for delay in receipt of accounts (even though they are sent on due dates or when delay is beyond their control) why is this order not enforced in the case of the Heads of offices and departments who draw more pay than the petty clerks and accountants?

Is it a fact that some military officers reported this matter to the higher authorities? If so, what steps have been taken to prevent the recurrence of unnecessary hardship to the Indian staff?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The head of an office cannot reduce the pay or stop the increment of accountants or clerks without proper inquiries and unless a case is made out for the inefficiency or misconduct. The Government have no information on the other points referred to by the Honourable Member.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BABINGTON-SMITH COMMITTEE.

668. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** 1. Will Government be pleased to state, when, if at all, they propose to carry into effect the recommendations of the Babington-Smith Committee regarding:

- (a) the holding of one-half of the Gold Standard Reserve in gold in India,
- (b) the re-opening of the Bombay branch of the Royal Mint for the coinage of sovereigns and half-sovereigns,
- (c) the affording of facilities to the public for the coinage of gold bullion and for the refining of gold.

2. Will Government be pleased to make a detailed statement of their policy with respect to all the questions raised in (1) and with respect to the question of gold currency in India?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: 1. (a) This question cannot arise in a practical form at present.

(b) and (c) first part. The Indian Mints are in a position to coin gold as soon as the demand for gold as currency arises, but no such demand can arise so long as the present premium on gold exists.

(c) second part. Facilities already exist, and are widely availed of by the public, for refining gold in the Bombay Mint.

2. The views of the Government have been made public on several occasions and they do not propose to make any further declaration on the subject:

GOLD VALUE OF THE SILVER RUPEE.

669. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Are Government aware that for nearly two years past the actual gold value of the silver rupee has been about 7.50 fine grains of gold as against its statutory value of 11.3 grains?

(b) Are Government aware that the fictitious statutory gold value of the silver rupee has driven the sovereigns out of circulation in India?

(c) Do Government propose to undertake the necessary legislation to make the statutory gold value of the rupee consonant with its bazar gold value?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (a) The Government are aware that the price of fine gold in India has for some time past been in the neighbourhood of Rs. 25 per tola, which means that about $7\frac{1}{4}$ grains of gold can be bought for one rupee.

(b) The answer is in the negative. The Government are aware that sovereigns cannot circulate as currency so long as their bazar price is above their statutory value.

(c) The Government do not propose to introduce legislation on the lines suggested.

LATRINE ACCOMMODATION FOR THIRD CLASS PASSENGERS ON THE LOCAL AND SUBURBAN SERVICES OF THE G. I. P. AND B. B. AND C. I. RAILWAYS.

670. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Are Government aware of the frequent complaints of serious hardship and inconvenience arising from the absence of latrine accommodation for third class passengers on the local and suburban services of the G. I. P. and B. B. and C. I. Railways in Bombay.

(b) Are Government aware that the distance traversed by the local and suburban services of these railways is nearly forty miles each way on both lines and that ordinarily the trains take two hours and sometimes even more to travel the whole distance?

(c) Do Government propose to suggest to the railway authorities concerned the necessity of providing the accommodation referred to in (a)?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Such complaints have not been brought to the notice of the Government. I may add that it is not usual to provide such accommodation in vehicles used for suburban services.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Do Government propose to consider whether servants' compartments attached to first and second class carriages should be fitted with latrines and be properly looked after, so that some facilities may be given to the poor wretched servants travelling with their masters?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am not aware, Sir, that servants' compartments are attached to first-class bogies on suburban trains.

RUNNING OF THE EVENING TRAIN WITHOUT LIGHTS BETWEEN SABARMATI AND DHOLKA.

671. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Are Government aware that the evening train between Sabarmati and Dholka was running without any lights practically for the whole of the quarter ending 31st December, 1923?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons which led to the running of this train without lights?

(c) Will Government state who was responsible for such palpable negligence and what steps have been taken to prevent the recurrence of such a thing?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Government have no information. The Railway Administration's attention will be drawn to the matter.

PROPOSED RAILWAY FROM VASAD TO KATHANA.

672. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Are Government aware that the people of the Borsad Taluka in the Bombay Presidency have been petitioning Government for the construction of a railway line from Vasad to Kathana?

(b) Is it a fact that a deputation of the people of the Taluka waited on H. E. the Governor of Bombay in 1915 as a result of which the Bombay Government strongly supported the necessity for the construction of the Vasad Borsad Kathana Railway on economic, administrative and political grounds?

(c) Is it a fact that in December, 1919 a conference of the representatives of the Bombay and Baroda Governments was held at the office of the Railway Board at Delhi to consider the question and it was agreed that the railway communication in the Borsad Taluka was essential and for that purpose it was decided (1) that the Vasad Borsad Kathana Railway line should be constructed on the broad gauge system as an integral part of the B. B. and C. I. Railway and (2) that the construction of the same railway should be commenced during the next financial year, i.e., 1920?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) The reply is in the affirmative.

(b) Government have no specific information, but the construction of the line was recommended by the Government of Bombay on economic, administrative and political grounds.

(c) The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan on the same subject on Saturday.

LENGTH OF THE PROPOSED VASAD BORSAD KATHANA RAILWAY.

673. ***Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta:** (a) Will Government be pleased to say what is the length in miles of the projected Vasad Borsad Kathana line and what would be the estimated cost of the construction of the line as broad gauge?

(b) Have Government received any representations from the people of the Taluka for the immediate construction of the Vasad Borsad Kathana Railway and if so will Government be pleased to lay them on the table?

(c) What action do Government propose to take in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) The line will be about 25½ miles in length. No up to date estimate of cost is available. It was estimated in 1917 to cost Rs. 19,09,187 on the 5 feet 6 inches gauge which is now likely to be exceeded. Revised estimates are under preparation.

(b) Numerous representations have been received which the Honourable Member may see at any time in the Railway Board's office.

(c) The Honourable Member is referred to the answer given to Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan on the same subject on Saturday.

EVASION OF THE IMPORT DUTY ON MATCHES.

674. ***Seth Kasturbhai Lalbhai:** What steps do Government propose to take to safeguard the revenue interests as also the interests of the indigenous match industry adversely affected by the evasion of the import duty on matches by splints, veneers and dummy match boxes imported into India in place of the finished articles?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member is referred to the provisions of the Finance Bill for 1924 introduced on March 1st.

INCOME-TAX AND SUPER-TAX REALISED FROM COTTON MILLS.

* 675. ***Seth Kasturbhai Lalbhai:** Will Government be pleased to state separately the amount of income-tax and super-tax collected from the cotton mills in British India for the financial years 1920-21, 1921-22 and 1922-23.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The super-tax collected from businesses relating to cotton spinning, weaving, cotton pressing, ginning and cleaning in British India during the years 1921-22 to 1922-23 was Rs. 93,69,569, 1,87,59,848 and 1,63,96,975, respectively. The Government are not in possession of the figures relating to income-tax and do not consider that their value would be sufficient to justify the trouble of collecting and compiling them.

Seth Kasturbhai Lalbhai: Are the Government aware that the cotton mill industry is one of the foremost industries and the public are entitled to know what its contribution is to the Government Treasury?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The Government are aware of the first statement. The second is a matter of opinion.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Is the amount which is contributed by the duty to the Government Treasury a matter of opinion?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: No, Sir.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: We want the figures.

Mr. Chaman Lal: Do the figures given by the Honourable the Finance Member show that the cotton industry earned more profits during the last period than during any earlier period?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The figures do not relate to the last period 1923-24. The latest figures here relate to the period 1922-23.

INTERMENT OF MR. AMIR CHAND BOMBWAL.

676. ***Lala Duni Chand:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether Mr. Amir Chand Bombwal was interned under the Defence of India Act from 19th May 1920 to 20th December 1920?

(b) Was the attention of Government drawn to the *Tribune* of 14th November 1920 in which, besides the comments on the case of Mr. Amir Chand Bombwal, the translation of a letter addressed by Nawab Mohammad Azam Khan of Kotla to the Deputy Commissioner of Peshawar was published in the *Zamindar* of 18th November, 1920, in which this letter was published in full?

(c) Have the Government contradicted or controverted the allegations made in the *Tribune* of 14th November, 1920, and in the *Zamindar* of 18th November, 1920?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state if the letter referred to in part (b) was written by Nawab Mohammad Azam Khan to the Deputy Commissioner of Peshawar and received by the latter?

(e) If the reply to part (d) be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state whether Mr. Amir Chand Bombwal was interned at the instances of Nawab Mohammad Azam Khan who was not allowed, on the objection of Mr. Amir Chand Bombwal, to preside over a public meeting?

(f) Is it a fact that the said Mr. Amir Chand Bombwal claimed Rs. 300 a month from the Government for the period of his internment as maintenance and the Government allowed Rs. 150 a month but now on his return from jail after 3 years he has been refused even this sum?

(g) If the reply to part (f) be in the affirmative, how can the Government justify their refusal to pay what is admittedly due to him?

Mr. E. Burdon: I have been asked to answer this question on behalf of Mr. Howell.

The answer is: The information is being collected and will be communicated to the Honourable Member on receipt.

COMPLAINT AGAINST THE STATION MASTER OF KASUR.

677. *Lala Duni Chand: (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether a petition signed by 65 traders of Kasur town in Lahore district was sent to the Agent, North Western Railway, on or about 12th August, 1923, complaining against the station master of Kasur station and demanding an inquiry?

(b) If the reply to the above be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to state what action has been taken on the said complaint?

(c) In view of the reply of the Government to my interpellations on the subject of abuses of Railway Administration given on 5th February, 1924, in this House, in which the Government expressed their readiness to inquire into the matter if any specific instances were quoted, do the Government propose to avail themselves of the opportunity that has been afforded by the above case?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Inquiry is being made and the result will be communicated to the Honourable Member in due course.

SAVINGS IN THE WORKING EXPENSES OF STATE RAILWAYS.

678. *Dr. H. S. Gour: With reference to a statement published in the papers, dated Delhi, the 21st February, that there has been a saving of 3 crores of rupees in the working expenses of the State Railways, will the Government be pleased to state if this saving or part of any of this saving is in respect of gross revenue and what part represents savings in salaries, fuel, etc.?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: The latest estimate of working expenses of railways for the current year compares with the grants fixed in the Budget under the various Sub-divisions as follows:

	1923-24 Budget.	Latest estimate.
General Administration	7,08,42	7,94,41
Ordinary maintenance and repairs	16,60,09	16,31,23
Operating expenses excluding Fuel	24,73,58	24,83,75
Fuel	8,53,60	8,54,94
Programme Revenue	9,00,00	7,29,96
Deduct non-Budget lines	3,28,08	3,50,94
Add Suspenses	41,10	47,35
Total Working Expenses	63,01,50	60,96,00

The gross traffic receipts are now expected to amount to 94,15 lakhs against 95,50 lakhs provided in the Budget.

Dr. H. S. Gour: May I inquire from the Honourable Member what amount of saving out of the 3 crores of the working expenses comes from reduction in the programme revenue?

Mr. A. A. L. Parsons: 1 crore and 60 lakhs practically.

THE GWALIOR AND NORTHERN INDIA COMPANY'S BUS SERVICE.

679. ***Mr. Abdul Hays:** (a) Is it a fact that while clerks in other offices of the Government of India have the option of using the Gwalior and Northern India Company's bus service or making their own arrangements for coming to offices, the clerks serving in the Department of Education, Health and Lands have been compelled to use the above bus service. If so, will the Government be pleased to state reasons for this differential treatment?

(b) Is it a fact that the Gwalior and Northern India Company bus service accepts no responsibility for the accidents sustained by the passengers travelling by their buses? If so, on whom does this responsibility rest especially in the case of clerks who have been compelled to use the service against their will?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: (a) Under the contract with the Bus Company 400 tickets have to be taken up. 34 of these were allotted at the beginning of the season to the Department of Education, Health and Lands and distributed to the clerks in that Department living in Raisina. No question of differential treatment arises.

(b) Yes. The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given on Saturday last to Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan.

PAUPER POPULATION OF INDIA.

680. ***Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether figures are available to show how much of the population of India depends for its livelihood on charity?

(b) If so, what is the number?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The only figures available are those included in the census tables for India. I invite the Honourable Member's attention to the table on page 208 of Part II of Volume I of the Report on the Census of India, 1921, a copy of which is in the Library of this House. Entry 189 on that page shows that in India there were 2,862,641 and in British India 2,018,505 persons who were classed as "beggars, vagrants, witches, wizards, etc." I do not know what further classes are included in the word "etc.," but the whole entry is under the head of "unproductive occupations."

Mr. K. Ahmed: Does it include the volunteers of the Swarajists who take some money from their funds raised out of subscriptions and donations given by the people of this country?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member must address that question elsewhere.

(Mr. President then called upon Mr. Jamnadas Mehta to put the next question.*)

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: This is not my question. Apparently some other Honourable Member's question has been mixed up here; although, I would be glad to have the information asked for.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Does it not elicit further information on the matter in issue? That is the point.

Mr. President: As nobody claims this question, it may drop out of sight.

IMPORTS OF FOREIGN SUGAR AND SALT.

681. ***Mr. Syamacharan:** Will Government be pleased to state separately the imports of foreign sugar and salt into India during the last three years with reference both to their quantities and market value?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The information can be obtained from the Annual Statement of, and the Monthly Accounts relating to the Sea-borne Trade of British India, to which the Honourable Member's attention is invited. Copies of these publications are available in the Library.

INCREASE IN REVENUE FROM THE DUTY ON FOREIGN SUGAR.

682. ***Mr. Syamacharan:** Will Government be pleased to state the increase in revenue from duty on foreign sugar in 1922-23 and 1923-24?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The duty collected on sugar and saccharine in the ten months April to January in 1922-23 was 849 lakhs. In 1923-24 it amounted to 279 lakhs.

RANK OF THE TWO JUDGES WHO EXAMINED THE CASES OF STATE PRISONERS IN BENGAL.

683. ***Mr. Syamacharan:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the leaderette of the *Servant* of the 23rd February, 1924, in connection with the reply made by the Home Member to the interpellation put by Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh on the 19th February, 1924, in this Assembly?

(b) Is it a fact that the two Judges appointed to examine the cases of the Bengal deportees (detained under Regulation III of 1818) were not even senior Sessions Judges as stated by the Home Member in this Assembly but that one of them was a senior Sessions Judge and the other only a District Magistrate?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: (a) Government have seen the article.

(b) No. My answer to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh is correct.

* (a) Will Government be pleased to state the reasons which led to the prohibition of the export from British India of skins and feathers of birds such as peacocks, swans, pheasants, etc., notified in the Commerce Department Notification No. 5028-S. R., dated the 19th September, 1902?

(b) Is it a fact that a considerable amount of trade is carried on within the country and that foreign countries have a great demand for such articles? If so, do Government propose to consider the advisability of cancelling the Notification mentioned in part (a) above and allowing the free export of peacock and other feathers?

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

684. ***Mr. Syamacharan:** Will Government be pleased to state the steps taken by the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the Indian Industrial Commission Report during the last three years and the results achieved thereby?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: It is not possible to give in detail all the information which the Honourable Member desires within the compass of a reply to his question. I would also remind the Honourable Member that the development of industries is mainly a transferred provincial subject and active measures for giving effect to the recommendations of the Industrial Commission are, therefore, largely in the hands of the Provincial Governments. So far as the Central Government is concerned, action has been or is being taken on certain of the more important recommendations of the Commission such as the constitution of a Central Department of Industries, the creation of an agency for the purchase and inspection of stores in India and the establishment of a School of Mines and Geology. If the Honourable Member will specify any particular recommendations of the Commission concerning the Central Government in respect of which he desires detailed information, I shall be glad to furnish it.

POWERS OF THE CENTRAL RAILWAY ADVISORY COUNCIL.

685. ***Mr. Bhubanananda Das:** Will Government be pleased to state:

- (a) What are the powers of the Central Railway Advisory Council?
- (b) When is their advice sought?
- (c) Is their advice binding on the Government?
- (d) Are they merely advising or can they control the action of the Railway Board?
- (e) Have they any power to initiate schemes or proposals?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member will find the answer to his question in the Resolution of the Government of India on the subject published in the Gazette of India of 18th March, 1922.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACWORTH COMMITTEE REGARDING THE CENTRAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

686. ***Mr. Bhubanananda Das:** Will Government be pleased to state why the recommendations of the Acworth Committee regarding the Central Advisory Committee for the Railway Board were ignored as that Committee clearly specified that such a body shall be elected and not nominated?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: The Honourable Member is referred to paragraph 2 of the Resolution just referred to.

TOTAL STRENGTH OF THE COUNCIL OF INDIA.

687. ***Mr. K. O. Roy:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the total strength of the Council of India at the India Office and whether it is contemplated to reduce its strength in view of prospective retirements?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state the dates on which retirement of Sir James Brunyate, General Sir E. Barrow, Mr. B. N. Basu and Mr. Aftab Ahmed Khan is due?

(c) What effect has been given to the recommendations made by the Inchcape Committee proposing review of the grant-in-aid from the British Treasury towards the cost of the India Office?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: (a) The Council of India at present consists of 10 Members. The Secretary of State has power under the Act to appoint any number not being less than 8 or more than 12 and, so far as is known to the Government of India, no proposal is under consideration for the modification of these numbers.

(b) The dates on which the Members of Council mentioned will normally be due to retire are as follows:

Sir James Brunyate: in May 1924.

Sir Edmond Barrow; in January 1924.

Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu; the 5th November, 1924.

Sahibzada Aftab Ahmed Khan; the 1st September, 1924.

(c) The position has been reviewed, but it has been decided that it is not practicable to substantiate any claim for an increase in the Treasury contribution towards the cost of the India Office.

Mr. K. O. Neogy: Is it intended to grant any extension to the officers mentioned in clause (b) of the question?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: That, Sir, is a question entirely for the Secretary of State.

REDUCTION IN THE NUMBER OF EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS IN BENGAL.

688. ***Mr. K. O. Roy:** Will the Government be pleased to state what action, if any, has been taken on the recommendation of the Bengal Retrenchment Committee for reduction in the number of Executive Councillors in the Province of Bengal?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The recommendations of the Bengal Retrenchment Committee were made to the Government of Bengal, from whom inquiries will be made as to how the matter now stands.

HONORARY PRESIDENCY MAGISTRATES.

689. ***Mr. K. O. Roy:** What action, if any, have Government taken on the following recommendation made by the Bengal Retrenchment Committee "We consider that honorary magistrates should not hold office as long as they like but as long as Government like and that the next revision of the Criminal Procedure Code should be made the opportunity for securing this in the Presidency towns in the same way as in 1893 it was secured by an amendment in regard to the mufassil?"

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member's attention is invited to sub-section (3) of section 18 of the Criminal Procedure Code inserted by section 3 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, 1923, (XVIII of 1923), which has already given effect to the recommendation made by the Bengal Retrenchment Committee.

MULTAN MUSLIMS AND INCOME-TAX.

690. ***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the letter published under the head "Multan Muslims and Income Tax" in the *Muslim Outlook* in its issue of the 21st February?

(b) If so, will the Government be pleased to inquire and let this House know, how far the alleged hardships of the Multan Muslims, are true?

(c) Do Government propose to remove the hardships of the Multanese caused by the Income tax officials by their double-edged sword, as stated therein?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (a), (b) and (c). The Government have no information on the subject. They have now seen the article referred to and the Central Board of Revenue have invited the attention of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Punjab, to it. The Honourable Member may rest assured that, as suggested by the writer of the article, the Commissioner will take any steps that may be necessary to relieve any genuine grievances.

PENSION OF ONE BEHAR BAKHT.

691. ***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to the article published in the *Muslim Outlook* in its issue of the 20th February, under the head "A descendant of the Great Moghul"?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state whether the statement that a pension of Rs. 8 per month has been sanctioned for one of the direct descendants of Bahadur Shah is true?

(c) If so, will the Government be pleased to state the reasons of sanctioning such a small sum?

(d) Do the Government propose to raise the pension to a decent sum?

(e) If not, will they be pleased to state the reason?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Inquiries are being made in the matter. The result will be communicated to the Honourable Member in due course.

MILITARY SLAUGHTER HOUSES.

692. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the number of military butcheries set up in British India? Do these butcheries supply beef to the troops in India for their food?

(b) Is there any other source of supply of beef to the troops in India other than the military butcheries? If so, what are the other sources?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state the number of bovine cattle under separate classification, namely, (a) bullocks and bulls, (b) cows, (c) buffaloes, (d) calves that were slaughtered in the military butcheries in each of the years 1920, 1921, 1922 and 1923?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state the quantity of beef received in each of the years 1920, 1921, 1922 and 1923 from sources other than the military butcheries and the number of bovine cattle under the above classification slaughtered at each such source in each of those years?

(e) Will the Secretary to the Army Department be pleased to state the number of hides and the number of calf-skins disposed of by the military butcheries in each of the years 1920, 1921, 1922 and 1923 and the sum realised by the disposal of such hides and calf-skins?

Mr. E. Burdon: (a) The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to (a) of the reply† given on the 15th February, 1921, to Question No. 68. The answer to the second part of the question is in the affirmative.

(b) Except for a few Municipal butcheries which are utilised on behalf of the military, there are no other sources of supply.

(c) Government are unable to furnish the information desired as no record is maintained of the classes of animals slaughtered in military slaughter houses.

(d) The information desired by the Honourable Member is not available and to collect it would, I am afraid, be impracticable.

(e) The hides of cattle slaughtered in military slaughter houses are the property of the contractors, and Government are, therefore, unable to furnish the information desired.

RANK OF THE TWO JUDGES WHO EXAMINED THE CASES OF STATE PRISONERS IN BENGAL.

693. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to a statement in the *Forward* that the papers of prisoners under Bengal Regulation III of 1818 in Bengal were placed before a District Magistrate and a Sessions Judge? If so, whether the statement is correct?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state whether the papers of prisoners in Bengal under Bengal Regulation III of 1818, were placed before two senior Sessions Judges or before a District Magistrate and a Sessions Judge? If so, will the Government be pleased to state the reasons for selecting a Magistrate for the same?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: (a) The statement is incorrect, and I have already answered part (b) of the question.

BENGAL STUDENTS FOR THE ROYAL INDIAN MILITARY COLLEGE, DEHRA DUN.

694. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the number of students taken from Bengal for the Dehra Dun Prince of Wales College in the year 1922-23?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state the names of applicants from Bengal in the years 1922-23 and 1923-24, with their qualifications, and the principle on which selection was made for the Prince of Wales College at Dehra Dun in those years?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state whether any student of the Prince of Wales College at Dehra Dun has been selected to join the Royal Military College at Sandhurst?

Mr. E. Burdon: (a) Two candidates from Bengal were selected for admission to the Prince of Wales' Royal Indian Military College, Dehra Dun, during 1922-23.

(b) In the year 1922-23, applications for admission to Dehra Dun were received from four Bengali candidates. For reasons which I hope the Honourable Member will appreciate I do not propose to give their names. So far as they are concerned, the matter is a private one. Two of the four were not recommended by the Governor in Council as they were not considered to be up to the standard required, and were accordingly not selected for admission to the College. No applications were submitted by the Local Government in 1923-24.

Selections are made from the best of the candidates whose names are submitted by Local Governments and Administrations. In this connexion, I invite the attention of the Honourable Member to paragraph 14 of the regulations relating to the admission of candidates to the College, a copy of which was laid on the table in the Council of State on the 24th January, 1923, in reply to Question No. 2.

(c) Yes. Five students from the Dehra Dun College have, so far, been selected for admission to the Royal Military College, Sandhurst.

SELECTION OF BENGAL STUDENTS FOR THE ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, SANDHURST.

695. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Will the Government be pleased to state the number of students from Bengal that have been selected for the Royal Military College at Sandhurst in the years 1922-23 and 1923-24?

Mr. E. Burdon: During the years 1922-23 and 1923-24, four candidates presented themselves for admission to the Royal Military College, Sandhurst. Of these, none reached the standard required in the open examination and none, therefore, was selected.

AUSTRALIAN BEEF FOR BRITISH TROOPS.

696. ***Mr. Amar Nath Dutt:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether beef for the soldiers of the Indian Army is supplied from India? If so, will the Government be pleased to state whether they propose to substitute the same by importing surplus Australian beef?

Mr. E. Burdon: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, I invite the attention of the Honourable Member to the reply† given on the 23rd July last to starred Question No. 341.

RESTRICTIONS ON THE MANUFACTURE OF EARTH SALT.

697. ***Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan:** (a) Has the attention of Government been drawn to a speech delivered by Sir Thomas Holland, K.C.S.I., at the Royal Society of Arts and reported in the *Englishman* of the 18th February 1924, wherein he doubts the desirability and effectiveness of the present rigid restrictions on the local manufacture of earth salt which pressed very hard on the poor and cost more than its worth in revenue and carried risk of agricultural deterioration?

(b) Do Government intend to abolish such restrictions?

(c) If not, do Government propose to make an inquiry whether or not such restrictions impose a great hardship on the poor?

† Vide page 4363 of L. A. Debates, Vol. III.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blckett: (a) The Government of India have seen in the newspapers a brief telegraphic summary of remarks said to have been made by Sir Thomas Holland on the occasion referred to. If he has been correctly reported in that summary he would seem to have had inadequate information of the facts.

In 1902 when a similar question was raised it was estimated that the withdrawal of restrictions on the manufacture of earth salt would result in an annual loss of salt revenue in the United Provinces alone which might amount (on a duty of Rs. 2) to as much as Rs. 44,00,000. What the loss all over India would be it is impossible to guess but it is certain that the figure would be extremely high. The annual cost of the Northern India preventive establishment on the other hand is less than 2½ lakhs of rupees, and proposals for reducing it are under consideration.

(b) In the circumstances the Government of India do not propose to abolish the restrictions.

(c) In view of the careful inquiry made in 1902 no need for a further investigation exists.

RAILWAY COLLIERIES.

698. ***Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many collieries have been acquired and are being worked by railway agency?

(b) What, approximately, was the quantity of coal raised from such collieries last year?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) Five.

(b) One million six hundred thousand tons.

TRAINING OF APPRENTICES IN RAILWAY WORKSHOPS.

699. ***Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state how many workshops exist on the State and Company managed lines and how many apprentices are receiving training in each?

(b) Has any arrangement been made to provide technical classes for them during their period of apprenticeship?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) I would refer the Honourable Member to paragraphs 34 and 56 of Volumes I of the Railway Administration Reports for 1921-22 and 1922-23, respectively.

The number of apprentices under training at the end of June, 1923, on the railways noted below was:

North Western	209
Eastern Bengal	34
Oudh and Rohilkhand	112
East Indian	278
Bombay, Baroda and Central India	360
Assam Bengal	20
Bengal and North Western	46
South Indian	35

The Great Indian Peninsula and Madras and Southern Mahratta Railways also train apprentices, but the figures for these lines are not available.

(b) Arrangements have been made to provide technical classes for the apprentices.

CENTRAL RAILWAY ADVISORY COUNCIL.

700. *Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan: (a) Have Government taken any steps to constitute a Central Advisory Council for Railways as recommended by the Acworth Committee?

(b) If not, will Government be pleased to state the reason for not doing so?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: A Central Railway Advisory Council has been constituted.

USE OF OIL FUEL ON RAILWAYS.

701. *Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan: (a) Have Government tested the possibilities of oil as an alternative fuel for Railways?

(b) If so, what decision have they reached in the matter?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) Yes. Extended trials have been made on the North Western Railway.

(b) The trials shewed a small advantage in the use of oil over coal as fuel in the Karachi district of the North Western Railway.

Oil fuel has been adopted on that district of the North Western Railway and on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway near Bombay.

COAL SURVEYS ON BEHALF OF THE RAILWAYS.

702. *Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan: Are any prospecting surveys being made for proving coal and determining areas to be eventually purchased for railway purposes? If so, where? What has been the cost of survey in each case up till now?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: A statement giving such information as is available is placed on the table.

Prospecting surveys being made for proving coal and determining areas for railway collieries, which have been sanctioned.

Railway or Company making the survey.	Coalfield.	Amount sanctioned for survey.	Expenditure to date.
		Rs.	
Joint East Indian and Bengal Nagpur Railways.	Kadla areas of West Bokhro.	17,800	Figures not available.
Joint East Indian and Bengal Nagpur Railways.	Baudh area of East Bokharo.	25,000	Ditto
Bengal Nagpur Railway . . .	Talcher . . .	43,613	Ditto.
Madras and Southern Mahratta Railway.	Do. . .	64,440	Ditto.
Joint Great Indian Peninsula and Bombay, Baroda and Central India Railways.	Kurasia . . .	38,000	Ditto.

SEPARATION OF JUDICIAL FROM EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS.

703. *Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan: (a) Is it a fact that reports have been submitted to the Government of India by the Punjab, the United Provinces and Bihar Governments regarding the separation of the executive and judicial functions in those provinces?

(b) Is it a fact that the Government of India are awaiting the report of the Lee Commission before giving their reply thereto?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: (a) The Government of the Punjab have not submitted any report to the Government of India. The other reports referred to have been received.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply given by me to Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh's unstarred Questions Nos. 78 to 80 on the 11th February, 1924. The general purport of that answer was that no action has so far been taken pending the receipt of the final views of the Governments of Bengal and Madras.

ENGAGEMENT OF THE SERVICES OF MESSRS PRICE, WATERHOUSE AND COMPANY, CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS.

704. *Mr. Ahmad Ali Khan: (a) Is it a fact that the services of Messrs. Price, Waterhouse and Company, Chartered Accountants, have been engaged by the Government of India?

(b) If the answer be in the affirmative, will Government be pleased to state on what terms and for what period they have been engaged and what is the precise nature of their work?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Three accountants of the firm of Messrs. Price, Waterhouse and Company were engaged for a period of about a year from December, 1920, to make recommendations to the Government of India for the introduction, wherever possible, of a system of 'cost' accounting in commercial and quasi-commercial Government departments. They are no longer employed. As to their terms of appointment, I would refer the Honourable Member to the answer* given on the 10th September, 1921, to a question by Mr. K. C. Neogy.

ABOLITION OF THE THATHAMEDA TAX IN UPPER BURMA.

705. *Maung Tok Kyi: (i) Will the Government be pleased to state (a) the estimate of the revenue they expect to derive in the year 1924-25 from the recent imposition of income tax in Upper Burma and (b) the cost of collection of the same?

(ii) Are the Government aware that the people of Upper Burma have been assessed to a tax called *Thathameda*?

(iii) Now that the income tax has been introduced in Upper Burma, is there any intention on the part of Government to see its way to repealing the *Thathameda* tax?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (i) It is not possible at present to estimate the yield of the tax or the cost of collection which will mainly present a percentage, payable to the Local Government, of the amount collected.

*Vide pages 182-183 of L. A. Debates, Vol. II.

(ii) Yes.

(iii) Any person who is assessed to income-tax will be allowed a rebate thereon equal to the sum paid by him on account of *Thathamada*.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: What is the meaning of *Thathamada*?

CONTRIBUTION TO BURMA FOR THE COLLECTION OF THE SALT DUTY.

706. ***Maung Tok Kyi:** (a) Is it not a fact that the amount contributed by the Government of India to the Burma provincial funds for collection of salt duty is much less than the actual expenditure incurred by the Burma Government every year?

(b) If it is, may I ask if the Government are prepared in future to pay the Government of Burma the whole cost of collection?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: The whole question of the method of assessing the contribution from central to provincial revenues on account of the combined salt and excise establishment in Burma has been under the consideration of the Local Government and the Government of India for sometime past and the final proposals of the former are now being awaited. The Government of Burma claim that the contribution hitherto made by the Government of India to the provincial funds on this account is insufficient. On being satisfied that this claim is substantiated in detail, the Government of India will make the necessary arrangements, if necessary, to assess this contribution at a sufficient figure.

WORK DONE BY MR. H. MAXWELL LEFROY TO IMPROVE THE SILK INDUSTRY.

707. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will the Government pleased to state:

(a) whether or not any practical improvement has actually been effected in the Indian silk industry since the appointment of Mr. H. Maxwell Lefroy in 1915? If so, how far?

(b) Has any detailed report been published about his work? If so, when and what?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: (a) Reports received from Local Governments in 1919 showed that several of them had undertaken measures for the improvement of sericulture on the lines recommended by Mr. Maxwell Lefroy. The Government of India also did what they could to assist by conducting researches into silk-worm diseases in 1919. With the institution of the reforms the development of industries, including industrial research, became a provincial transferred subject, and the matter is now one for Local Governments.

(b) A copy of the report on an inquiry into the silk industry in India by Messrs Maxwell Lefroy and Anson, compiled in 1916, will be found in the Library.

MATCH INDUSTRY.

708. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether or not they are aware of the growing interest of Indians in the match industry?

(b) what have the Government done to encourage and improve it in view of the foreign competition?

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

(b) The Honourable Member is reminded that the development of industries is now mainly a transferred provincial subject. The development of an industry can only be undertaken by the Central Government in particular cases which have been specifically declared to be Central in consultation with the Local Government or Governments concerned and the match industry has not been so declared by the Government of India. I would at the same time remind the Honourable Member that the tariff places a high duty on imported matches.

TRAINING OF INDIAN GRADUATES AT THE JAMALPUR RAILWAY WORKSHOP.

709. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) how many graduate apprentices were trained for railway services at the Jamalpur workshop during the last two years?
- (b) how many of them have completed their course and what provisions have been made for them?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Government have no information but will make inquiries.

CENTRAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE.

710. ***Kumar Ganganand Sinha:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether or not they will be able to fructify the scheme for the establishment of a Central Research Institute and proposed appointment of Ayurvedic and Unani experts this year?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: The reply is, I am afraid, in the negative.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A GENERAL MEETING OF BRITISH GUIANA INDIANS ON THE 22ND NOVEMBER, 1923.

711. ***Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan:** Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) Whether they have received a copy of the Resolution adopted at a general meeting of the British Guiana Indians in the Town Hall, George Town, held on the 22nd November, 1923, under the auspices of the Indian Association?
- (b) If so, what action have Government taken in the matter?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: The Government of India have been furnished with a copy of the Resolution referred to by the Honourable Member. They propose to lay the whole question before the Standing Emigration Committee.

STRENGTH OF THE POLICE FORCE IN THE KOHAT AND BANNU CANTONMENTS.

712. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to give the present strength of the police force in Kohat and Bannu cantonments; and also state if additions have been recently made, or are now

proposed to be made therein? If the answer to the above be in the affirmative, will the Government be pleased to indicate the exact nature of such additions, and the reasons for the same, as well as the financial effect of the proposals?

(b) Is it not a fact that the duties which have now been assigned, or are proposed to be assigned to the police in these cantonments were hitherto performed by the military? And will not the arrangements now undertaken relieve the military estimates of a portion of their burden, and throw them on the civil estimates?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: (a) A statement is laid on the table showing the present strength of the Police force in Kohat and Bannu cantonments and certain proposals for additional police.

The object is to furnish the two cantonments with better protection against raids from Independent territory which have caused much anxiety in the past. Recent events have established the necessity for the adoption of effective measures to ensure the safety of residence in those stations.

(b) Hitherto there has been no establishment for 'watch and ward' in these cantonments, which have been dependent for their protection on military patrols and inlying pickets, available for service immediately an alarm is given but affording no general protection except to the buildings they occupy and to certain other points. Watch and ward is a police responsibility and the arrangements now proposed to be undertaken will not relieve the military estimates of any portion of their burden.

		Ordinary sanctioned Strength.	Temporary emergency Strength.
<i>Existing Strength.</i>	<i>Kohat.</i>		
	For investigation . .	13	13
	For Watch and Ward . .	19	8 <i>plus</i> 109 levies.
	<i>Bannu.</i>		
	For investigation . .	17	17
	For Watch and Ward	16	<i>Nil plus</i> 109 levies.
	<i>Cost.</i>		
	<i>Kohat.</i>	Recurring.	Non-recurring.
		Rs.	Rs.
	2 sub-inspectors.	}	}
	9 head constables.		
	100 foot constables.		
	<i>Bannu.</i>	90,000	69,000
	2 sub-inspectors.	}	}
	10 head constables.		
	100 foot constables.		

<i>Proposals for additional Police.</i>			
---	--	--	--

NORTH-WEST FRONTIER PROVINCE INQUIRY COMMITTEE REPORT.

713. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Will Government be pleased to state how far the North-West Frontier Province Inquiry Committee has progressed, and when is the report likely to be published?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: The Honourable Member is referred to my reply to Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan's question No. 617, dated the 8th March 1924.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Is there no definite time within which the report will be published?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: It will not now be a matter of many weeks before the Honourable Members will see it.

MINOR PROVINCES.

714. ***Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh:** Will the Government kindly place on the table a statement giving the names of the Minor Provinces, the administration of which is directly vested in the Central Government; the years in which they were so formed; as well as their annual revenue and expenditure?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: The Minor Provinces to which the Honourable Member refers are presumably the North-West Frontier Province, British Baluchistan, Delhi, Ajmer-Merwara and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. They were formed into Chief Commissionerships in 1901, 1887, 1912, 1871 and 1872, respectively. Information as to the annual revenue and expenditure of each of these Minor Provinces is given in the detailed estimates and demands for grants for the year 1924-25, of which a copy has been supplied to the Honourable Member. I would invite a reference by him to the information on pages 171 to 252 of that volume.

Mr. K. Ahmed: That does not include Berar, Sir, but only Ajmer-Merwara?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: Berar is not a minor administration in point.

Mr. K. Ahmed: What sort of minor administration is Berar then?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: Berar is an administration under the control of the Central Provinces.

LOCAL ALLOWANCES OF POSTAL OFFICIALS IN THE PUNJAB.

715. ***Mr. Chaman Lal:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state the reason for which the Punjab special local allowance paid by the Local Government to their civil employees in receipt of Rs. 99 and less is denied to the postal and R. M. S. staff working in the said province?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons for which the local allowance paid to the postal and R. M. S. staff at the following stations is fixed at a rate lower than that paid to civil employees of the local Government:

1 Murree, 2 Simla, 3 Dharamsala, 4 Kasauli and Khyber area?

Mr. G. B. Clarke: (a) Local allowances are granted to postal (including R. M. S.) officials at a large number of places in the Punjab at rates which are considered suitable having regard to the scales of pay provided for them.

(b) The rates at which local allowances are granted to postal officials at Murree, Simla and Kasauli and in the Khyber area and to Railway Mail Service officials at Simla are considered appropriate, having regard to the scales of pay provided for them. No allowance is given at Dharamsala.

COMPENSATORY ALLOWANCES TO POSTMEN AND POSTAL MENIALS EMPLOYED ON THE FRONTIER OUTPOSTS.

716. ***Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons for which the Frontier compensatory allowance paid to Superintendents and Inspectors, Postmasters and the clerical staff in the Derajat Division is denied to postmen and menial staff even on the Frontier outposts?

Mr. G. B. Clarke: Local allowances under the designation of "special pay" are as a matter of fact, granted to postmen and postal menials at several places in the Derajat Division. Such allowances are not necessary at places where postmen and menials are recruited locally.

SELECTION GRADE APPOINTMENTS IN THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

717. ***Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to state separately the percentage of selection grade appointments in the circle offices and the general line in all postal circles in India separately?

Mr. G. B. Clarke: The whole of the information asked for by the Honourable Member is not available at present but will be supplied to him as soon as possible.

FINES IMPOSED ON POSTAL OFFICIALS OF THE LAHORE GENERAL POST OFFICE.

718. ***Mr. Chaman Lal:** (1) Will the Government be pleased to state the amount of fine and the number of officials fined during the time of Mr. Cordeiro, the Postmaster, Lahore G. P. O., and for the corresponding period of his predecessor?

(2) Is it a fact, that the increments of the following officials were stopped for one year to affect future increments with the result that these officials will have to suffer fines noted against them during the remaining period of their service.

Serial No.	Name.	Amount of Fine up to 24 years' service.
1	Ghulam Haider	300
2	Mool Raj Chuni	300
3	Fazal Hussain	708
4	Ghulam Mohammad	756
5	Duga Dutt.	872
6	Narinjan Dass	1,140
7	Mohammad Sultan	1,140

Mr. G. R. Clarke: (1) Rs. 457-5-0 on 619 officials during the time of Mr. Cordeiro and Rs. 288-9-1 on 473 officials for the corresponding period of his predecessor.

(2) The reply is in the affirmative except that the increment of No. 2—Mool Raj Chuni was stopped for three months without affecting future increments and that the amount shown against No. 7—Mohammad Sultan should be 1,080.

Mr. Chaman Lal: What steps are Government taking to restore the amounts due to these gentlemen?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: None.

SHORTAGE IN THE POSTAL CLERICAL STRENGTH.

719. **Mr. Chaman Lal:** Is it a fact that the postal clerical strength in India is short by 1,200 men according to the present time-test?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: The Honourable Member's attention is invited to the reply given by me on the 25th February 1924 to Mr. Kamini Kumar Chanda's starred question No. 423.

RESPONSIBILITY OF POSTMASTERS FOR THE SAFE CUSTODY OF ARTICLES.

720. **Mr. Chaman Lal:** Is it a fact that Postmasters and Sub-Postmasters are held responsible for the preservation of public advertisements and bookstalls without being remunerated for this extra service?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: Every postmaster has a general responsibility for the safe custody of all articles in the post office under his charge. He will have no special responsibility for the preservation of either advertisements or bookstalls.

PAYMENT OF MILITARY PENSIONS BY POST OFFICES IN THE PUNJAB AND N. W. F. CIRCLE.

721. **Mr. Chaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to state the number of Indian military pensioners paid by each head post office in the Punjab and N. W. F. Circle, the number of staff actually given and the number of staff justified?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: A statement is placed on the table.

Name of Head Office.	Number of pensioners paid.	Staff given.	Staff justified.
Abbottabad	2,876	2	2
Ambala	3,157	3	3
Amritsar	7,106	6	6
Bahawalpur	185	Nil.	Nil.
Bannu	692	1	1
Campbellpur	3,582	3	3
Delhi	1,207	2	2
Dera-Ghazi-Khan	120	Nil.	Nil.

Name of Head Office.	Number of pensioners paid.	Staff given.	Staff justified.
Dera-Ismail-Khan	1,108	2	2
Dharamsala	8,550	7	6
Ferozepur	3,986	3	3
Gujranwala	2,310	2	2
Gujrat	6,094	6	4
Gurdaspur	4,328	3	3
Gurgaon	5,823	5	4
Hissar	6,394	6	5
Hoshiarpur	7,756	7	4
Jammu	841	1	1
Jhang	643	1	1
Jhelum	11,991	10	10
Jullundur	4,616	4	4
Karnal	561	1	1
Kohat	2,315	2	2
Lahore	2,931	2	2
Ludhiana	10,406	8	7
Lyalpur	1,600	2	2
Mianwali	622	1	1
Montgomery	1,394	2	1
Multan	804	1	1
Muzaffarnagar	66	Nil.	Nil.
Peshawar	3,418	3	3
Rawalpindi	12,148	11	11
Rohtak	6,467	6	4
Sargodha	3,346	3	2
Sialkot	3,492	3	3
Simla	425	1	1
Srinagar	1,394	2	1

GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTERIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RAILWAY BOARD.

722. ***Mr. Ohaman Lal:** Will the Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the secretariat establishment of the Railway Board labour under the following disadvantages as compared with the ministerial establishments of the other departments of the Imperial Secretariat as also of some of the offices attached thereto:

- (a) that beyond Superintendentships and the one post of Registrar no individual can look forward to any higher appointment, e.g., that of Assistant Secretaryship, etcetera,
- (b) that claims to any such higher promotion are refused on the ground of an alleged want of suitable technical knowledge,
- (c) that there is no provision for the men to be otherwise compensated for this permanent loss by their being selected to any of the various appointments on the State Railways,
- (d) that during the last 5 years, at least, only some 2 or 3 men have managed to go out on to some of the Railways, in certain special appointments, but that there is no regular provision by the Railway Board for sending out a certain number of men, annually, in both the official and subordinate grades of such appointments as Assistant Traffic Superintendents, Controller of Stores, Traffic Inspector, Claims Inspector, Storekeeper, Inspector of Coaching and Goods, etc.,
- (e) that for all these permanent and material disadvantages, in comparison with not only the other departments of the Imperial Secretariat but also some of the offices attached thereto, the only compensation, and that of a purely temporary nature, is the concession of free railway passes?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I do not propose to answer this question in detail. Some days ago I said in reply to Dr. Gour that examination had shown that the rules relating to the grant of free passes to Railway Board establishment were such that undue advantage could be taken of them and that the rules were being tightened up. This question is obviously intended to elicit information to show that the rules should not be tightened up. But I am not prepared to accept the underlying suggestion that Government are bound to open up identical prospects of advancement to every Department and that if they do not they should compensate in other ways the ministerial establishments of those Departments which consider they are at a disadvantage in this respect. Assistant Secretaries in the Railway Board do not correspond to officers of the same designation in other Departments. They are nearly all railway officers of considerable seniority and technical attainments. It is not the practice to fill these appointments from members of the Railway Board office nor is it considered that service in that office qualifies men for the appointments on Railways referred to in part (d) of the question.

TEMPORARY HANDS IN THE OFFICE OF THE RAILWAY BOARD.

723. ***Mr. Ohaman Lal:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state as to how many temporary hands there are in the Railway Board Secretariat establishment and with what service as such? Will Government be pleased to tabulate the number of assistants and clerks separately?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state whether they are prepared to exercise their powers in absorbing a certain number of their permanent ministerial establishment into both the superior and subordinate grades of the Traffic Stores and other Departments of the State Railways as a regular annual measure?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Railway Board have recently entertained in their *permanent* ministerial establishment certain men from outside (as distinct from retrenched men) on the grounds of their possessing certain technical knowledge; but who, to all intents and purposes, are employed on purely clerical work as is performed by the other members of the staff. If so, why have these men been brought in above the heads of the existing temporary staff?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) A statement giving the information is laid on the table.

(b) The Honourable Member is referred to the reply just given.

(c) One man has recently been appointed from outside because he possessed special knowledge of statistical work.

Statement of Temporary Assistants and Clerks in Office of Railway Board.

1 Assistant with over 6 years' service.

1 " " " 5 " "

2 Assistants " " 3 " "

6 Clerks " " 6 " "

4 " " " 5 " "

2 " " " 4 " "

2 " " " 3 " "

2 " " " 2 " "

3 " " " 1 year's "

5 " " " under 1 " "

1 Stenographer with over 6 years' service.

LEAVE RESERVE FOR THE OFFICE OF THE RAILWAY BOARD.

724. ***Mr. Chaman Lal:** (a) Will the Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a leave reserve has been sanctioned for the Imperial Secretariat establishments, but that the Railway Board ministerial staff are excluded from participation in this privilege?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state why this exception is being made? If it is on the grounds of any re-organisation, under consideration, of the staff, then will such re-organisation give effect to the benefits of the leave reserve for the Railway Board ministerial staff?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) Yes.

(b) The question of forming a leave reserve for the office of the Railway Board has been held over pending the reorganisation of the office.

PREMATURE DEATHS AMONG POSTMEN AND MENIALS IN BOMBAY.

725. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state the number of postmen and menials in Bombay that died, during the last five

years, before the date on which they were to be due for pension? Will they also be pleased to state whether, on account of the premature deaths of these postmen and menials, their relatives got some help and if given, in what proportion? Will they also state the reasons of the premature deaths of these postmen and menials?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: The number of postmen and menials who died while still in service during the last 5 years was 61 and 40 respectively. Pecuniary help was given in 22 cases during 1922-23 and 1923-24. The amount paid did not exceed Rs. 50 in any case. Information for previous years is not available. The reasons for the deaths are not known.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government be pleased to inquire into the causes of deaths?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: It is not the custom to make inquiries of the causes of death of persons in the Department.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: If it is shown that, ordinarily, a number of people die early, is it not the duty of Government to make inquiries?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: I am not aware that these people have died early.

SCALES OF PAY OF CERTAIN CLASSES OF POSTAL OFFICIALS IN BOMBAY.

726. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state the scales of pay of readers, overseers and local sorters of the postal department that obtained in Bombay in 1900 and that is obtaining at present? Will they also be pleased to state the scales of pay of the postal clerks in these years?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: The officials of the clerical class who are now on a time-scale of Rs. 50—140 were in the year 1900 in grades ranging from Rs. 20 to Rs. 90.

The local sorters, who in 1900 were on a fixed pay of Rs. 30, are now on the time-scale for clerks, namely, Rs. 50 to 140.

In 1900 the rates of pay for reader and overseer postmen were Rs. 20 and Rs. 30 respectively. These officials are now on a time-scale of Rs. 27 to Rs. 45 *plus* a house rent allowance of Rs. 7 *plus* in the case of reader postmen a "special pay" of Rs. 7-8-0 and in the case of overseer postmen a "special pay" of Rs. 10 a month.

PROMOTION OF POSTMEN AND POSTAL MENIALS.

727. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the postal clerks are allowed to rise up to the selection grade during the period of their service while in the case of postmen and menials of the same Department, they are not allowed to rise after the limit of 21 years of service is reached? If so, will Government be pleased to state why has this distinction been kept?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: There are no selection grades for postmen and postal menials as such.

There are however appointments of head, sorting and overseer postmen carrying a special allowance over and above the ordinary pay for postmen. The rules of the Department also provide for the promotion of postmen, who possess the requisite qualifications, not only to departmental branch

postmasterships but also to appointments in the regular clerical line. All suitable menials are eligible for promotion to the grade of postman and thereafter for further promotion if they possess the requisite qualifications. I am not aware of any limit of 21 years' service as stated by the Honourable Member.

GRANT OF HOUSE RENT ALLOWANCES TO SUBORDINATE POSTAL OFFICIALS IN BOMBAY.

728. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the same amount is granted as house-rent in Bombay to the postman, the reader, the overseer and a menial? If so, why has not the status of these different men been taken into account in granting house-rent allowance?

Mr. G. R. Clarke: A house rent allowance of Rs. 7 a month is granted both to postmen (including reader and overseer postmen) and to menials, because although there is a difference in their official status, they belong to the same class socially and their style of living is presumably the same. A flat rate of Rs. 7 was recommended by the Postal Committee.

GRANT OF PENSIONS AND PRIVILEGE LEAVE FACILITIES TO MENIALS OF THE POSTAL DEPARTMENT.

729. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state the reasons against granting pension and privilege leave facilities to menial servants of the Postal Department, like other servants?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: The menial servants of the Postal Department receive pensions similar to those given to menial servants of other Departments. The Honourable Member is referred to Article 481 (v) (5) of the Civil Service Regulations.

The Government of India are considering the question of framing special rules to regulate the granting of leave to menial servants of all Departments including the Postal Department. In the meantime it has been decided that the grant of leave to menials should be subject to the condition formerly in force under the Civil Service Regulations that such leave will not involve any extra cost to Government.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I ask the Honourable Member to repeat his answer as regards pensions?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: I will read it again.

"The menial servants of the Postal Department receive pensions similar to those given to menial servants of other departments. The Honourable Member is referred to Article 481 (b) (5) of the Civil Service Regulations."

Mr. N. M. Joshi: It is somewhat difficult to understand it as I have not got the book. I do not know what are the pension rules in other departments but my information is that they are not given pensions at the same rates at which the Honourable Member will get his pension. Is it a fact?

(No reply was given.)

INCREMENT OF LESS THAN A RUPEE FOR POSTAL SERVANTS.

730. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that under the time scale if the increment in the pay of the postal servants comes to less than a Rupee, it is not paid every year? If so, why?

Mr. G. B. Clarke: The question presumably relates to the fact that practically all the time-scales sanctioned for postmen, mail guards and inferior servant provide for the grant of an increment of Re. 1 or more at intervals exceeding a year. If so, the reply is that this arrangement involves less trouble in administrative and account offices than would be entailed if increments of proportionately smaller amounts were granted annually and the larger increments are more acceptable to the staff.

RETRENCHMENT ON THE G. I. P. RAILWAY.

731. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi (a)** Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the retrenchment officer appointed by the G. I. P. Railway has recommended some reductions of officers' posts? If so, how many posts has he recommended for reductions? Will Government be further pleased to state whether his recommendations have been accepted and how many of them have been given effect to? If not, why not?

(b) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the retrenchment officer of the G. I. P. Railway has recommended to reduce the number of the senior subordinate posts? If so, how many posts were recommended for such reductions and how many have been given effect to?

(c) Will Government be further pleased to state whether it is a fact that in giving effect to the recommendations of the retrenchment officer, only junior subordinate posts were reduced? If so, how many of them were reduced and why?

(d) Will Government also give the total number of (1) senior subordinate posts and (2) junior subordinate posts before the recommendations of the retrenchment officer were given effect to? How many in each one of them were held by Indians and how many Indians and non-Indians were retrenched in each of the senior and junior Subordinate posts?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: All available information on the subject is contained in the Explanatory memorandum of the Railway Budget.

REPORT OF THE RETRENCHMENT OFFICER ON THE CLAIMS BRANCH OF THE G. I. P. RAILWAY.

732. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** (a) Will Government be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the retrenchment officer of the G. I. P. Railway while reviewing the work of the Claims Branch of the G. I. P. Railway, has pointed out that it has been a fraud office? Is it also a fact that in spite of the bad report by the retrenchment officer on this office, its officer in charge has been promoted?

(b) Will Government be pleased to place a copy of the report of the said retrenchment officer on the Claims Branch on the table for the information of the Members of the Indian Legislature?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: (a) Government have no information but will make inquiries.

(b) The report was made to the Company and not to the Government.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government inquire whether the retrenchment officer called a particular branch office of the G. I. P. Railway a fraud office?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I understand the retrenchment officer made some severe criticisms upon that office but have not seen that report myself.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will Government enquire for that report and find out whether that statement was made?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I have no further information to give on the subject. I think the report is in the Board's office.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Will the Honourable Member be pleased to place that report, this being a very serious affair, in the Library of the Legislature?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I do not propose to do so, Sir.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh: Will the Government kindly state why they will not do so?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: Because, Sir, I consider that, if reports of this kind are laid on the table here or placed in the Library in future, the officers who make these reports will not make such free or such full reports.

Pandit Sham Lal Nehru: Have the Government taken any action on the report?

The Honourable Sir Charles Innes: I am sure the Agent has, Sir.

GRANT OF COMPENSATORY ALLOWANCES TO THE STAFF OF THE POSTAL AND TELEGRAPH DEPARTMENT IN PRESIDENCY TOWNS, AND IN RANGOON AND KARACHI.

738. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state whether they have considered the question regarding the grant of compensatory allowance to the staff in the Postal and Telegraph Department in the Presidency towns and in Rangoon and Karachi? If so, what is their decision? If not, will they expedite the consideration and come to a decision at an early date?

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: The question of compensatory allowances in the more expensive towns has recently been considered by a Committee. It is a question of general application and not merely confined to the Posts and Telegraphs Department. When proposals for the latter Department are formulated, they will be laid before the Standing Finance Committee as requested at a recent meeting.

EMIGRATION AGENT IN MAURITIUS.

734. ***Mr. N. M. Joshi:** Will Government be pleased to state whether they have appointed an Emigration Agent in Mauritius? If so, when, and what are the conditions of his employment?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: The reply is in the negative.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: May I know why an Emigration Agent was not appointed in Mauritius?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: Government have appointed Agents in Ceylon and Malaya and are waiting to see the results of their work before deciding upon a similar appointment in Mauritius.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: How long are they likely to wait?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: The Agents in Ceylon and Malaya have only recently been appointed. Government are waiting to see how the experiment works.

Mr. N. M. Joshi: Do they expect any difficulty in the working of the experiment?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: The question is whether it is worth while to spend the necessary money.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: May I ask what this experiment has to do with Mauritius?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: It has nothing directly to do with Mauritius. What I intended to imply was that the keeping of Agents in Ceylon and Malaya was a new departure, and that Government were waiting to see how the experiment worked there before deciding whether to incur further expenditure on a similar agency in Mauritius.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: May I know how long the Government expect to wait?

Mr. M. S. D. Butler: I cannot state any definite time but Government will no doubt wait at least a year to see how the experiment works.

INCOME-TAX ASSESSMENT IN THE PUNJAB.

735. ***Makhdum Syed Rajan Baksh Shah:** (a) Will the Government please say what are the directions of the Government issued to the Income-tax authorities for the assessment of the income tax?

(b) Are the Government aware that the present method of assessment pursued by the income-tax authorities is absolutely unfair and unsatisfactory and the methods of inquiry adopted by the income-tax inspectors are arbitrary, perfunctory, one-sided and hasty, which result in unnecessary trouble to the public?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to lay on the table a statement showing:—

(i) the number of persons on whom income-tax has been levied for the first time during the year 1921, 1922, 1923, respectively, in the Multan Division of the Punjab Province,

(ii) how many of this number produced their returns of accounts duly filled in and how many of these returns were disbelieved and on what grounds.

(d) Are the Government aware that in Multan city of the Punjab Province there is great dissatisfaction among the public regarding the income-tax assessment, where the income-tax is being levied on ordinary

shop-keepers, artisans, etc., who equitably would not be liable, but are being entangled on the mere hearsay reports and opinions of income-tax inspectors without any regard to the returns of accounts rendered by them which are disbelieved while no proper inquiry is made? If so, will the Government be pleased to invite the attention of the officials concerned to adopt sound methods of inquiry?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: (a) The assessment of income-tax is governed by the Income-tax Act and the instructions published in the Income-tax Manual which is on sale to the public.

(b) The Government are not aware what method the Honourable Member refers to. The Income-tax Act provides ample opportunities of appeal by the assessee and on points of law he can claim a reference to the High Court. They are not aware that the work of Inspectors is unsatisfactory. It is their policy to restrict the employment of such officers so far as possible and to require Income-tax Officers to collect their own information. The number of Inspectors in the Punjab is being reduced, from 56 to 34. It is open to an assessee to produce proof of his income and if he does so, it will no doubt be accepted by the Income-tax Officers or in the last resort by the appellate authorities.

(c) The Government have not the desired information on the subject.

(d) No. If the assessee is dissatisfied with the Income-tax Officers' assessments, they can appeal to the Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, and if they are dissatisfied with the Assistant Commissioner's decisions on appeal, they can approach the Income-tax Commissioner, who will no doubt exercise his powers of review when necessary.

UNSTARRED QUESTION AND ANSWER.

APPOINTMENTS AND SALARIES OF CERTAIN CLASSES OF OFFICERS IN DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA.

195. **Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:** Will the Government be pleased to place on the table:

- (a) A statement of the appointments and the salaries attached thereto now reserved by statutory rules for the members of the Indian Civil Service in the Departments of the Government of India;
- (b) A statement of the appointments and the salaries attached thereto now held by the members of the Provincial Services in India in the Departments of the Government of India;
- (c) A statement of the appointments in the Departments of the Government of India and the salaries attached thereto now held by officers who do not belong either to the Indian Civil Service or to the Provincial Services?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The information asked for is being collected and will be laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT BY THE BRITISH CABINET OF A COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhamma-
dan): Sir, may I put the question of which I have given private notice to
the Honourable the Home Member. It runs thus:

"Has the attention of Government been drawn to a statement appearing in the
press cabled by the special correspondent of the "Statesman" in its issue of the
8th March to the effect that the Cabinet has appointed a Committee to consider Indian
affairs with authority to consult Members of the Secretary of State's Council and
others?

(b) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the statement made in the
"Daily Herald" to the effect that the Committee will consult Members of Parliament
as well as representatives of Indian opinion and that the decision of the Cabinet was
regarded by members of the Labour Party as the first step towards meeting the
insistent Indian demands for further consideration of the claims for self-government?

(c) Will the Government be pleased to inform the House as to what is the
personnel, objective and functions of this Cabinet Committee?

(d) Will the Government be pleased to state what action it has taken to institute
the inquiry promised to be made by the Government of India with a view, in the first
instance, to ascertain the defects in the present Reforms Act?

(e) How far the functions of this Committee supplement those of the Cabinet
Committee?

2. (a) Is it a fact, as stated in the "Daily Herald", that Indian delegates will
be consulted by the Cabinet Committee?

(b) If so, will the Government be pleased to consider the advisability of asking the
Assembly to elect its own delegates with a view to assist the Cabinet Committee in
its inquiry as to what further steps should be taken for giving India a larger measure
of self-government?"

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): I thought it ad-
visable to accept notice of Dr. Gour's question, because it raises a matter
in which the Assembly is no doubt greatly interested. I have wired to the
Secretary of State asking for further information on the press statements
referred to by Dr. Gour. The news given in the papers that a Committee
of the Cabinet has been formed is correct. The Secretary of State has in-
formed us that a Cabinet Committee has been constituted to consider
Indian affairs, with authority to consult Members of the Secretary of
State's Council and others. Further information than that I regret that
I am not able at the moment to give. The Secretary of State informs us
that the Cabinet Committee is already in operation, but what will be the
exact scope of its functions or its procedure, we do not know. If further
information on the subject is given us, I shall communicate it to the
House, and it is possible that that information in itself will supply the
answer to the remainder of Dr. Gour's question.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muham-
madan Urban): May I ask the Honourable the Home Member if the at-
tention of the Government has been drawn to another cable which appeared
in the papers that a question was put in the House of Lords as to whether
this Committee was anything new or only one on the lines of the Committee
which was appointed last year, and that the answer was that it was only
on the lines of the Committee appointed last year? .

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I think the Honourable Mem-
ber is confusing the two Committees. If I am correct—I naturally speak
subject to correction—the answer given in the House of Lords merely re-
ferred to the reconstitution of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, which,

as the Honourable Member knows, has been sitting regularly since the passing of the Government of India Act. As I understand, that Committee has been now reconstituted. The telegram to which Dr. Gour referred and in regard to which I gave an answer, refers to a Cabinet Committee, which is of course of a different nature.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadian): Is it not a fact that an announcement was made by the Prime Minister that he was going to appoint Committees for each one of his Departments, and is it not a fact that this particular Committee is only in pursuance of the policy announced by the Prime Minister?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: That possibly may be so.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: Sir, have Government any information with regard to the personnel of the Committee?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: None.

Dr. H. S. Gour: May I inquire whether the Honourable the Home Member has cabled to the Secretary of State for fuller information on the lines suggested in my question?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I cabled to the Secretary of State for any information that he could give us at present in regard to the Committee in question.

Mr. R. K. Sanmukham Chetty (Salem and Coimbatore *cum* North Arcot: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Sir, is this the first instance in which a Committee of this nature—a Cabinet Committee—has been appointed?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I am unable to say whether it is the first time that a Cabinet Committee has been appointed in regard to Indian affairs, but I am aware that Cabinet Committees have been appointed in regard to many other matters.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru (Meerut Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): Is the Cabinet Committee coming out to India?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I can of course give no answer to that question save that I do not know what would happen to the English Cabinet if many of its Members came out to India.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadian Urban): May I ask the Honourable the Home Member if this Committee has anything to do with the Departmental Committee which he promised us during the discussion on this question sometime ago?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Cabinet Committee, Sir?

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Yes. Will that abrogate your idea of a Departmental Committee?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: It will certainly not abrogate our inquiry.

Mr. K. C. Roy (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): May I ask the Leader of the House if he is aware that a similar Cabinet Committee was appointed when the Montford Reforms Act was under consideration?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I believe that was the case, Sir. The precise details are not within my recollection, but no doubt the Honourable Member remembers them more accurately than I do.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: Were the Government of India consulted before this Committee was appointed?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: No, Sir, the Government of India were not consulted.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Will the Honourable the Home Member inform us whether this Committee is going to consider the question of a revision of the Government of India Act?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I am afraid I have given the House all the information I possess on the subject. The Honourable Member is now pumping from a rather dry well.

Mr. K. Ahmed (Rajshahi Division: Muhammadan Rural): Will the Government of India be pleased to recommend some names of Indians to be included in the Joint Committee, and at the same time request the Joint Committee to consider the matter of amending the Government of India Act, 1919?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I am afraid I did not exactly catch the Honourable Member's question.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Will the Government of India be pleased to send in names of certain Indian gentlemen who may be included in the Joint Committee, and are they in a position to request the Joint Committee to consider the question of the amendment of the Government of India Act, 1919, so that the grievances of the Indian people may be removed?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member is perhaps referring to the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

Mr. K. Ahmed: Yes, Sir.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: We could not suggest the names of Indians to appear before that Committee until they were asked for by the Committee itself.

Mr. Abul Kasem (Bengal: Nominated Non-Official): Will the Honourable the Home Member state if this Committee is to inquire into the working of the Government of India Act?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Cabinet Committee, Sir?

Mr. Abul Kasem: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: There, again, Sir, I am afraid the Honourable Member is asking for information which at the moment I cannot give. If we obtain further information, I shall give it to the House. More than that I cannot say.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao (Godavari *cum* Kistna: Non-Muhammadan Urban): May I ask whether, since the speech of Lord Olivier in the House of Lords, the Government of India have had any communication with him on the subject of constitutional reforms, and if so, what further communications have taken place?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: We have had no communications with the Secretary of State since then.

Mr. Shambhu Dayal Misra (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan): May I ask what is the meaning of the words "and others"? Do they mean the Government of India?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: If those words are defined in any further communication we may have, I shall give the information.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: May I ask the Honourable the Home Member if he is prepared to take the House into his confidence as regards the contents of the cablegram he has sent to England about the Cabinet Committee which the Honourable Member has referred to?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Regarding the Cabinet Committee, Sir?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Yes.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Certainly. It merely asked for information. "It seems advisable that in view of our Budget discussion we should be in a position to give as full information on the subject as possible." That is all we said.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Will the Honourable Member consider the advisability of adjourning the Budget discussion till this reply comes?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I am afraid I cannot do so; we know nothing about the date on which we may receive any further information.

Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh (Tirhut Division: Non-Muhammadan): May I take it, Sir, that there is nothing specially important in this announcement of Reuter?

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: The Honourable Member may take only this, that I have given him all the information on the subject, and any implication he likes to attach to it will be his own and not mine.

THE INDIAN CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey (Home Member): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the date on or before which the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Indian Penal Code and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, for the purpose of affording greater protection to persons under the age of 18 years has been instructed to present its report be extended from the 10th March 1924 to the 26th March, 1924."

The matters dealt with by the Select Committee are somewhat complicated and indeed somewhat far-reaching, and, although we have done our best we have not been able as yet to arrive at a stage where we can present our report to the House. We therefore ask for an extension of the period up to the 26th of March 1924.

The motion was adopted.

THE INDIAN INCOME-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, I present the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Indian income-tax Act, 1922, for certain purposes.

SALARY OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Sir, on a point of order, may I inquire whether certain items that have been classed as non-votable items are really so or not? In the first place I shall draw your attention to page 46 of the detailed estimates under the heading Legislative Bodies, Legislative Assembly. Now, Sir, the salary of the President of the Legislative Assembly for all the 12 months has been classed as a non-votable item. If we refer to the Government of India Act, section 68-C, which deals with this subject, we find that this section provides that a President of the Legislative Assembly will be appointed by the Governor General for the first four years beginning from the first day of the session of the Assembly and thereafter he will be elected by the Assembly itself. Sub-section (5) of the same section of the Government of India Act says that, so long as the President is appointed by His Excellency the Governor General, his salary would be fixed by the Governor General and as such it would be entirely non-votable. But as soon as the President is appointed by the Legislative Assembly, his salary has got to be fixed by the Legislative Assembly itself, and in my opinion this part of the salary for which this year's Budget provides ought to be a votable item. Sir, I ask for a ruling on that point of order.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): On a point of order, Sir, may I know whether this comes in on the general discussion now or when it comes on a particular demand?

Mr. President: It will be more appropriate to raise it under the heading of "General Administration". I do not quite appreciate whether it is a point of order at all one way or the other.

THE BUDGET—LIST OF DEMANDS.

SECOND STAGE.

Expenditure from Revenue.

DEMAND No. 1—CUSTOMS.

Mr. President: The Assembly will now proceed to the consideration of the Demands for Grants.

The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 73,17,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Customs'."

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, since the Demands for Grants were in print, we have discovered that we can reduce

this grant by Rs. 1,33,000 owing to a decision arrived at by the Standing Finance Committee on the 24th of February. I should like, therefore, if I may, to ask that the motion might be that a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,84,000 be granted instead of Rs. 73,17,000.

Dr. H. S. Gour (Central Provinces Hindi Divisions: Non-Muham-madan): I move for the adjournment of the debate for three days to enable this House to receive the promised despatch from the Secretary of State on the important question which we have raised this morning and upon which the Honourable the Home Member has promised an early reply. I would, therefore, ask, Sir, that this House do stand adjourned for the consideration of this Budget three days hence.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley (Home Member): Before the Honourable Member's motion is considered, may I make my own position in the matter clear? The Honourable Member refers to a promised despatch; he states also that I have promised an early reply. But the actual fact is that I have asked the Secretary of State for information, and have communicated to the House the information so far received from him; I have also promised to ask him for any further information at such time as he is able to give it. I cannot undertake that that will be at an early date, for it depends on him and not on us, and I certainly do not believe that we could receive any further information within three days.

Mr. President: The motion being one of dilatory character, it is for the Chair to accept it or not. As the Honourable Member will have an opportunity of discussing the policy of the Government of India on the motion that the Finance Bill be now considered, I think I had better suggest to him not to move the motion to-day. Refusal to allow the motion to-day, does not mean that the opportunity for considering that matter will not arise, and therefore I do not propose to accept the Honourable Member's motion.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Customs'."

Ruling as to the order in which motions should be considered.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Halley: Will you allow me, Sir, to ask as a point of order, where we stand with regard to some of the motions which I see on the paper before us? We have various motions for reduction, by Rs. 100, by Rs 12 lakhs, and the like, but we also have a motion "that the demand under this head . . . be omitted," and I see that motion repeated in respect of various other Demands. If I am correct that motion is a direct negative, but my immediate point is to ask for your ruling on the order in which these motions will be taken. If a motion for reduction by Rs. 100 is accepted, then, it will not, I understand, be possible to put the motion that the head be omitted. Some difficulty arises in our minds as to the method of allowing the Honourable Member who has put that motion, and who no doubt is somewhat anxious to press it, an opportunity of doing so.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muham-madan Urban): Sir, the point of order raised by my Honourable friend would, I think, be sufficiently answered by the terms of paragraph 131 of

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

the Legislative Assembly Manual of Business and Procedure, which reproduces Rule 48. That paragraph runs as follows:

"No motion for appropriation can be made, except on the recommendation of the Governor General communicated to the Assembly.

(2) Motions may be moved at this stage "

—this stage being the stage of voting on Demands for Grants—

"to omit or reduce any grant, but not to increase or alter the destination of a grant."

I submit that my motion is a motion to omit the grant and it comes quite clearly within sub-clause (2) of clause 181 of this Manual. As for the difficulty as regards the reduction of the grant by Rs. 100 preceding my motion for the omission of the whole grant, that, I submit, is a question for you. It is for you, Sir, to arrange the order in which these various amendments shall be put to the House. If my motion was in time and proper, my right to move it cannot be affected simply because the printer has chosen to print it as No. 2 and not as No. 1.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I was not questioning the right. I was only asking how it can be done?

Pandit Motilal Nehru: That is a matter which I leave in the hands of the Chair.

Mr. V. J. Patel (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): The reason why we gave notice of this and similar amendments is this. Under Standing Order 72 it is provided that:

"If notice of a motion to omit or reduce any grant has not been given two clear days before the day on which the demand is to be considered, any Member may object to the moving of the motion, and such objection shall prevail, unless the President, in the exercise of his power to suspend this Standing Order, allows the motion to be made."

We thought that, if we did not give the notice of a motion to omit any grant, it may be that this rule may be so construed as to debar us from moving any such motion. It was in view of this consideration that we gave the notice and it is entirely for you, Sir, to decide whether we can move it or not.

Mr. President: This difficulty has been brought to me because motions can be moved at this stage under the terms of Rule 48 to omit or reduce any grant. This expressly conflicts with the statement of the Standing Order 38 that an amendment may not be moved which has merely the effect of a negative vote. Our practice has been to follow the Standing Order but, if the Honourable Member insists, we shall have to follow the other practice. As things stand, Mr. Neogy has withdrawn his motion to reduce the demand by Rs. 100. The Honourable Member will observe that, if I were to call his motion first and if he was fortunate enough to secure a majority for it, then I will have to exclude those who wish to discuss the details of the Customs Administration. I am not in a position to decide whether it is more important that the Honourable Member should have the opportunity of throwing out the entire grant before others have had the opportunity of discussing the administration of the Customs Department or not. I understand that it is the general desire, though I have had no official information from either side of the House on the subject, to discuss the major question included in the proposition put forward by Pandit Motilal Nehru. Therefore, I should like, if possible, to arrive at

an understanding with the Assembly that, if we agree to have a general discussion on this demand for Customs, no further general discussion of that character can arise under any other motion to omit other grants. I am ready to offer the House the opportunity of going beyond the strict limits of the vote on Customs at this particular stage, provided they understand that when other motions are made they will not be able to raise the same points under other demands for grants.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I am quite prepared to accept that course, as far as we are concerned.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I am not in a position to say what the sense of the House is as to whether the motion which stands in my name should be taken up first or the other motions which merely propose reductions by small sums. But I would like you, Sir, to throw some more light upon the observation you just made which I understood to mean that on this grant and at this stage you will not allow a discussion except on points referring to the grant itself. (*Several Honourable Members:* "No, no: that is the other way".)

Mr. President: I am sorry I did not make my meaning clear. In view of the special circumstances of the case and the fact that this Assembly has always tried to follow the spirit and not the letter of the law, I am prepared in this case to allow a discussion on matters outside the Customs vote which may arise on the question that that grant be made, on the clear understanding that, though similar motions are down referring to other demands later on in the Demands for Grants, I shall not allow that discussion to be resumed on each separate demand. After we have disposed of this particular case one way or the other, the discussions must be closely restricted to matters relevant to each demand. I draw Mr. Rama Aiyangar's attention to the fact that, as I pointed out to the Honourable Pandit on the other side of the House, if the Pandit secures a majority for the proposal that the grant be omitted or money be not granted, then his (Mr. Rama Aiyangar's) opportunity to raise details of Customs administration falls. He will not have that opportunity.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar (Madura and Ramnad *cum* Tinnevely: Non-Muhammadian Rural): On this matter I will abide by the decision of the Honourable Pandit. If he allows me to move my motion, then I will move it; but if he thinks his motion to be more important, then I will withdraw mine.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member has not quite appreciated the point. The intention of those who have put down motions to throw out the demands is different from the Honourable Member's intention, which is either to save money or to criticise administration. I have been pointing out that there is a clash of interest between these two processes. If the matter is put to me I must rule that the major interests take precedence of the minor interests.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the demand under the head Customs be omitted."

I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity you have accorded to me at this early stage of the debate to address the House on this motion. It is necessary for me at the very outset to explain the exact meaning and scope

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

of the motion. I have to thank you, Sir, that you have in your preliminary remarks clarified the position so far as the principle upon which I base my motion is concerned. I may at once concede that it has nothing whatever to do with any criticism of the various items that are included in this demand nor with any grievance which may be connected with any particular branch of the Customs Department. I have no doubt that those who have studied the Budget and its various heads will be able to point to a number of items which should either be omitted, being such as should never have found a place in the Budget, or which, if they are allowed to remain there, should be very considerably reduced. I confess that I have not studied the whole Budget or this head particularly from that point of view, but I may, in passing, mention that there is one item which cannot escape the notice of even a cursory observer who turns over the pages, and that is the item of the excise duty on cotton. I do not, however, as I have already submitted, rely upon that or any particular item or put my case upon any grievance which may arise under it. To put it shortly, Sir, I propose on general grounds to refuse to vote money for the needs of the Government of India. My grievance is not against this or that branch of the administration but against the entire administration of the Government of India. I have selected Customs simply because it happens to be the first item on the list of grants.

Now, Sir, why is it that I make a grievance against the entire system of administration of the Government of India? The reason will be apparent to the minds of the House. It is nothing more nor less than the very unsatisfactory nature of the response which has been made to the Resolution which this House passed by a large majority last month on the subject of the establishment of responsible government in India. I say that I am perfectly entitled, Sir, to stand on this ground, and I may at once inform the House, especially some of the more nervous Members of it, that it has nothing whatever to do with what has been described as the wrecking or destroying policy of the non-co-operators. It is a perfectly constitutional and legitimate means of bringing a very serious grievance to the notice of the Government, and, when other remedies have failed, it is the only course open to people who have outstanding grievances. I wish here to point out to the House that I am using nothing which is by any means the special property of the non-co-operator. I am indeed doing nothing new as will appear from the following paragraph in Taswell-Langmead's *English Constitutional History*, which deals with this matter. It is to be found on page 290 and runs:

"The dependence of supplies on the redress of grievances originated under Richard II. It had previously been usual for the king not to answer petitions until the last day of the session, when the supplies had of course been granted. The attempt to invert this order of proceeding had been declared by Richard II's judges to be high treason. But in the second of Henry IV. the commons again endeavoured to secure this important lever for the application of parliamentary power. The king resisted firmly, and the commons gave way for the time, but the practice gradually gained ground."

Now I wish particularly that Honourable Members will bear clearly in mind the difference between the effect of a motion of this character when it is raised in a free House, in a House to which the Executive Government is responsible, and when it is raised in a House like this in which the Executive Government has the serene satisfaction of doing what it pleases, whatever we may say or we may do. It is important to understand the exact nature and effect of such a motion as it varies with the powers of the House

in which it is made. To show what it is in England, I would here beg permission to quote from the English translation of the book entitled "The Budget", originally written in French by René Stourm, which is a standard book on the subject. I read from page 385. This is what Fox said in the House of Commons on February 20th, 1784, in the course of his long continued controversy with Pitt, with which the House will be familiar as a matter of history:

"It cannot be contested that the Constitution gives to the House the right to refuse the funds; but this is a weapon which the House must use with caution and only when the public cause imperatively demands such action. I shall always uphold this right . . . This is a struggle between the prerogatives of the Crown and the prerogatives of representatives of the people. The Chamber should use all the means within its powers to defend these privileges; this is a duty which the Constitution imposes upon the House. To withhold the demanded funds is the most powerful of all weapons, and must, I admit, be used in the last resort. If the ministers should persist in their obstinacy and push things to the extreme, it would be perfectly proper to use this right which makes the distinction between a free people and the slaves of an absolute monarchy."

Now, I beg Honourable Members to bear clearly in mind the distinction pointed out here between a "free people" and the "slaves of an absolute monarchy." In the case of a free people, what are the consequences that follow a motion of this kind, if it is allowed? Here they are—at page 381:

"To refuse to vote the budget! One can scarcely conceive the consequences of such an eventuality. If the year were to open without the budget having been voted, the bondholders could not get their interest; nor the pensioners their pensions; the tradesmen would beat in vain at the gates of the Treasury; the officials would work without salaries; the schools would be closed; the Army would be deprived of its pay, of its livelihood, of its equipment, of its provisions. All the functionaries of the State, that is to say practically everybody, would find himself affected; the activities of the country would be paralyzed."

That, Sir, is the result of a vote on a motion of this kind being carried in a free country and in a House where the Legislature has an Executive subordinate to it. But what are the consequences here? Instead, as described here, of the tradesmen beating in vain at the gates of the Treasury, all that can happen after we have passed this Resolution is that tradesmen and others will only beat their own heads instead of beating at the gates of the Treasury when the Demand is restored. I may be allowed to read another little extract which shows that, even when grave consequences follow in free countries, it is the incumbent duty of the representatives of the people to resort to the motion and to carry it notwithstanding all these consequences, if the nature of the grievance justifies it. This is at page 389 of the same book and is taken from the debate in the French Chamber of Deputies:

"Perfectly independent legislators, imbued with the feeling of the sanctity of their duties, should not be afraid to refuse to vote the Budgets if the latter fail to give them the desired guarantees against abuses. Nothing is less surprising than the fact that individuals in power are of a different opinion and that they fear such procedure likely to over-turn the State . . . but that individuals, who take no part in the plunder, should consider this useful firmness a dangerous extremity, is a sign of weakness which protects extravagance and corruption and is an accomplice to the downfall of governments!"

I need not give any more extracts. I may mention that, since the year 1784, it is stated in this book that such a motion has never been made in England. And why? Because the occasion never arose to make such a motion. The development of the constitution made it impossible for the Government in power to resist the will of the people even for one second, to say nothing for a longer time. The right is still there, but it is a right which has been correctly described as a weapon lying rusting in the armoury

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

of the constitution. That is so in England. We here, if we are to do our duty in this House, have not to take out a rusty weapon from the armoury but to forge one clean and burnished and get familiar with its use to protect the rights of the people whom we represent after acquiring the power to do so. For the present what is the effect? The highest that it can be put at is that it will amount to a strong protest—as strong as this House can make—against the action we complain of. The helplessness of the representatives of the people cannot be better illustrated than by the discussion of the Budget in this House. We assembled last week in this Chamber in all seriousness as representatives of the people to consider demands approximating nearly 150 crores—more accurately Rs. 131 and odd crores—as if we were going to apply this huge sum for the benefit of the people and in doing so were exercising our independent judgment. But, we were only doing something like what children playing at soldiers do. There were all the parliamentary forms; there were all the parliamentary paraphernalia; there were the formalities and the conventionalities; but what was the substance? Where did the substance lie? Had we at any time in the course of the discussion, or have we to-day, any real control over the most insignificant item entered in this Budget? Of course we can have our say and after we have had our say, it will be for His Excellency the Governor General to consider what is essential for the administration and what is not, and whatever is essential he will certify. Now, Honourable Members will remember that, when this Budget was introduced by my Honourable friend the Finance Member, the words of Lord Olivier were ringing in our ears. They were first heard over the cables in a Reuter's message, rather disjointed and in sections, and, when they were so heard, they sent a cold wave throughout the country. That wave has now passed away. The fragments of that long message have now been pieced together. They have been considered by the country and the incessant cry from every quarter of India is "throw out the Budget". And why? Because the response made in the House of Lords is totally unsatisfactory and disappointing. Well, as I have said, we cannot really throw out the Budget but we must do what we can and we have been allowed an opportunity to do what we can by raising a debate in respect of this item. What I say is this. It is not, as Lord Olivier puts it, that we, like cross children, say, "we will not play." The real fact is that we refuse to play an unfair game in which both sides do not occupy an equal footing and equal advantages. We took the earliest opportunity of saying in this House that we cannot join in it until you revise the rules of the game. The rules have not been revised. No immediate or early prospect of a revision of the rules is held out. What is said is, "we will see if we cannot within these rules find something which would make the actual play fair to you and fair to us." That was the reply given in this House by my Honourable friend, the Home Member. When the cable from England arrived, after a good deal of expectation and the building of many castles in the air, it turned out that Lord Olivier was not prepared to go any further, or advance the case any further at all than what my Honourable friend, the Home Member, had done in his speech in this House. That response, I submit, has been considered by the country at large as not only insufficient but highly unsatisfactory and disappointing.

Now, what are the grounds of our dissatisfaction with that response? Sir, my first complaint is that the position has not been correctly appreciated by the Secretary of State for India. He has brushed aside serious

grievances lightly and has come to the conclusion that the distrust which undoubtedly exists in this country is due to "mistaken belief, ill-informed belief and ill-inferred belief", the belief here referred to being that expressed in the manifesto of the Swaraj Party—I am not referring to it as anything special to the Swaraj Party, but because the Secretary of State has chosen to refer to that document. I do not identify the House, I do not wish to identify the House, with anything that is contained in that document, but I think I can without fear of contradiction say that the sentiments expressed in that document are not sentiments peculiar to the Swarajists alone. They are sentiments which have been expressed almost from every platform, by men of every shade of opinion. Only yesterday when I was looking through the proceedings of this House for the last year I found that the same sentiments were expressed on the floor of this House by my Honourable friend, Mr. T. Rangachariar, when he moved a similar motion. Although the belief which engenders the distrust in us is described by the Secretary of State as a "mistaken belief, an ill-informed belief and ill-inferred belief," we find that His Lordship with some inconsistency admits that there are things which do rankle very generally in our minds. That, I submit, is due to the fact that His Lordship has not probed our wounds deeper. I do not blame His Lordship for not doing so. He could, after all, only have the materials supplied by the Government of India to go upon and it may be that his materials were not so full as they ought to have been. I need not go at any length into the omissions to be noticed in the important statement made by the Secretary of State, but I shall just only mention a few which show that he was far from a correct appreciation of the situation as it obtains in India probably because the materials before him were insufficient. But before I mention those omissions, I desire to express my appreciation, and I hope it will be shared by the House, of the extremely fair and courageous criticism of the Secretary of State of some of the incidents dealt with by him: notably, the exploits of General Dyer, the famous "steel frame" speech, the popular feeling against the certification of the salt tax—the effect of which I am sorry has been minimised by a subsequent explanation—the very sympathetic treatment of the Kenya question, and the courageous declaration in regard to the release of Mahatma Gandhi. As the House is aware, the Government of India and the Government of Bombay in doing the right thing have robbed it of all the grace that there was in it by assigning a particular reason, namely, his serious illness. Lord Olivier, less obsessed by the fetish of prestige, has now declared clearly that it was repugnant to human feeling that a man of his character, referring to Mr. Gandhi, should be treated as a criminal. Speaking for myself, Sir, I recognise and acknowledge this graceful admission and I think it does to a certain extent, if not totally, remove the sting involved in the order of release.

To mention only some of the most important things that have been omitted from the consideration of His Lordship, I would first mention the Rowlatt Act, that disgraceful piece of legislation which was described by Mahatma Gandhi as "an unmistakeable symptom of deep-rooted disease in the governing body." That, Sir, coming after a chain of events, was really the last straw and the cause of precipitating the trouble. It would have been fair to Lord Olivier as well as to ourselves if he had been fully informed of the people's determined stand against that legislation, if he had also been informed of the indiscriminate oppression and repression which were resorted to and which afterwards led to many a disturbance of the peace.

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

and the loss of many an innocent life. All those violent measures were resorted to suppress the national outburst of feeling and not to check any organised crime or rebellion. Then, again, the campaign of repression which followed the application of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, I thought also had something to do with the present situation, but we find no mention of it in Lord Olivier's statement which professed to go into the causes of the prevailing mistrust. Then as to the Sikh trouble, no account of the Sikhs and recent events in their history can possibly be complete without a full description of the horrors committed in Guru Ka Bagh; but there is no reference to it in Lord Olivier's speech. If there is one thing more than another which has exasperated our Sikh brethren, it is the doings of the authorities at Guru Ka Bagh. I therefore submit that the inference of His Lordship the Secretary of State is justified, if it can be justified, more by his desire not to offend the Government of India than by his premises, because, as I have stated, he admits, even upon the facts submitted to him, that there are things which do naturally rankle in our minds and which ought to rankle in the minds of all human beings similarly situated. If His Lordship had gone deeper into the history of the Indian unrest, he would have found that the movement of non-co-operation was not a new movement never thought of before the year 1919. The unrest is a chronic disease more deep-seated than Lord Olivier has taken it to be and for that I beg to draw the attention of this House to what that far-sighted statesman, Gokhale, said in 1905 when there was no idea of starting a movement of this kind. He said on that occasion, I think it was in the Congress, when he was dealing with the question of the partition of Bengal:

"If the opinions of such men are to be brushed aside with contempt, if all Indians are to be treated as no better than dumb driven cattle, if men whom other countries would delight to honour are to be led to realise the utter humiliation and helplessness of their position in their own country, then all I can say is 'good-bye to all hopes of co-operating in any way with the bureaucracy in the interests of the people'. I can conceive of no greater indictment of the British rule than that such a state of things should be possible after a hundred years of that rule."

Four years later, in 1909, he expressed the same sentiment on the question of the Indians in South Africa, when he said:

"What is the passive resistance struggle? It is essentially defensive in its nature and it fights with moral and spiritual weapons. The passive resister resists tyranny by undergoing suffering in his own person. He pitches soul force against brute force, he pitches the divine in man against the brute in man. He pitches suffering against oppression, he pitches conscience against might, he pitches faith against injustice, right against wrong."

The result of what I have submitted so far is that our first grievance is that His Lordship the Secretary of State has not correctly appreciated the extent of our grievances and the real depth of our open wounds. Now I come to the response that he has made. I will not detain the House at any great length but I will take what the Honourable the Home Member said in this House as representing really the gist of what His Lordship stated in the House of Lords, because we have it from both these high authorities that the statement in this House was made with the full concurrence of His Majesty's Government. What my Honourable friend the Home Member said here was in effect that there could be no present revision of the Government of India Act but that the purpose of the Government was high. Now, Sir, so far as that is concerned we take it as a

refusal of the demand which was put in the form of a Resolution of the House, and our frank reply to that part of it which says that the purpose of the Government is high is that we have long since ceased to be satisfied with mere declarations of purposes, however high, unless they are accompanied by action. His Lordship the Secretary of State adopted the same line though in far more conciliatory language. He in effect says "we are willing to do everything for you. We are now. Let us settle down. We are trying to discover points of contact." I have not omitted to consider very carefully the important concluding words of his speech, expressing His Lordship's hope to discover these points of contact with the least avoidable delay. But what does all that come to? I submit it does not come to anything more than this: Here is a patient bleeding to death but the surgeon says "I am pre-occupied. I must take my own time to get ready to stop the bleeding." Now, Sir, it must not be taken that I have not fully appreciated and am not thankful to Lord Olivier for the very conciliatory language he has used. It is not a case of our being reminded, as was done some time ago in the House of Commons, that the British people were the most determined people in the world and that whatever representations we may make they would not change their intentions as regards the Government of India Act or the granting of responsible government to India. I am very glad that that tone has

not been adopted by His Lordship the Secretary of State. In 1 P.M. passing, I may say that I for one fully concede the claim made by Mr. Montagu on behalf of the British people; but, if that claim is to be judged by what is happening in India, I say frankly that I do not envy the kind of determination which it implies. It implies a determination to withhold the rights of the people, or at least to postpone their grant indefinitely. While admitting it to be a fact that the British are a very determined people, I may be allowed humbly to suggest that determination is not the sole heritage of Britishers, and that it is a human quality, more human in those who stand upon their rights than in those who withhold the rights of others. But, as I have said, I appreciate the tone of His Lordship the present Secretary of State's response to us. I wish that sweet words could remove grievances. We have the misfortune of knowing and feeling things of which probably the Secretary of State is not even aware. For the rest, His Lordship's statement only draws attention to the difficulties of the situation. We all recognize that, but my submission is that the very moderate and modest demand that was put to the Government in the Resolution of this House would have been the most proper way of meeting the exigencies of the whole situation. It has not been given a fair consideration either here or in England. But I again, in order to avoid any misunderstanding, acknowledge the change in the angle of vision, if I may use a well-known phrase, which is apparent in His Lordship's statement. At the same time, Sir, I feel bound to draw attention to the extreme urgency of the case and to the fact, that the line of action foreshadowed by the Government of India and His Majesty's Government is wholly unacceptable to the country and therefore to us as representatives of the country. His Lordship has compared the present Government of India Act to a seaworthy vessel, and he says that it ought to carry us across if we get into it and row. My only answer to that is that it may be a seaworthy vessel but what we want is not only a seaworthy vessel but a vessel big enough for our cargo, large enough to accommodate the millions of passengers that have to cross over from servility to freedom. For that purpose the vessel is not at all fitted. Sir, the other day I

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

quoted in another connection from a published letter of the present Prime Minister, and, before sitting down, I only wish to remind the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of the last sentence of that letter which runs thus :

"Whatever form the governing machinery may take, two things must be granted. In the first place the Viceroy's Council must be of the nature of a Cabinet and must be responsible to the representative authorities. In the second place India must have control of her own finances. I hope that broad-minded wisdom is to assist both of us to arrive at a happy conclusion."

I submit, Sir, that it is now time for the Labour Government to deliver the goods, and I maintain that we are perfectly entitled to withhold the payment of the price until the goods are delivered. We mean nothing more by passing this Resolution, because, as I have said, it does not amount really to an actual refusal of supplies. We, in this imitation Parliament are doing something in imitation of the real right of the people's representatives. This has only one result, namely, to bring it to the notice of the Government that, so far as we are concerned, we have taken the strongest possible step that was open to us. It may be our misfortune but it is not our fault that it falls flat and we cannot give effect to the motion as it is given effect to under the rules which prevail in free countries.

In conclusion, Sir, I would appeal to the Honourable Members of this House to remember their vote on the demand itself, to remember that they have supported the demand which was put before the House on behalf of the people of India by a very large majority, and also to ask themselves if they think that the response given by the Secretary of State and by the Government of India is anything like a satisfactory response to a demand of that kind. I have not the remotest doubt in my mind that all elected Members, I mean Indian elected Members, will have no doubt whatever upon this point. And if that is so, I claim their support; I ask them and appeal to them not only to support me in this House by any observations that they may have to make but by their votes.

Mr. President: Amendment moved :

"That the Demand under the head Customs be omitted."

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: Sir, my two Honourable Colleagues will perhaps excuse me if I take it on myself to deal with this motion, for it has not been argued as one relating to the technical aspects of the Customs establishment. The Honourable Pandit has been perfectly frank on that subject. He knows, as well as we do, that the State could not afford to lose 45 crores of revenue, which would be the result of withdrawing the customs establishment; he knows as well as we do, that, if we withdrew that customs establishment, there would be no chance of maintaining, much less of increasing, any of those protective duties which we are told are so necessary for the industries of India. The mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad would lose half their production; the report of the Tariff Board might be torn up; the steel industry would be left to free competition from Europe and America. That, as he knows, would be the result if this Demand were entirely refused. But he knows equally that, even were the vote accepted by the House, India would not be in danger of those consequences; he knows perfectly well that we must utilize our powers under the Act to place ourselves in funds to carry on this Department; indeed, he intends that we should do so. He knows that we should be failing in our duty, not towards Government, but towards India.

it we did not take those steps. However irresponsible he may be, he is safe enough; for he knows that we shall not fail in our responsibility. But I must go somewhat further. It is abundantly clear that the object of the Mover is not merely to force us to use our reserved powers to restore this grant, and to incur thereby any unpopularity which accrues from the use of this special authority, which we have often heard described as a "prerogative of autocracy." He knows well that, if we were to use this power, we should incur no unpopularity thereby; he would not, when he next met his constituents, gain a single adherent by referring to our action; it could not be added to the catalogue of those crimes which his more enthusiastic followers detail amid the groans of outraged audiences. On the contrary, were we to accept this motion, were we to abolish our customs establishment, the industrial centres would be the first to execrate the Honourable Pandit's name. But he is safe; he knows that we shall protect him from this fate. Then what is his real purpose? His real purpose is, he says, to call attention to a grievance; and he intends to do so by imposing such embarrassment as may be on the Government. Whether his immediate case be good or bad, whether it be founded on reason or unreason, that is his real object. Then since the restoration of this one grant cannot cause us real embarrassment, obviously he must go further. The matter cannot stop at voting down Customs; if that is successful, then, to be consistent, he must vote down the whole of our Demands. He must go further: he must vote down our proposals for raising taxation. He must leave us entirely without funds, and without any means of incurring expenditure, in the hope that from the mass of those embarrassments and from the resulting general campaign of obstruction Government may be forced to remedy the grievances under which he and his friends, or, as he says, India, suffers. His own particular followers are no doubt convinced that these results will follow; but he was at pains to make a particular appeal to those Members who did not enter the House under the wing of his party; I also shall address myself to them. I think that it would be of little avail if I were to argue here on the question, which is almost academic, whether this case does actually fall within the scope of the old principle of "grievances before supply." The real question is whether those for whose support he asks, whether those whom he asks to join him in this programme, are convinced that he has good reason for adopting this course; whether the grievances from which India suffers are actually so great, whether the response of the Secretary of State or the Home Government has been so incomplete, that this course is justified. And, again, before they proceed further, those whom he asks to support him must be convinced that the course, whether theoretically justified or not, will actually enure to the benefit of the principles for which they stand.

Let me take his first point. His avowed reason for advocating this course is the inadequate nature of the response of the Indian Government and of the Home Government to the constitutional demands of this Legislature. We and the Secretary of State stand together. He has analysed Lord Olivier's speech; much of it he accepts with something like gratitude, but there is much in his attitude which he finds entirely insufficient. For instance, the Secretary of State omitted all mention of the Rowlatt Act—though indeed he seems to forget that the Rowlatt Act was passed before our new constitution came into force and was cancelled by the efforts of the last Assembly; the Secretary of State omits all mention of the repression under the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and he gives no

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

account of Guru Ka Bagh. These points were dilated on by the Honourable Pandit at some length; but is it seriously contended that because the Secretary of State's information on those points, or his expression of sympathy on those points, was insufficient, that we must now proceed to the step which he advocates? But he goes further; he says the response, in itself, was inadequate,—“the patient was bleeding, yet the physician asked for more time.” Well may it be that the physician has found himself under the necessity of taking due precautions to see that his diagnosis was correct, and if delay is the only charge against the Secretary of State, his offence was pardonable. But let us get to the substance of the thing. After all what has been the nature of the response? I claim that neither we nor the Secretary of State have been reactionary; nay, we have not evinced any desire to stand still. It may be, that our outlook has been practical rather than idealistic. It may be that we have been determined, both of us, to see, first of all, before a further advance is made, what are the defects in the actual administration of our present constitution, and to find remedies for those defects. We believed that it was not possible to proceed in advance of those administrative and perhaps legislative adjustments which are necessary to the proper carrying out of the constitution; we were convinced that, if we did this, we should fail of our objective. I believe there is no country, certainly it is the case that there is no country in Europe, which depends more than does India on the actual conduct of its administration and its governmental institutions; it depends on them not only for its stability but its material progress. I do not care what the implications of that may be. It is nevertheless a fact; and we maintain on our part that we cannot so force the pace of political progress as to advance ahead of such necessary adaptation of our machinery as is required to make each successive stage effective. In fact our reply is based on one consideration only, not that the pace should be retarded but that evolution should be orderly and harmonious throughout. It is true that we opposed Mr. Rangachariar's Resolution. We did so because we considered that Resolution disregarded the principle for which we have always stood, that the progress towards responsible government should be by progressive stages. We considered that it was impossible to agree to pass at once beyond our transitional constitution and embark on the final stages of responsible government. We opposed also the proposal for a Round Table Conference. I have been told that we opposed it almost with bitterness. I myself am unconscious of any feeling of bitterness in the matter; certainly I resent any suggestion that we opposed it merely because we were not prepared to take into consultation men of different views from ourselves either within this Council or without it. That was not the case. We opposed it, because it explicitly proposed to substitute some other form of constitution for that “evil thing” the Government of India Act. We opposed it because it appeared to us to be supported on grounds which assumed that the British Parliament was not the arbiter of the progress to be made by India in constitutional advance; and finally because we believed that in itself it was an ineffective piece of machinery, lacking in all the elements necessary to command success. That is, in short, my answer to the assertion of the Mover that our response has been entirely unsatisfactory. I say our conscience in the matter is clear. If we had shown any intention that we desired to go back on the solemn pledges of the British people, if we had ourselves abrogated the constitution, then perhaps, an extreme step of this nature might have been justified. We have not done so. We have ourselves shown that we were in earnest in going forward, though by

a different method to that which the Honourable Member proposes; his answer is to ask Members outside his party to take such steps as would, if full effect were given to them, bring His Majesty's Government to a close.

As I have said, I had two considerations to place before those whom the Honourable Pandit asked to support him in his programme. My second question was this—even on the supposition that his complaint against the Secretary of State and ourselves is justified, will the course he proposes to pursue be for the benefit of the ideals of those whom he is asking to vote with him? Is it in itself the kind of remedy which they, of their own initiative and in their own discretion, would adopt as statesmanlike and politic in the present circumstances? Now, here again, I do not desire to go into historical analogies; I am not going to analyse words or formulas. Whether the course he asks them to adopt is constitutional or otherwise matters little to me; it is an interesting point, but it is not decisive. The question I ask is whether it is practicable or politic. I will concede him much. I will concede that there have been occasions when general obstruction within the forms provided by the constitution may have changed the form of Government; it may have induced a majority to yield the just claims of a minority; it may have persuaded to reason an executive that otherwise was blind to reason. All that I will concede. But that does not affect my point; we are not engaged on an essay in constitutional history. We are now on a question of political tactics, nay, of statesmanship. I ask those whom the Honourable Pandit calls upon to support him, to consider whether this course is likely to yield any fruit in the circumstances in which India is placed in regard to the United Kingdom, and in the present circumstances of India itself in its own internal conditions.

Now, as regards the first point, the facts are so obvious that I hardly need to dilate on them. Honourable Members well know, as well as we know, the manner in which the British Parliament is likely to receive news of a vote in the sense desired by the Honourable Pandit. They can understand well the refusal of a definite item of supply in order to secure economy or improve administration. They can understand again a refusal of an item of supply in order to call attention to a particular grievance and to effect a remedy. But this is a general denial of all supplies. The immediate remedy is not in sight, is indeed not even suggested. It is a gesture of dissatisfaction, a manifestation of disapproval . . .

Pandit Motilal Nehru: On a point of personal explanation, the remedy is suggested in the Resolution itself, and the denial of that remedy has resulted in the moving of this motion.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: That Resolution itself suggested an ultimate objective and asked for a Round Table Conference. You are not protesting here against the operation of a bad law, and asking for its abolition. You are not protesting here against the process of certification, or the arbitrary use of power; you are asking for a general change of policy and, in order to secure that change of policy, you suggest a course which, following the ordinary principles of constitution, would bring Government to a stand-still. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru:* "What constitution?") The ordinary principles of any constitution. But let me proceed to my further point. It is possible that my Honourable friend in making this motion was himself prepared to recognise that it would have but little effect, or even have an

[Sir Malcolm Hailey.]

adverse effect, on Parliament. Perhaps his view really was that it should serve for a demonstration to India and should result in concentrating the sympathy of India on the demand for a change in the constitution. Now if the former object was, in my view at all events, likely to be infructuous, the latter seems to me to involve certain dangers of its own. His own friends will admit that the matter cannot stop here. You may refuse supplies; you may refuse the taxation to raise finance. But the matter would not end there. If we are to follow precedent, then it must be followed by a movement outside this Assembly. (*An Honourable Member*: "Yes, certainly.") As an Honourable Member behind me says, it is inevitable. I am not going to credit my Honourable friend himself with any intention to raise a violent agitation in the country (*A Voice*: "Non-violent agitation.") and I am not going to suggest that Members who only recently signed a formal report showing their conviction that the country is not yet ready for civil disobedience, are prepared to advocate resort to it. I am going to suppose simply that mass agitation will be raised outside this Assembly in order to secure a change in the constitution. Now, it may be possible that those who will lead that agitation may have a greater control over their followers than has hitherto been the case. It may be that they can exact a discipline which hitherto, as they had themselves to admit on several occasions, they have not been able to enforce. That may be the case; it may be. But we have had previous experience of mass movements in India and it is for those for whose support the Honourable Pandit now asks, to decide how far the leaders of such an agitation are likely to be able to control it. It is for them to judge. It is for them to ask themselves whether the continuance of mass agitations of this kind really produce an atmosphere which is conducive to progress towards responsible government. It is further for them to ask themselves what will be the final result of the continued agitation of this nature on the political mentality of the Indian people. It is possible that we who stand here have so far only had to reap the wind of previous attempts, and that those who will come after us may have to reap the whirlwind. Now, these considerations I feel to be strong; so strong that I have placed them before the House without controversial or contentious argument. They lie in a very small compass. I have purposely understated my case. I have let it stand for itself; but I think it is sufficiently strong to stand for itself.

Sir, I am one of many officers whose previous career was in general administration, but who have been brought within the orbit of Indian politics. I am one of many officers of my service who accepted the declaration of 1917 because they believed that in principle it was correct. It is true that we foresaw many difficulties in its execution, and we had no very clear vision of the future. Nevertheless, we believed that the principle was correct, and we set ourselves loyally and wholeheartedly to work the new constitution. We realized, not without a pang of regret, that progress on those lines was bound to affect the position of the services to which we belonged and of which we were proud; we knew indeed that progress on those lines was bound to affect the whole course of the British connection with India; it was certainly bound to make many modifications in the administrative principles to which we had hitherto devoted our lives and energies. That was true, but having once accepted the principle of the declaration of 1917, we worked loyally for it. Even now there are many of us who see strongly the anomalies—even the illogicalities—that

are necessarily involved in working a transitional constitution. But these can be surmounted by patience and goodwill; we have sufficient faith in the ultimate end to enable us to disregard these temporary inconveniences; and they are after all a small matter in the long evolution of a constitution suited to the Indian character and people. There are therefore many of us who will view this position with regret and with resentment—with regret, because it seems to be almost a manifestation of unreason (*Cries of "No, no."*) on the part of an Assembly of which we have been proud, and with resentment, because we believe that, in itself, it is a check on the orderly and harmonious progress of India towards responsible self-government. It is because of this feeling alone, that I ask those who might have felt tempted to join the Honourable Pandit to think of that higher duty which transcends party feeling, to think—and to think in time—whether the step he contemplates will retard or advance their progress towards the ideal which they and we have at heart.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till a Quarter to Three of the Clock.

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

Mr. M. V. Abhyankar (Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, when I took up the Budget for its perusal, I came across a Schedule marked "Demands for Grants for expenditure to be submitted to the vote of this House." I thought this was the time when this House could sit and decide for itself where to spend and how to spend the hard-earned money of the tax-payer to his best advantage, and I may say that my heart nearly jumped up into my throat at the very idea, but I had to gulp it down immediately as the distinction between the voted part and the non-voted part of the Budget and the powers of certification and veto under the Government of India Act came to my mind. To add to this, we had the other day His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's most candid and confidential statement to this House that, so long as he was in charge, this House should not expect any reduction in the military budget. (*The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey and the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett*: "No, that is not correct; in the number of fighting troops.") Very well, in the number of fighting troops; it does not matter. (Laughter.) I am coming to that. I thought, Sir, that the British doctrine of no taxation without representation had some peculiar meaning in this country and the doctrine stared me and stared me in the face but simply in order to mock and jeer at me, and tell me that the great doctrine has, if any, an opposite meaning in this country to the one it has in England. And it was then that the cruel sense—my friend will pardon me—that the cruel sense of humour of the Honourable the Finance Member, when he stood up with the Budget in his hand for its submission to the vote of this House, was realised by me. In self-governing countries the word "demand" means a request. And a request by whom and to whom? A request to the Legislature of the country by the Executive which has to subserve it, but in this country the word "demand", I know, is used in its real dictionary sense. It means nothing else or nothing more than the actual demand to the Legislature by the irresponsible Executive which dominates the former, which controls the former. (*Mr. V. J. Patel*: "It is a command.") Under these circumstances, when the Honourable the Finance Member was standing in this

[Mr. M. V. Abhyankar.]

House with the Budget in his hand and saying that he was submitting it to the vote of this House, he was doing nothing more than standing with a promissory note in his hand, asking this House to sign it at the point of a bayonet. We are very often told, we are repeatedly told, I would say, Sir, that Britain, that the British people are the trustees of India and the Indians. We have been told, Sir, also by the Honourable the Home Member that his objective and the objective of this House was the same. But he said that one of the great impediments in the way of the realisation of the Indian hopes was the want of a national army. Now, I ask this House to throw its eyes on the Budget and find out and say if there is any attempt made in the military part of it particularly to Indianise the army quickly; by quickly I mean within the next five or ten years at the most. Well, there is none. We are told we cannot have self-government. Why? Because we have no national army. Further, we find that we cannot have a national army. Why? Because we have no self-government. The two things act and react upon each other and continue moving in a vicious circle to our chagrin and disgust. Is that the way, I should like to know from those in this House who are the representatives of our trustees in England to discharge their God-given or history-given trust, whatever they may choose to call it? And if that is so, I should like to know how this country is going to progress. The Honourable the Home Member says: "Yes, we want to give you Swaraj, but it is not time yet." I know, when a man who does not want to do something is asked to do it, the day on which you ask him to do it is always the wrong day. Are we then to wait interminably? These objectives which take geological epochs to fulfil them, are to my mind no good, they are worse than useless. Then, assuming further that we could, that this House had the power to make any or all alterations that it desired in the Budget, have we the control over the Executive which will work out the departments which will be supplied by the Budget, and have we, I should like to know, any authority over those who will guide and control the policy of those departments which will be worked with the money that will be sanctioned by this House? We have not. It is useless. In the first place, we have neither control of the purse nor have we the authority over those who are going to use the money. It is just like a man drawing some beautiful sketches of a house which he wants to build without having either the money or the architect at his disposal and command. Nothing better than that. Then, Sir, what could be the object of the Honourable the Finance Member's submitting this Budget to the vote of this House? To my humble mind, there could be no other object than the one of sanctifying the desires of the Executive by asking this House to sign its decrees and thus get one more year's lease to oppose the very human and natural aspirations of the people to guide and control the destinies of their country. And the worst part of the whole affair is that all these things will go on and will be done in the name of and with the approval and the sanction of this House and with the sanction of the representatives of the country. That is the worst part of the whole business.

If one were to study the Government of India Act, one would find that India is being administered as an estate, not as a country, and if one were to study the system of the Budget, one would instantaneously find out that the whole system is nothing else but an enthronement of the bureaucracy and that too in the name of the people of this country. When Britain went to war with Germany, the British statesmen told us that they did so in order to make the world safe for democracy. Now I wonder

if the Government of India Act, and the Budget under the Act have made India safe for democracy or bureaucracy. I do not think there will be any doubt on this question. As has already been said by my worthy leader, our opposition is not to this item or that in the Budget. Our opposition is to the system, to the way India is being governed to-day, to the way we are being treated in our own country, and it is in order that we may enter our emphatic protest and unanimous protest on that point that we have chosen, or we have taken upon ourselves to oppose this Budget; and under these circumstances, I have no doubt that every elected Member of this House and I hope every nominated and even official Indian Member of the House will put aside all those trammels and conventions in the name of justice and country for once at least, and will side with us and will let the world know that they are not in love with this system and with the present Government of India Act. I hope that will be done; I am positive that will be done.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal (Calcutta: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Personally, Sir, I and I believe some others on this side of the House
 A.P.M. —their number perhaps is very small, yet it is true that some of us—find ourselves in a very difficult position. We are between . . . (A Voice: "Between the devil and the deep sea".) No, Sir, I always like to disappoint my audience and I will not say what you are thinking. We find ourselves on the one side driven by the inexorable Official Benches behind us, and in front of us is the Swarajist unknown. And we find it very difficult what to say or what to do under these circumstances. (Lieutenant Colonel H. A. J. Gidney: "Very hard lines.") My friend, Colonel Gidney, says "Very hard lines." This reminds me, Sir, of a remark which he made when he gave me his vote. He said "I prefer to work with the devil I know to working with the devil that I do not know." I could say that and be done with it. For there is a part of this House which we know and there is another part of this House which we do not know. Pandit Motilal, whatever the actual value of his cards, has placed all his cards on the table. Have the Government done so? (Cries of "Yes" and "No.") Let the records of this Assembly prove whether they have done so or not. Have they met us half way? Pandit Motilal—a very reasonable man except when he is in the company of very young people (Laughter)—would be satisfied, he told you all, with a little gesture, with just a turn of the eye, from Sir Malcolm Hailey, just a glance transmitted or broadcasted from Whitehall, from Lord Olivier.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha (Chota Nagpur Division: Non-Muhammadan): Those days have passed.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Just a glance, just a gesture. I am quoting him. He said "Give us a gesture", and he would be satisfied. I would not be satisfied, Sir, with a gesture. I do not believe in political flirtations. I want acts; I want assurances; I want facts and actualities to go upon. But my friend Pandit Motilal is a very reasonable man and he would be satisfied with a little gesture, and he says that even that gesture is not given. I agree with him there. Government have not made a single gesture. They have not been reasonable; they have not met us half way. I do not understand them, Sir. I know there are difficulties; I know there must be delays. I know the problem is a very complex and complicated one. I know we cannot say, as God said, "Let there be light, and there was light." Neither Sir Malcolm Hailey nor the whole body of our Swaraj friends, not even Mahatma Gandhi can say, "Let there be Swaraj, and there will be Swaraj." It will take time. We all admit it.

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

But what I ask is this, "Is it impossible for British statesmanship and Indian nationalist statesmanship to put their heads together and find a way out of this *impasse*?" Pandit Motilal said he would be your "man." Well I cannot say that, neither to Pandit Motilal nor to Sir Malcolm Hailey. I refuse to be anybody's man. But the Pandit is a reasonable man. He says to the Government, "Give us something." The Government have not given him or us anything. Pandit Motilal wanted a Round Table Conference. I wanted something less than that. I can imagine the reasons why the Government could not accept Pandit Motilal's demand of a Round Table Conference. I understand the difficulties that led the Government not to look even at my prayer. The reason was this that they saw that the force of numbers was on the side of Pandit Motilal and he would accept nothing but his pound of flesh, and the Government was not prepared to give him a drop of blood. That was the situation. That situation might have been saved perhaps not from Delhi but certainly from London. Lord Olivier might have made a gesture, while supporting the Government here, by saying, "Now that our Government have refused the idea of a Round Table Conference we cannot give that to you. We must work in harmony with them, but we will give you something." If not a Round Table Conference, why not, Sir, a Royal Commission? Why not a committee or inquiry of some sort into the working of the Government of India Act with a view to examine—we did not ask them to give us a promise beforehand,—the present situation. Lord Olivier might well have said, "Well, we do realise the gravity of the situation in India. We do recognise that there has been an insistent demand for the establishment of full responsible government in India." He would not confess even this much. Will he require the presence of another great war to recognise the insistency of this demand? The demand for self-government had been insistent for decades and decades before Mr. Montagu made his historic announcement, and, when the war came and there was a grave situation, when they wanted our money and our lives to protect their own freedom and their Empire, it was then that they suddenly recognised that the demand for self-government in India had been insistent. Do you want another war to recognise the strength of this demand for full responsible government in India? That would not be statesmanship. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief the other day gave me an excellent retort. I knew he was a good shot. I did not know till then that he was also as good in repartee. He told me, "You give me a war and I will make your officers quickly." Do you want us to give you a war? We cannot give you war. We have not the power to give you a war, nor have we the desire to do so. But do not cry before you are out of the wood. There are others. The gods may have decreed, who knows, that you shall have another war, may be in five years' time. You may have another war in ten years' time. Lord Curzon, speaking before the Persian Ambassador, prophesied that when I was last in England. You may have another war. And, if this discontent grows and deepens and corrodes into the heart of every section of the Indian people, what then? You are not orientals, you have not our imagination, but you claim to have statesmanship. But statesmanship that is not illumined with imagination is not worth the name. If there be another world-war, what will be your position? What will be our position if this rankling sense of wrong and injustice corroding into the heart of the Indian people, perculating from the highest to the lowest, rousing the masses from their stupor of ages were to create

the inevitable conditions on the eve or in the midst of the next world-war, the centre of gravity of which might be in Asia? You ought to have imagination enough to foresee it; and, if you have that imagination, you would hasten to make it up with us, you would make it up with the people of India, while you are both on the way. You have failed to do it. The Government has failed to give any response. They might have given, if not an assurance, at least some hope. I do not say that they could have done all that we wanted. Even Pandit Motilal knew that the Government could not give him the moon. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "I did not ask for it.") I know you did not. You are a very reasonable man. You gave the Government a blank card. They might write any names there. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "Representatives to the satisfaction of this House. That was my prescription.") But that was in your mind, but not in your Resolution. But the Government have done nothing. Lord Olivier has done nothing. We were all looking,—not I—because I am too old for all that. I have all my life refused to look to England for my salvation. I do not look to Lord Olivier for the gospel of Indian Swaraj. I know that not even our old, old friend, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, could give us all that we want or even that which he said he would let us have,—when he was out of office. He could give us everything when he was out of office. Being in office now and having to shoulder the responsibilities of office, we realise that he could not do even what he wanted to do, honestly I believe, when he was out of office. We all have our limitations. Pandit Motilal might do many things outside this Assembly. But there are things which he cannot do inside this Assembly. There are rules, there are responsibilities, there are obligations, there are conditions; and not even the Prime Minister of England, much less the Prime Minister of England who belongs to a party which does not command a real majority in the Parliament, can do whatever he wants. We give him credit for his good intentions. We realise his practical limitations. We did not want,—we knew that Lord Olivier could not give us,—much. We did not ask him to give us immediate Swaraj. But why could he not tell us, why could not the present Labour Government declare—"We cannot give everything that you want, but we will give you an inquiry, an honest inquiry. We want time to examine the conditions in India. We will send out some sort of a Commission which will meet you. We will invite you to join that Commission." The new Labour Government in London might say that. Lord Olivier has practically said something of that kind, but why could he not be absolutely clear about it? He says that he has formed a Committee, a Cabinet Committee. Why could he not extend that Committee into a Commission; and tell us—, "We have appointed this Commission. We have invited some of your own leaders to sit on this Commission. We have asked this Commission to go out to India, to take evidence there, and explore all the avenues of advance under the present constitution, and also to advise us if the time has come when an amendment of the present Government of India Act may be made to the profit of India and wish safety to England. If I were in Lord Olivier's position I would say that. Any statesman would say that. But I think we are not statesmen here, we are only demagogues. But I think even demagogues may, in certain circumstances, give a few tips to the proudest statesmen. If I were in Lord Olivier's place I would have said that. Why has he not said it? That is what puzzles me. I recognise the difficulties of the Leader of this House. He is not his own master. He has to look to his own masters thousands of miles away. He has danced to the tune of Whitehall. (*A Voice*: "To his masters here in India also.") He has no-

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

master here. (*A Voice*: "The bureaucracy are his masters. He is their phonograph.") That is going off the track. We asked the Government to give us something, at least a gesture. We asked the Honourable the Home Member to give us three days' time. I asked him to adjourn this Debate for three days. Dr. Gour asked him to take three days' time to consider the situation in consultation with London. Send wires, bring replies, hold consultations. That has been our latest prayer. The situation is grave. The Budget is going to be thrown out. It has been thrown out in the Central Provinces. It is likely to be thrown out in Bengal. If figures speak facts, it is sure to be thrown out here. (*A Voice*: "Lend your help.") That is another story. Why should not you consult the Government in London? Take time, three days' time, grant a reprieve, not to us, but to your Budget. Why not do this, and then within this time give Pandit Motilal a gesture, just a gesture, and he would be satisfied and we would all be saved from the very awkward position in which we find ourselves. The Government would do nothing. The Government are unreasonable. That does not mean that my friend Pandit Motilal, reasonable in every other respect, has been reasonable in his motion or in his demand to throw out the Budget. Our difficulty is that we cannot support the Government. My difficulty is that I cannot support my friend Pandit Motilal. (*Voices*: "What about your constituents?" "Shame!") Yes, I confess it, Sir, to my shame, that I cannot support a proposal which does not satisfy my unregenerate reason and is against my unilluminated conscience. I cannot support Pandit Motilal, because what he proposes leads to nowhere. Yesterday, I had to come from Raisina to somewhere in this neighbourhood, and when I was going back with a friend in his car, somewhere on the way, my friend said "There is your house. I will drop you down here. Come, let us take a shortcut." He asked the chauffeur to take a certain turn. After about 5 or 6 minutes of furious driving along a dark street, we found ourselves in the vicinity of the Secretariat building, that led to nowhere. There was a cow tied just in front of a wall, and we had to turn the car, take a round about way, spend about, I think, half a gallon of petrol, and cover more than 6 or 7 miles of road, before I reached my house. And, as I was having that bit of experience, I was thinking of the motion of my friend Pandit Motilal. This policy of throwing out the Budget—where does it lead to? It leads to nowhere. There is the Secretariat wall and you will have to turn back. If you could storm that wall, I would say, "Go on right ahead". If you could bomb that wall, I would say, "Go on right ahead". Could you do it? No, you cannot. You know you cannot. Throwing out the Budget has to me only one meaning and it is this. If you throw out the Budget here, you must be assured of being supported by the country, not by public meetings and Resolutions of the Swaraj Party, but you must be supported by the deathless determination of the people not to pay a single shell to the Government treasury, to carry on the administration of this country, even if the Budget is certified by the Viceroy. (*A Voice*: "That will follow after this.") Is the country prepared to refuse to pay taxes? (*A Voice*: "Yes") Are you prepared to ask the people to refuse to pay taxes? (*Voices*: "Yes") The logic of throwing out the Budget is civil disobedience, to use the language of Mahatma Gandhi, and the inexorable logic of civil disobedience is active rebellion. That is what I understand. That is the universal experience of history. After the refusal

to pay ship money, what happened in England? Pandit Motilal has cited constitutional history. He referred us to the refusal of supply by the Parliament of Richard II. He admitted that it did not take the country very far. How long did it take for the British people to assert and attain their present right of complete control of the purse and of the executive from the time of Richard II? Dr. Gour told me (he is absent and being the Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University he must know these learned things) that it was 250 years from the time of Richard II to Charles I and even then they did not get full responsible government. The head of Charles I was lost. The Great Rebellion had to come and even then after the Great Rebellion full control of the purse did not come. I speak subject to correction (there are historians and professors here). Parliamentary control was not fully established before the reign of Queen Victoria (*A Voice*: "You are wrong".) I speak subject to correction. Young people remember their history better than old men like myself. Practically, the great constitutional struggle in England went on from the days of the Magna Charta up to the time of Queen Victoria. Parliament became supreme only during the reign of Queen Victoria. It took years and years and years and they had to put in a rebellion between, to secure all this. I will not further explore the domains of British history. Let us come to actual facts before us, in India. If you throw out the Budget what will be the result? The Viceroy will certify it, restore it. So the Government will go on all right. Traders would not beat at the gate of Sir Basil Blackett. If he is mischievously bent, he might notify to the thousands of clerks here in the Secretariat, that the Assembly has not voted supplies and you must go home after to-morrow. If Sir Basil did this the Secretariat people might stand not at the gate of Sir Basil Blackett but before this Assembly. But that is not going to happen. We may throw out the Budget, but the Government will carry on with the tax-payers' money as merrily as ever. No, Sir, it is not practical politics. We do not gain anything by throwing out the Budget. We only help the Government to create and recreate this precedent of certification. Last time they certificated. The Viceroy certified the salt tax. It was not a popular tax. Rightly or wrongly people did not like it. There has always been a very large volume of sentiment against the salt tax. Even foreigners have understood that it was an act of iniquity on the part of the British Government to tax the poor man's salt. The Government in England saw it, and public opinion in England also recognized that it was not perhaps the wisest thing for the Government of India to have certified the salt tax; and therefore even Lord Olivier says that the certification of the salt tax was not perhaps quite proper. The imprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi was another act of unwisdom on the part of Government. If I were in Sir Malcolm Hailey's place—I am glad I am not there now, Sir (Laughter). I am more comfortable here than Sir Malcolm is likely to be there for some time to come. (Laughter.) If I were in his place, I would not have touched the Mahatma. It was an act of unwisdom. If the Mahatma had been left free all these years, the position of the Government would have been much easier. We all know that he was not bent on mischief. We all know that there might possibly have been a revolt even in his own camp if he had been left free. (*A Voice*: "Question".) Possibly people might have gone to him and asked, "Here is the 31st December, where is your Swaraj?" But our friends opposite lack Oriental imagination. I would have left the Mahatma free. Lord Olivier also confesses the unwisdom of that act of the Indian Government. The policy of the Nationalists now should be to drive the

[Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.]

Government Benches to become unreasonable and more unreasonable and yet more unreasonable, and then their own unreasonableness will be their own undoing. Why should we contribute to their safety by our own unreason? (Hear, hear.) That is, Sir, what I do not understand. Therefore, I cannot support Pandit Motilal's motion. I cannot support, as I have said, the Government position either. So, what am I to do? (Laughter and a Voice: "Resign and go away.") If I owed my seat to the courtesy or the kindness of my Swarajist friends, the friends of my Honourable friend opposite, I would not have come here at all. I refused their support. I refused to sell my freedom to them. My responsibility is to my constituency. I won my seat in spite of the opposition of the Swarajist party and the Swarajist leader in Calcutta. (Hear, hear.) (A Voice: "Question.") So you see I do not owe my seat to my friend there; I owe it to the considered choice of my constituency. (A Voice: "Who has sent you those telegrams?") Thank you, I will answer. I am sorry I did not bring those telegrams. I got one telegram from Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta. He is one of the leaders of the Swarajist party and as President of a public meeting in Calcutta . . . (A Voice: "Is not that your constituency?") Calcutta is my constituency but not Mr. J. M. Sen Gupta or a demonstration organized by the Swarajists. (Hear, hear.) I had another telegram from Mr. Nirmal Chander Chandra, the Swarajist leader who contested my seat, as President of another Swarajist meeting. I had a third from another Swarajist leader. They are not my constituency. My constituency consists of nearly ten thousand electors. I shall certainly obey their mandate. If 6,000 of those electors send me a mandate, I shall immediately retire. I have no axe to grind myself. I expect nothing either from the Government or even from the Swaraj Fund. (A Voice: "That is for their own use.") If my constituency asks me to resign I shall certainly do so. But I consider it—well, rather, rather—what shall I say? Is 'impertinent' unparliamentary? (Laughter) I consider it rather impertinent interference with the rights of my constituency on the part of people who do not belong to it, who did not vote for me and who, on the contrary, opposed my election. Now, my position . . .

Mr. D. V. Belvi (Bombay Southern Division: Non-Muhammadian Rural): I rise to a point of order. Is there a time limit to speeches in this House or not? I want to know that.

Mr. President: Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal.

Mr. D. V. Belvi: I take it there is no time limit.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member had better study the rules and Standing Orders.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: Now, I have said that if I were convinced that the policy of my Swarajist friends would lead us somewhere, I would vote with them. I say it leads us nowhere. They want simply to create an impression,—an impression in England. They think the people in England will say, "Look here, the Assembly has thrown out the Budget and therefore we must immediately pack ourselves, bag and baggage out of India". I do not believe that impression will be created. I do not believe in creating impressions in this way. Impressions may have to be created in politics but not in this way. There are other ways of creating impressions. We did create some impression in England in the days when people were afraid of my visit to Delhi. (Laughter.) We did create some impression then. That is not the kind of impression which this throwing

out of the Budget will create. I do not believe in that. Those who believe in it, let them vote for it. I do not believe in this petulant futility; and therefore I cannot vote for Pandit Motilal's proposition. Neither can I vote with the Government, because I see that, if there is extreme unreasonableness on one side, there is equally extreme unreasonableness on the other side also. And when two unreasons fight each other, the safest thing for those who believe in their own reason and conscience, is to sit tight in their own seats.

Mr. D. V. Belvi: Sir, I have listened to the interesting speech of my Honourable friend Mr. Pal, but it seems to me that he has gone off at a tangent. He has not touched the real point at issue. He thinks that we are fighting a shadow. I assure him that we are not doing anything of the kind. We have started this debate and Pandit Motilal Nehru is putting this motion before the House of a set purpose. Our object is to show that what we have got in the shape of this Reform Act is only a mockery. We have been granted absolutely nothing. I was extremely sorry to read the other day the title of a small book published under the authority of Government. The title of the book I believe is "The Simla Session of India's Parliament in 1922". I was moved to tears when I read the title of that small book. Have we got a real Parliament? What we have got, as Pandit Motilal Nehru rightly put it, is an external form, an external appearance, external paraphernalia. But is there a real Parliament? What we have got is a lifeless body, or, a toy Parliament; just as children are given a toy gun, a toy motor car or a toy ship, so have we been given a toy Parliament by the Mother of Parliaments. Have we got any real rights here? We want to show to the people of Great Britain and also to the people of this country that, even if we throw out the Budget there is a provision in the Act itself which will nullify our action. So what is the good of this Government of India Act? That is the main object of our attempt to throw out this Budget.

Now I wish to turn to the speech of the Honourable the Home Member. I do admit that any statement made by a statesman like the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey must be received with very great respect. I examined his arguments very carefully, but I am sorry to say that to-day he has not been able to advance the case for Government even by a single inch. He says, "Our consciences are clear." Well, let me have leave to tell him that "My lady, protests a little too much". "Our consciences are clear"—that is a matter between you and your consciences. But to the outside world it does not look that much that is done by the bureaucracy in this country is done with a clean conscience. The object of the bureaucracy is to keep this country for as long a time as possible in its grip and to treat India as a close preserve for the benefit of the English people and their children. There can hardly be a doubt on this point. Look at the whole course of Indian administration; what do you find? Almost all the higher posts here are filled up by Europeans, and the posts which carry smaller salaries ranging from Rs. 10 to Rs. 500 or so are filled by natives of the different castes and communities. Is that the way to govern a country? Is it honest, is it right, to govern a country in this manner? If we are not to raise a protest at the time when the Demands for Grants are made, when are we to raise this question? This debate has been started with a view to express our complete disapprobation of the manner in which the government of the country is carried on. Some of

[Mr. D. V. Belvi.]

The Members of this House were startled the other day when my Honourable friend Mr. V. J. Patel said to the face of the bureaucracy here that he challenged the *bona fides* of the bureaucracy in this country. Some of them were aghast at the statement that was made by my friend. It is well known that Mr. Patel is a Swarajist. It is true that he is an Extremist as I am one myself, but I can cite the evidence of a gentleman who was honoured by Government more than once and who fortunately for me is a Member of this Legislature at present. He has the high privilege of being nominated to this House by Government more than once, and he is, I may say, the prince of moderate politicians in this country. He is no other gentleman than the Honourable Sir P. Sivaswamy Aiyer. I shall quote a passage from the memorandum recently submitted by this Honourable gentleman to the Royal Commission on Imperial Services in India. Part of this memorandum has been published at page 25 of the "Indian Review" for January 1924. I shall read only a small paragraph from it, to show that it is not only Mr. Patel who questions and rightly questions the *bona fides* of the bureaucracy but Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and many other people of the country. I shall read that passage with your leave, Sir. The passage runs thus :

"In spite of the declarations of Parliament, a deep-rooted mistrust of the *bona fides* of the British Government and of its willingness to grant responsible government in the near future is almost universally prevalent in India."—*You will kindly mark, Sir, the word 'universally'—*"While it is possible to say a great deal in favour of the cautious attitude of the British Government and administrators here, it is equally possible to find justification for the distrust and impatience displayed by the people. Undeniable as are the numerous blessings of British rule, the Indian feels that the energies of the British services have been rather devoted to making the country a safe and comfortable place to live in than towards the preparation of the people of India for self-reliance and self-realization. Rightly or wrongly, the Indian feels that, if the destinies of India had been guided by the British Government with a higher conception of its duties as a guardian, and with aims similar to those which a strong national Government like that of the Meiji era in Japan would have set before itself, India might have achieved much greater progress in education, in administrative capacity, in the ability for self-defence and in the development of her industries. One feels that the spirit which has often actuated the British Government is that which induced some of the English witnesses before the Indian Mercantile Marine Committee to say that India does not require a Mercantile Marine because England can provide for all her wants. India need not develop her industries, because England can supply her with the products of her manufactures on cheaper terms. India need not put herself to the trouble of governing herself as she has only to raise the necessary funds and her guardian will look after everything and cheerfully bear the Whiteman's burden for any length of time. If the Indian Civil Service is the finest in the world and India has been the nursery of British administrative talent, the Indian feels that the nursery has been cultivated at his expense and by the denial of opportunities for the development of indigenous talent which till recently has been obliged to seek such opportunities in the service of Indian States."

I do not believe that it is possible to record a severer condemnation than this of the system of Government which has been pursued in this country for more than a century.

We are told by the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey that self-government is to be realized by progressive stages, and we have to prove our fitness to the satisfaction of the British people and the British Parliament. Now this assertion, which unfortunately for us is embodied in the Preamble of the Government of India Act, 1919, reminds me of a short story which I read some years ago. The story is very brief and it can bear repetition here. There lived a poor

but clever man once upon a time. He was fired with the ambition of making some money for himself and his family. He published an advertisement broadcast all over the world to say that, if any one sent him a poem to his satisfaction, he would give him a prize of ten lakhs of rupees. He added to this advertisement only one condition, and the condition was that every man who sent him his poem had to annex to it a small fee of fifty rupees. The man's wife was an unsophisticated woman and she asked him, "What do you mean? You are a poor man, you have not got even a hundred rupees with you; how can you give a prize of 10 lakhs as you say in your advertisement?" He replied "What a silly woman you are; you do not see that I have been careful to lay it down in my advertisement that the poem must be to *my* satisfaction. It is for me to say when I shall be satisfied; and rest assured I shall never be satisfied; all the money in the shape of fees will go into my pocket, and nobody will get the prize from me." That is just the way in which the reforms are conceived and the arrangements are set up. You will find that history repeats itself. The people of the Philippines asked for self-government from the United States of America. There also the plea was the same. "You are not fit for self-government. You will not be fit for self-government for many centuries to come". We want to show to the British people that we can no longer put up with this humbug. We know how other countries achieved their freedom, but they had to wade through blood. We do not want to do it. What happened in the United States of America in the eighteenth century? We call attention to the fact that Canada, South Africa, Egypt and recently Ireland have been granted their freedom after there was more or less fighting, more or less shedding of blood. We do not want to wade through blood. We want to ask the British people "Will you give us, as reasonable, as sensible men, the rights of British subjects, or will you go on putting us off from time to time?" British rule in this country hitherto has undoubtedly been a huge fraud from beginning to end. There are redeeming features here and there; no doubt British rule has done a good many things for us; I am not shutting my eyes to the good things under British rule, but British rule is to be judged not by the standard of a primalval people but by the standard of civilized people who profess to live under a civilized Government. The question is whether the British people are treating us as a civilised Government should. Where is the principle of self-determination here? One of the fourteen principles discovered by the late lamented President Wilson was self-determination. Is there self-determination in the case of India? When we ask for a Round Table Conference consisting of Britishers and Indians for jointly drafting a constitution for India, we are told "No, you will get your Swaraj or self-rule in dribblets". That is a proposition to which we respectfully demur. I interjected in the course of the speech of one of my friends here that the Secretary of State for India was a mere phonograph, and I do repeat once again that he is a phonograph. What has the new Secretary of State done? Look at the Jaito affair? how readily has he swallowed without discrimination the cooked story put into his mouth by the bureaucracy on that subject? In fact he was prepared to believe the cock and bull story that 6,000 and odd people who went there as spectators were foolish enough to fire upon the troops of the State and upon the Administrator of the State. Nothing can be more untrue than this version. At any rate, His Lordship would have been well advised to hold his tongue when matters were to be inquired

[Mr. D. V. Belvi.]

into in the Nabha State. But he has hurried on, because the bureaucracy wanted to make out a case for the Administrator of the Nabha State. That concocted story was cabled to him from India and he repents it as if he were a mere phonograph. My Honourable friend, Mr. Pal, says that we shall only teach the English people here to go on certifying, or certificating the money grants which we may refuse. But we want to show to the world that, even if we reject the money grants, they will be restored by the Viceroy. That means that this Legislature possesses no real power whatever. The other day a facetious friend of mine met me and began to laugh at me. I asked him the reason. He said, "You are an M. L. A.". I said, "I am". He asked "Do you know what the meaning of your title is? It means a member of the lunatic asylum." (Laughter.) Now, Sir, Sir Malcolm Hailey meant to convey that there may be a going back in constitutional advance owing to this action of ours. But what have we got really? We care a brass farthing if this mock of the Legislature is abolished. We have got absolutely nothing that is real. Let the world once for all know that India is being governed with naked autocracy. I do not want shams. Let the veil be torn off from the sham. The world is now deluded into the belief that the Government here is now carried on with the approval of the people, that they have got popular Government, that there is a House of Lords and that there is also a House of Commons. We do want to show to the world that what we have been granted is a sham, it is a gilded sham, a magnificent sham. I was astonished to find that there is a street named "Parliament Street" in this city. There is a Council of State and Legislative Assembly in India. But is there any life, is there any reality, about these institutions? What are their powers? If they pass a measure here, there is no guarantee that it will be respected by the Government. The Executive is not responsible to them. Sir Malcolm Hailey told us to our face the other day "Well, we are not responsible to you, we are only responsible to the British Parliament. You pay us our salary, that is perfectly true; but we are only responsible to the Home Government and not to you." I do not think that there can be a worse mockery of self-government than this.

Sir, I want to say a word about the monstrous system of dyarchy, which we owe to the kindness of our friend Mr. Lionel Curtis. We wanted a piece of bread and our friend induced the British Government to give us a stone. We wanted really responsible Government here. But we were granted a dyarchy, which is half-human and half-beast. The poor Ministers are chafing in their places. The whole country is discontented with the system of Government. How can we bring all these facts to the notice of the British Parliament and the British public unless we take some such constitutional measure as the refusal of supplies? I know that the heavens will not fall down even if the whole Budget be thrown out. Sir Malcolm Hailey will be the first man to advise His Excellency to restore the Budget in its entirety. We know it full well. But we believe that this will be the only way of showing to the world that India is highly discontented and, unless she is granted what she really wants, there will be no peace in the country. That is the object of my party. The Honourable Mr. Pal says "Where have you got any force to back up your demands?" We know that our demand cannot be backed up by any physical force. We have not the remotest idea of using physical force.

We have not come here to wreck the Reforms in the sense that we want to blow up the Legislature with the aid of dynamite or to throw bombs here. Swarajists have come here to show that the present form of Government is a mere mockery, that the Government of India Act is a sham intended to throw dust in the eyes of Indians and also in the eyes of the civilized world. India is given the privilege of sending representatives to the League of Nations. What a grand privilege it is! But can we forget that we are treated even in several parts of the British Empire as coolies? Even if His Exalted Highness the Nizam of Hyderabad or His Highness the Maharaja of Baroda goes to a part of the British Empire, say South Africa, he is liable to be treated as a cooly. (A Voice: "Shame".) His Highness will not be in a better position than a poor man like myself. Is that the position which is to be assigned to us? We are told off and on that we are British subjects. If we are British subjects, give us the rights of British subjects, or else say once for all that you have conquered us and that you will treat us always as a conquered nation. We shall understand our position then. But do not please kill us with cruel kindness; do not say that you are doing all this for our benefit and out of kindness. Say it frankly and in a manly manner that you cannot stand this nonsense of self-government but that you will go on governing us with an iron hand. That will be much better. We do not want this attenuated form of freedom, bondage with ease. We do not want it. We want liberty. We want liberty and we want to achieve it in a strenuous manner. We do not want this bondage with ease. The House will see that the object of the Honourable Mr. Motilal Nehru is not to bring a catastrophe upon the country but simply to express the dissatisfaction of the country and to shew that this Act is a mere sham. That is the object with which this motion has been brought forward. Our object is to show that we are now mere puppets and that we have got no real power in our hands. We have come here all the way from our homes at a distance of thousands of miles, but what do we find here? A mock Parliament, a toy Parliament, a debating club and nothing more. For these reasons, Sir, I shall be very glad to support the motion of my leader Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Sir Campbell Rhodes (Bengal: European): Sir, we are discussing Customs (Laughter), the customs, I suggest, not of the people but of the Swaraj party. We have had many speeches. Age does not stale nor customs wither their infinite variety. But I was specially struck with the speech of the Honourable Mover, with its apologetic tone which made me really wonder, firstly, whether he realised the vital importance of the action he was taking and, secondly, whether he himself really believed in it. We have been told that he put his cards on the table. He did so, but he put them face downwards, and I suggest he will only win by a revoke. He has attacked the Labour Government at Home, that one party from which he may hope for some friendly gesture as it has been called, some advance, possibly before the time that has been fixed as the maximum period within the Act. He has described the consequences of throwing out the Budget in other parts of the world. He says he does not fear those consequences. He says they do not obtain in this country. I understand his argument to be that however irresponsible he and his party may be, they are relying on the responsibility of the Government of India. He says it is merely a protest. I fear that, with my knowledge of conditions at home, it will not be taken merely as a protest. It will

[Sir Campbell Rhodes.]

be taken as a proof that this House is lacking in that sense of responsibility, without which no further advance can be made.

Well, Sir, there is one other point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Honourable Pandit and that is in regard to the position of his own party. We have heard something about flirtation, flirtation with the Government. But I gather there has been a good deal of flirtation going on in the shadow of the ruins of Raisina. What has transpired there, we know not. But there is an uneasy feeling amongst some of his friends—and I assert this, borrowing the phrase of the Honourable Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, not as a fact but in order that it may be corrected if not a fact—who have pledged themselves to vote for this throwing out of the grant, but have done so at the command of the majority and against their own better judgment. If this is so and if this throwing out of the grant is carried, then I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the motion will be carried by the wishes of the minority. When my friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, who I am sorry to see is not here, because I desired to plead with him, said some unpleasant truths. You, Sir, were immediately asked whether there was a time limit to the speeches. I do think in this House at least we might all be allowed to express our feelings and our views freely and without interruption. But I should have liked to plead with my friend from Bengal and point out to him that on this matter every man will have to vote. There can be no abstention. If a man does not vote, he gives half of his vote to each side. He cannot remain neutral. He has got to make up his mind. We have been told by the last speaker that the Reforms are a farce. They certainly did not come in with the blessing of my community. We have done our best to work them since their inception and I think no one of any party will deny this fact. We are constantly told that this House is not a responsible House and it has been repeated so often that I think that some of my friends here honestly believe it. And yet look at our record of the last three years. Policies to which the Government were definitely opposed have been carried and put into practice. I may instance the fiscal policy to which, if they were not definitely opposed, they were certainly very lukewarm. I can instance the nationalisation of railways which has become an accomplished fact. There has therefore, I submit, been evolution. We have been going down the right road, a badly-paved road, a narrow road and a twisting road, but we have been making progress and we have not come to that wall of which my friend from Bengal just spoke. Pandit Motilal Nehru suggests that we should turn back. If we turn back, we may turn back for many years. I do not think the House fully realises the gravity of the decision that they are going to take before the sun sets to-night, the effect of an adverse vote on the future progress of the reforms and the alienation of those in England and here who have worked and worked unceasingly to make those Reforms a success. The Honourable Pandit has referred in flattering terms to British determination. I accept the compliment. There is such a thing as British determination. If there were not this British determination and if my community in India had not set out with determination to make these Reforms a success, to help our friends along the road of reforms towards that ultimate goal of self-government which we all desire to see, and if we had not put our back into it when others were outside these Councils, not only not assisting us but interfering with us

4 P.M.

in our work, then I say that I personally should not be in India to-day but should be enjoying the genial weather of a March afternoon in London. I want to impress upon this House, Sir, the great gravity of this constitutional crisis and the serious effects the refusal of this grant will have. The knowledge and experience I have gained in this House warn me that if this grant is thrown out, at least 25 per cent. of those who will vote against it will repent by to-morrow morning, will realise that they have been pushed over a dangerous precipice and that it may take years to undo the harm that it is in their power to do this afternoon.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Sir, I am thankful, and I am sure my Indian colleagues in this Assembly will be very thankful, to the last speaker for the very valuable advice that he gave us. We have however taken a decision. We recognise that it is an extreme step, a step which is justifiable under extreme circumstances. The Honourable the Home Member himself admits that under certain circumstances such a step might perhaps be justifiable. He says that, if the Government of India and the British Government had gone back on their pledges and promises, perhaps such a step might be justifiable. These are his words which I took down at the time when he was speaking. So this step is not altogether ruled out by the Honourable the Home Member. The question is whether circumstances justifying us to adopt such a step have arisen or not. That is the only question. The Honourable the Home Member does not question that it is a constitutional step. Perhaps he thinks, as we think, that it is a constitutional step though he does not say so in so many words. It is our right to refuse supplies under certain circumstances. It is our constitutional right to do so. (*Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar:* "It is our duty.") And I will go further along with my friend Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar and say that it is our duty in certain circumstances to refuse supplies. So the sole question for this House now to consider is whether the circumstances justifying this House in taking this extreme step have come into being. And I submit, Sir, that those circumstances have come into being. We are, Sir, under British rule for the last 150 years. There are certain tragic facts which it is necessary for us to take note of. It may or it may not be that the British Government are or are not responsible for those tragic facts. But the fact remains that the British Government have not been able to prevent the occurrence of those tragic facts. And what are those facts? The average income of an individual in India is hardly £ 2 annually, or Rs. 30. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:* "That is a tragic misstatement.") It is a misstatement? Will you tell me how much of it is? (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:* "No".) We have repeatedly told the Government to estimate the annual average income of an individual. They will not face or undertake such an inquiry. And the official or semi-official as well as the non-official estimates taken in years gone by prove conclusively that the average annual income is Rs. 30 or thereabouts. (*The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett:* "No".) Then again, Sir, millions of people in this country live on one meal per day. Millions die of pestilence, plague, cholera, all sorts of diseases. In 1918—I do not remember the year—6 millions of my countrymen died in three months owing to influenza alone. (*Lieut.-Colonel H. A. J. Gidney:* "Is that the fault of the Government?") These are tragic facts which I want the House to note. I do not want to lay them all at the door of the British Government. .

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

But what I do maintain is this that the British Government, after 150 years of their rule in India, have not been able to prevent the occurrence of these facts. It is under their rule that these things have occurred. Take education. After 150 years of British rule 5 per cent. of the population know how to read and write. The whole population is disarmed. We are told we are not ready for defence. You forget that you have disarmed the whole population since 1857. This being the state of things, I ask what is the remedy? We started the non-co-operation movement. When? After we got the so-called reforms. We declared that the reforms were unsatisfactory, disappointing, inadequate. We said so in the Congress at Amritsar, in the Congress at Bombay, in the Congress at Delhi. We refused to take part in the deliberations of these Councils. We then found that these Councils were being utilised by the bureaucracy for its own ends. For three years these Councils were being worked by the bureaucracy in a manner which—I will not use a stronger expression—reflects no credit on them. With the sanction, express or implied, of the so-called representatives of the people, the bureaucracy had been able to send 30,000 to 40,000 of the best of our countrymen to jail, Lala Lajpat Rai, Mahatma Gandhi, Maulana Mohamed Ali, Maulana Shaukat Ali, C. R. Das (*Lala Hans Raj*: "Pandit Motilal Nehru") and half a dozen of them are here in this House, perhaps more, including my friend, Mr. Hans Raj. And all this was done with the express or implied consent of the so-called representatives of the people. This was the fruit of the working by some of my countrymen of these reforms. Now, we want to show once and for all that we are no party to the carrying on of this administration. You may carry it on on your own responsibility. I am absolutely certain you would not have been so hard-hearted yourself if you had the sole responsibility. If you had to carry on the administration on your own responsibility, you dared not have done all that you did during the last three years. Fifty crores of new taxation with the consent of the so-called representatives of the people! That is what you did. And now we are here in this House to stand between you and those who had hitherto co-operated with you to the great detriment of this country. And here we are telling you, we are perfectly willing to co-operate with you. Are you willing to listen to us? Do you want our co-operation? Our co-operation will be on our own terms. The position of my friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru, and therefore of the whole Swaraj Party, is wholly misrepresented by my friend Mr. Pal here. He says, my friend Mr. Motilal Nehru is "a reasonable man". He will be satisfied with a gesture. Gesture? What gesture? Read the Resolution which my friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru, had moved. We do not want mere empty gestures. We wanted a Round Table Conference. For what purpose? We wanted a Round Table Conference for the purpose of determining the constitution for India—a constitution of full responsible government. That is what we wanted. And that constitution, after it was framed by the Round Table Conference, was to be placed before the newly elected Legislative Assembly for its sanction to be ultimately embodied in an Act of Parliament. Is that a gesture?—could any one describe it as a mere gesture? No. It is, I submit, a demand for self-determination. We wanted to determine for ourselves when and what form of Government we should have. The attitude of the Swaraj Party was perfectly clear, the Resolution was in unmistakable language and the speech of the Honourable Pandit was equally unambiguous. My friend the Honourable the Home

Member had fully understood the Resolution and its significance and implications as stated by him in reply that the demand contained in the Resolution was much more than what some of the Members on this side or that side of the House thought. However, I need not detain the House any longer on this question. The fact of the matter is that, in our opinion, the time has arrived when we should refuse supplies, thus disassociating ourselves with the carrying on of the administration of this country. We know the consequences. We are told that the Viceroy will certify. Yes, we know it. • The Viceroy will certify, but he will have to do so on his own responsibility, and we want you to do on your own responsibility what you are professing to do with our consent. We want you to carry on the administration of this country by veto and by certification. We want you to treat the Government of India Act as a scrap of paper which I am sure it has proved to be. Therefore, Sir, if the Viceroy certifies, and I am sure he will, we are not afraid of it. Let him do it by all means. But what then? Great minds think alike. My friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, on the one hand, and the Honourable the Home Member, on the other, both think alike. They say, "But are you prepared for the next step?" What is that next step? Mass movement; non-payment of taxes. I hope my friend the Honourable the Home Member has not forgotten the mass movement of 1921. The Honourable the Home Member says that the country is not ready and my Honourable friend Mr. Pal also thinks so. I do not agree. Therefore we want you either to accede to our demands or to drive us to the mass movement. The responsibility will be yours. We shall refuse supplies. The Government of the country then will have to be carried on by veto and by certification. We go to our people and we place the facts before them. Why? For the matter of that, when I stood for election the very first sentence in my manifesto was, "I stand as a candidate for the Assembly, and, if I be elected, I shall endeavour to the best of my capacity to embarrass and to obstruct the bureaucracy by all peaceful means, by all legitimate means, unless and until the national demands are conceded to the satisfaction of the Indian National Congress". (Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: "At each stage and at every step.") Yes, at every stage and at every step. I wish my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal allows me to do so. That is my difficulty. Constitutional obstruction is our very creed. If you do not concede our demands, then we throw out the Budget. We obstruct you in every possible manner, and it is then for you to decide whether you will drive us to go in for mass movement. You will have to decide whether you will take the responsibility of driving us to the launching of a nation-wide movement of non-payment of taxes or whether you will reconsider your position. There will be one more chance for you. Throwing out the Budget does not necessarily mean that from to-morrow we are going to start the movement of non-payment of taxes. I am not at all sure that my people are not ready for it. I am not at all sure that they are not ready. I have been disagreeing with some of my friends on that question. We had the movement of non-payment of taxes in Kaira district some four or five years ago. The whole district refused to pay land-revenue. You had the movement of non-payment of some punitive tax only the other day in the whole taluq of Borsad and it was that mass movement in the Borsad taluq that drew the attention of the new Governor of Bombay, who at once sent his Home Member to make inquiries. You do not care to hear our petitions; you turn deaf ears to our requests; you do not care for our protests; you do not care for our Congress Resolutions. What are we to do? What do you

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

want us to do? There is no other way left to us. I have stated before, and I state it to-day, that I have always failed to understand why you are so stubborn, why you are so unyielding. You profess to give us self-government by stages. We say, "Well let us sit down, let us sit together, let us sit across the table and let us talk the matter over. Let us see if we cannot come to some understanding." We do not trust you and you do not trust us. That is the difficulty. We feel that you do not want to part with the powers and that you are deceiving us. You do not mean business. All that is needed is that you must remove the causes of this distrust and misunderstanding. You are now calling my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru a very reasonable man. You say, "What a reasonable speech he has made; he is very reasonable. Patel is a bad man". It is only when you came together that you found out that Pandit Motilal was a reasonable man. But two years ago, in 1921, he was worse than Patel. He was a terrible man. You locked him up for six months. I had read those writings with big letters on his compound wall when the Prince of Wales was about to visit Allahabad. I know all that. And it is because the same Pandit Motilal Nehru is here now that you have come to know him. Let us know each other. That is all that we want. If you do not, the Pandit of 1924 will be the Pandit of 1921. Let us therefore sit down and decide what we want. Let us settle our differences. Why all these years of anxious consideration? Why all this anxiety? Why all this trouble? Why all this use of repressive laws and the locking up of so many thousands of our countrymen in jail? Why are we passing sleepless nights? You do not trust your own troops if they are Indians. You do not trust your own subordinates if they are Indians. That is your present position unfortunately. Therefore we say, "Let us sit down together and let us understand each other." You remain unmoved. That is the trouble. Therefore, we have now decided, rightly or wrongly—from our point of view very rightly—to take this extreme step. If you will pardon my saying so, I repeat that the responsibility is yours. Lord Olivier still maintains that the British people understand—I do not exactly remember the words—(Mr. M. K. Acharya: "They are the arbiters of India's fate.") they are the arbiters of India's fate. I do not know if those words were used by him. I remember to have read his speech in the House of Lords to the effect that the British people are the people who claim to know and understand the conditions under which democratic institutions can be introduced and can grow. Our view point is entirely different. We say "No. Do not please think so. We understand our interests better. We claim the right to determine our destinies. We know what is best for us, and we take our stand on the principle of self-determination for which the Labour Party is standing, and has stood for the last so many years." Therefore, I submit that the time has come when either you must mend your ways or we must make you mend your ways. (Mr. D. V. Belvi: "Or end this sham.") I entirely agree with Mr. Belvi. All this is a sham, I entirely agree. But what I want to point out is this that there is absolutely no reason, no justification whatever for you to take up such an unyielding attitude and you can not blame us if we on our part do something to put you in a proper frame of mind. Otherwise show us the way by which we can put you right. There is no other way. You agree that refusal of supplies is not unconstitutional but you say we are justified in taking that extreme step only when we are in a position to go to our people and find them prepared for a campaign of

non-payment of taxes. Well, I ask you in all seriousness, do you want to drive us to that? If not, tell us why you take up this attitude. Some of my Honourable friends here also feel that it is only when we are in a position to launch civil disobedience that we should go in for this extreme step of refusal of supplies. I do not know why. I say we shall be putting the Government in the wrong. If we go in for non-payment of taxes a year hence or six months hence, the responsibility will be theirs, not ours. As representatives of the people we must support this amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru because the people want us to do so. We have the mandate of the country. Meetings are being held all over the country asking us to refuse supplies. It is an unmistakable, emphatic, opinion of the country that we should refuse supplies, and we are bound to do so in pursuance of that mandate. It will be the mistake of the people if they do not take up the movement of non-payment of taxes if you carry on this administration by certification. But we are here to give you a warning that unless you are prepared to mend your ways and come to terms with us, the Treasury Benches will no longer remain a bed of roses.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Madras: Nominated Non-Official): Sir, the Honourable Mr. Belvi did me the honour of quoting an extract from a memorandum which I had prepared for another occasion. (*A Voice*: "Louder please.") To every word of what I said I still adhere, and my authority for those statements was no less a person than Sir William Vincent who had held high office here and who made the same criticisms in a lecture which he delivered at the Royal Colonial Institute. My Honourable friends will therefore acquit me of any want of sympathy with their objects, with the object which has moved them to put forward this motion. If I am unable to support the motion it is not because the cry of Swaraj falls flat upon my ears or makes no appeal to me, but it is entirely because I feel that the method which they have chosen is absolutely inefficacious either as a protest or as a means to achieve anything else. It is said that it is the most effective form of making a protest. A protest against what? Against the statement made by Lord Olivier in the House of Lords upon the Indian situation. My Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru was fair enough to acknowledge that Lord Olivier's statement bore witness to his sense of fairness and to his sympathy with the people of India. But evidently the Panditji thought that it did not go far enough and I am disposed to agree with him. But, on the other hand, I do not regard that statement as devoid of all rays of hope which should cheer workers for the political uplift of this country. What is most valuable in that speech is not the specific statements which it contains but the spirit which it breathes, the spirit of sympathy, of fairness and of anxiety to assist us. In fact, the remarks which he made in the very opening sentences of his speech about his desire to find some effectual means of bringing about a contact between the Swarajists and the Government show that he was anxious to meet India, and the Committee of the Cabinet, of whose appointment we have heard also, indicates a disposition on his part to make a further move. Is it possible for us to expect Lord Olivier to have made a very different statement from what he actually did make on that occasion? Let us remember the conditions under which that statement was made. Within a few weeks after the Labour Party had come into office, before Lord Olivier had had any time to acquaint himself with the conditions at all, before, in fact, his study of the Indian problem was complete, Lord Olivier showed sympathy with us in his diagnosis of the ailments of India. Pandit Motilal Nehru is not

[Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.]

satisfied with that diagnosis. He thinks that he ought to have made a reference to the campaign of repression which had been going on in this country. But there are two explanations for that. The House of Lords is not a confessional, and no Government or Minister is expected to go into the House of Lords or House of Commons and deliver a full catalogue of all the sins and defects of his Government or the Governments which have preceded him. Even individuals cannot be expected to make such an avowal of their sins and omissions. Could you expect a Government, even if they had convinced themselves that they were guilty of any such sins or omissions, to make such an avowal? That is not a circumstance which induces me to doubt his sincerity or his sympathy. Sir, under the circumstances under which it was made, remembering that Lord Olivier's education in Indian affairs was far from complete, I think we have fair grounds for considering that statement not unsatisfactory. In making replies to criticisms, people generally choose only the most vulnerable points and meet them. In the same way Lord Olivier referred to some of the points in the criticisms made of the administration of this country and tried to meet them. There are other features of the administration about which he perhaps might not have been able to frame an equally satisfactory answer either to himself or to the public, as, for instance, with regard to the military organisation of this country. But very probably his studies, as I said, of Indian affairs have not proceeded far enough and I do hope that the Government of India in their communications from time to time to the Home Government will enlighten the Secretary of State upon this problem as well as other problems which have been a matter of real concern to Indians. Now, taking all these circumstances into consideration, I think one may fairly come to the conclusion that the Secretary of State and the members of the present Cabinet are inspired by sympathy with us and are anxious to do the best they can for us. Now is it reasonable to expect that they should have gone further? After a few months more, it may be possible for them but certainly not at this stage. I consider that the occasion for your making a protest has not arisen yet. My Honourable friend Mr. Patel went into an indictment of the whole administration of India. I think it is unnecessary to go into that question. Now, what we have to consider is this. This Labour Government has come into office and the members of it have openly expressed genuine sympathy with our cause. But they have not had sufficient time to help us. We cannot ask the Labour Government to stand and deliver a responsible government to this country within a few weeks of their accession to office. Assuming for the sake of argument that the occasion for a protest has arisen, the question arises if this is the most efficacious form of protest. I assume that your object is only to protest. If it is something else or more I will deal with it later on, but if your object is to enter an emphatic protest against the unsatisfactory character of the reply of the Secretary of State, would that not be quite sufficiently served by a strong expression of opinion on the part of this House either in connection with this motion or on some other occasion? Would it not be sufficiently served by the numerous expressions of public opinion in the press and by various public bodies? Is it necessary to go further and say that this Budget should be thrown out in order to mark our dissatisfaction? Have you not sufficiently expressed your dissatisfaction with the various faults of the administration and with the insufficiency of the reforms by the various movements which you have initiated and by the hardships and inconveniences undergone by many of the leaders of your movement? Do you

think that this Resolution refusing supplies can be a more powerful testimony to your sentiments than the imprisonment undergone by the leaders of your movement? I do not think that this by itself will be a more effective protest.

Let us pass on to the other question. Is there any objective for this proposition beyond a mere desire to protest? If you want to do anything more than protest, what is it? Is it to hurt anybody, is it to hurt the Government or to hurt ourselves by bringing Government to a standstill? If you think it is to hurt the Government, I am afraid it will not serve its purpose. If it is to hurt ourselves, I dare say it will be successful and it will also impress the people in England and the Labour party in England with a sense of our lack of responsibility. Now the only object which can be achieved at all by this protest will be that you will injure the reputation of the Assembly; it will not be able to hurt the Government and may hurt yourselves. What is the real intention with regard to this proposition? Do you want it to be accepted by the Government or not? We are all anxious that the Government should respond to the voice of the people and grant self-Government. Now the best thing that the Government can do under these circumstances is to comply with our wishes, to close down all the services, the colleges, the courts, the hospitals and the police stations and every other institution in the country and say 'We cannot carry on because the Assembly has not voted funds.' That is the course which the Government would be entitled to adopt if responsible government prevailed here. Supposing that they adopt that course, can we complain? The question which I want Members—specially those who are not pledged to any particular course of action—to put to themselves is this. What will be the wish of the supporters of this motion? Do you want it to be carried out or not? If you want it to be carried out or if you expect it to be carried out, the result will be that all the beneficial activities of the administration must come to a standstill. Is that your object? If that is your object, who are the persons to suffer? The people at large. And whom will they have to thank? Not the Government, because they simply complied as a responsible government with the wishes of our friends here, Messrs. Pandit Motilal Nehru and Patel. That will be the result not of the Government being irresponsible but of the Government being over-responsive to the wishes of the people. If, on the other hand, you do not wish the Government to come to a standstill, if you do not expect the Government to come to a standstill and nevertheless give your votes for this proposition, is that a dignified course or consistent with the duty to be true to oneself or with regard for the public interests or with our professed desire for responsible Government? If you honestly believe that the Government should not carry out this motion, then I can understand your attitude. That will be a dignified, self-respecting and honest attitude, but if in your heart of hearts you hope that the Government will not do it, and I do believe that any Government with a sense of responsibility, not necessarily to a Legislative body but with a sense of responsibility for the higher ends of all civilised society, would not do it. If you hope for it and expect it, to go and vote for the proposition is a procedure which utterly lacks all sincerity. I make this appeal not to the gentlemen who have already made up their minds and who have given pledges to the country to pursue the policy they have launched. To them I make no appeal and I do not hope to convert them. My friend Mr. Moir the other day referred humorously to the sacrificial rite which was being prepared and I see several white capped Druids ready to assist in the operation of lighting the flames into which the Budget will be thrown.

[Sir. P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.]

I make no appeal to them, but I make an appeal to those other gentlemen who consider themselves independents but who have found themselves entangled in an alliance which I am afraid some of them at any rate consider an unfortunate alliance and about which they do not feel quite easy. I make an appeal to those gentlemen to consider for themselves whether the course which they propose to follow is an honest course, a sincere course. I know that they are in a difficult position, but it has been said by a statesman on one occasion that there are promises which it is more honourable to break than to fulfil, and I believe that this is one of those occasions.

Now, Sir, apart from this aspect of the case, let me just refer to one other

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I request the Honourable gentleman, instead of putting two alternatives before us whether it is not the third alternative (Cries of "Order, Order.")

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: Sir, the Honourable Mr. Patel expressed the opinion and gave us the advice that we should try and put the Government in the wrong. I entirely agree with him that that should be our policy. Our policy must be to put the Government in the wrong and not to put ourselves in the wrong by adopting the present course. The responsibility for any harm that will follow will be laid at our door and not at the door of the Government. Sir, last year there was a discussion in the Assembly with regard to the alteration of the powers of His Excellency the Viceroy of certification and restoration. A Resolution was brought forward in the Simla session and in replying to that Resolution the Honourable the Home Member said, "these safeguards which are now provided in section 37A may be unnecessary if we had to deal with an Assembly composed of gentlemen like you, Moderates. But supposing the Swarajists return to power at the next election, shall we not find it necessary to have those safeguards." Now, if we vote against the Budget as a whole and throw it out, shall we not be justifying the existence of those safeguards and the wisdom of the provision? Rightly or wrongly, Parliament decided to give us a transitional constitution. I am not going into the merits of that question. They gave us a transitional constitution which was not meant to give us responsible government but only a certain amount of influence in the Central Government and no more. Rightly or wrongly, they expected that there might be conflicts between the Legislature and the Executive Government, and they thought it necessary to provide for them. Now a transitional constitution like that can only be worked with a certain amount of the spirit of compromise, of the disposition to give and take. There must be a certain amount of conciliatory spirit on both sides. It is only thus that you can possibly work it. Because on certain occasions the Government have exercised the power of restoration of the Budget or the power of certification, it does not follow that on other occasions the power or influence of the Legislature has been ignored or is nil. I am not a blind supporter of the Government. I lay claim to some judgment and I can be as critical of the Government's faults as any one. (Hear, hear.) Now, the conclusion which I have arrived at from my experience of the last three years is that it is wrong to say that the reformed constitution has given us no influence or power (Hear, hear) or that the Government do not respond to our wishes. The Government have done so. There have

been a number of occasions, as for instance, when we cut down the estimates by five per cent., which was an absurdly crude method of cutting down expenditure, the Government did accept the cut and endeavoured their very best to meet our wishes. There have been several such occasions. One occasion, for instance, in which my friend on my left complained very bitterly of the exercise of our power was our refusal to grant a supply to the Lytton Committee to come out to India and pursue their investigations. There have been many occasions like that when the Government have conformed to the wishes of the Assembly and one may say that generally their anxiety has been to conform to our wishes. It may be that on certain occasions they have failed to listen to us and it may be their judgment was in the wrong. But that is not the question. In the case of any transitional constitution, which does not vest the full power of the purse in the elected legislature, there must be differences of view as to the urgency of particular items of expenditure or as to the expediency of particular methods of raising revenue, and those conflicts had to be provided for somehow in a make-shift constitution; and, if those powers are utilized, it would be, as I said before, just as constitutional for the Government to exercise those powers to prevent the administration from being paralysed and brought to a standstill, as it is constitutional for us to exercise the right of refusing supplies. Now, Sir, I think that by refusing the supplies on this occasion we should be justifying the necessity for safeguards of that kind. On the other hand, if we grant supplies and if we criticise the particular demands on the merits, we shall be showing that we can exercise our powers with a sense of responsibility. If there is a difference between us and the Government go wrong, we shall certainly put them in the wrong as in the case of the certification of the salt tax.

Sir, I would therefore earnestly appeal to the gentlemen who have not yet made up their minds to ponder over all these questions seriously and consider whether it is not their duty to vote in a manner which will really be more consistent with the requirements of individual rectitude and of national progress.

Mr. N. M. Dumasia (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, it requires great courage to go against the trend of opinion of a powerful party. It requires still greater courage to go against the opinion of a man of such eminence and patriotism as Pandit Motilal Nehru. It is heart-rending that we cannot see our way to respond to his appeal to vote with him. But, Sir, as I listened to his eloquent speech I thought that he was not quite comfortable in his position. I thought that he was perhaps a little unhappy, and when I remember what Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal said, I am inclined to agree with him that it was because of the pressure and influence of the younger men in his party that he was unhappy and that he was fighting against his own convictions. But on this occasion we, independent Members, are fortunately spared from doing violence to our own feelings. Sir, to-day I am fortified in the position that I have taken up by the attitude which my Honourable friend, Mr. V. J. Patel, took up a few weeks ago in the Bombay Municipal Corporation. A question came up for the exemption of the Municipal Corporation from the stamp-duty on certain documents. At that time Mr. Patel got up and said, "The administration of the country should be carried on. It must be carried on, and for that purpose Government must have revenue." Therefore, Sir, I to-day take up the position which Mr. Patel did in the Bombay Municipal Corporation. I hope he will not think that I am not justified in that position.

Mr. V. J. Patel: On a point of personal explanation, Sir. My friend has wholly failed to understand me, as he generally does.

Mr. H. M. Dumas: Sir, a report of the proceedings has been published in the Bombay newspapers and the report speaks for itself.

Now, Sir, I come to the real issue. What is the question before us? The question is, whether the administration of the country is to be carried on, or whether it is not to be carried on. If you push the motion of Mr. Motilal Nehru to its logical conclusion, it will be this, that if there is no grant, there cannot be the military, there cannot be the police, and there cannot be any guardians and protectors of the peace, and the administrations should come to a standstill and what will be the result? The result will be the spread of Bolshevism throughout the country. (Laughter.) Sir, you may laugh, but if the motion is put into force, that will be the only result—and perhaps some of the Members invite that. (Voices: "No, no; something better than that.") Sir, as I have said, the only consequence of such a Resolution would be this, that, if Government had not the powers of restoration of the grants, there would be no order and no law and no peace in the country, and Bolshevism would run rampant and ruin India as it ruined Russia. The only corollary to this Resolution would be this, that there will be Civil Disobedience, and it will lead only to revolution at a later stage. That is the only result that we can foresee at present. This motion, if it is intended only to frighten Government out of their wits, will not succeed in doing so,—yes, I tell you so because Government have the power of certification. If it is a challenge to Government, then Government will not take it lying down, because Government have not been reduced to impotence. Sir, as I have said, the only question is whether the administration of the country is to be carried on. And it is the duty of every citizen to help the Government in carrying on the administration of the country. We have our grievances, but we can have them redressed by the machinery that has been given to us. This machinery has been given to us in order to advance us to the road of self-government. If we destroy that machinery, will India get self-government? You will get it not by any threat that you can hold out to Government, but by co-operation. If you persevere in your legitimate and reasonable demands, then, Sir, as surely as night follows day, we will, within a measurable distance of time, attain Swaraj. Sir, this motion will not lead us to our goal. It will have a bad effect upon the masses of the people. They will think that by this motion they will escape taxation, and that will unsettle their minds and create a feeling of revolt among them. But the greatest injury that will be done to India will be the impression that will be created by such a motion on India's friends in England. We should be careful not to alienate their sympathy. That is another important point that we should always remember. Considering all these things, Sir, the time has not come to take such a drastic step. As Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal said the other day, we have power but we have no responsibility. If we use this power to throw out the Budget, then it will be said that we have misused that power; and if we misuse that power, how is it possible for us to attain responsibility in the future? Sir, when Mr. Patel went to Nagpur, we all admired his courage because we thought that he was going there to court arrest and suffer imprisonment. But what did he do there? Sir, he co-operated with the Governor there, and with his co-operation he succeeded in having the matter settled at Nagpur.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I am perfectly willing to co-operate even now, but on my terms.

Mr. N. M. Dumasia: I am very glad to hear he believes in the efficacy of co-operation and is willing to co-operate on his own terms; but as regards those terms, one should decide whether they are reasonable or unreasonable. Mr. Patel wants immediate Swaraj. (*Voices: "No, no."*) I am glad to hear those voices, but I do not know whom to believe; here is Mr. Patel who says he wants immediate Swaraj, other people say that it is not so.

Mr. V. J. Patel: I want to have the right to decide for myself what I should have.

Mr. N. M. Dumasia: But you did not make it clear on the first day when you said you wanted immediate Swaraj. Even now if Mr. Patel co-operates with Government, I am sure he will get Swaraj. With these remarks, Sir, I ask the Assembly not to take any rash step in haste of which we may have to repent at leisure.

(Several Honourable Members moved that the question be put).

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee (Industries Member): Sir, my only justification for taking part in this Debate and at this late hour is that I realize, as some of the Honourable Members who have already spoken also realized, that the issue before the House is a most grave and momentous one, an issue that is fraught with very serious consequences to the political progress of our country. I am anxious, Sir, that this progress should not be jeopardised by any action that the House might take this evening. I have had the privilege of the friendship of the leader of the Swaraj party in this House for more than a quarter of a century, and I think he will bear me out when I say that my anxiety for constitutional progress in this country is as great as that of any Member of this House.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: I am not permitted to give out secrets.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: When you are permitted, I am sure you will give it out. I am anxious, Sir, that the action which this House will take should not jeopardize the constitutional progress which all Indian Members in this House are most anxious that we should attain. (*A Voice: "And English Members also"*)—and English Members also, I can confidently assert. My Honourable friend opposite, Mr. Patel, just now said (I am glad, Sir, he has come back to his seat) that, if this Resolution is adopted, he would address himself to a mass movement similar to what had taken place in 1921. At least I understood him to say so. (*Mr. V. J. Patel: "Certainly."*) Now, Sir, I ask, is that going to lead to the constitutional progress of the country? (*A Voice: "It would have led if you were not here."*) Did Chauri-Chaura lead to the constitutional progress of the country? Did Malegaon lead to the constitutional progress of the country? I do not believe that my Honourable friend himself for a moment believes that the mass movement which he contemplates would lead to the constitutional progress of the country. If he did, then he is answered by my Honourable friend here (Pandit Motilal Nehru) who gave his own opinion against a repetition of the movement of 1921, I mean, against the civil disobedience programme. I think my Honourable friends here realise very fully that the country will not be any the better for the repetition of the 1921 movement, otherwise they would not have come into this House—and I welcome them here—they would not have come into this House in the manner that they have done,

[Mr. A. C. Chatterjee.]

They are co-operating with us. In 1921 they refused to co-operate with Government. I do hope, Sir, that my Honourable friend, Mr. Patel, did not realise the implications of what he said a little while ago. I am quite sure that my Honourable friend here, the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru, does not want to go back to the 1921 programme.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: On a point of personal explanation, Sir, may I say that there is not a word that has been uttered by Mr. Patel which does not represent the opinion of the Swaraj party and, as a Swarajist, I do not dissociate myself from anything that he has said. There is only a difference of language. I chose to use my own words and he chooses his own.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Well, Sir, I am not a commentator. I am a plain business official and I take language as I understand it; and I certainly did not understand the language of my Honourable friend to my right (Pandit Motilal Nehru) to mean what the language of my Honourable friend opposite (Mr. Patel) meant.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Because we were not expressing the same idea.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Quite so. I say the ideas are different. You do not want to get back to the 1921 programme. No Indian wants to go back to the 1921 programme.

Mr. V. J. Patel: Then give us what we want.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: Yes, we all want constitutional progress. I said at the outset that we do want constitutional progress, and I personally do not want this House—this House for which I have very great affection and very great respect—I do not want this House to do anything which will mar the constitutional progress that we are striving for.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: We want real constitutional progress.

The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee: It is a mock constitutional progress that you are asking for at this moment. What is it that you are asking for? You are asking that this Demand should be omitted. My Honourable friend has admitted that that does not mean what it would have meant in a free country. It only means that Government will restore the Demand. Yes, quite so. Government will be bound to restore it. We cannot afford to lose 45 crores of rupees. How are you going to maintain the Government of the country? It is quite impossible. My Honourable friend has conceded that he is only making a protest. Then, for whose benefit is he making the protest? Is he making the protest for the benefit of the Indian people? I have already shown that he does not want to go back to the 1921 programme. The inevitable result of going back to the 1921 programme, as my Honourable friend Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal pointed out, would be civil disobedience, and even my Honourable friends are not prepared for civil disobedience. I give them credit for that. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru:* "We are prepared for it"). You are not yet ready. You do not want to leave the country in the air while you are preparing after passing this mock motion. I think what my

Honourable friends are really aiming at is that they want to impress the British people and the British Cabinet. Sir, we are always taking credit to ourselves for being people with imagination. I wish that we could also be practical. I think the only result of the passing of this Resolution will be that the British people will say "Here are a people, who clutch at the shadow and give the substance the go-by". Here you have an opportunity of criticising the administration on each head of Demand. (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "To what end"?) My Honourable friend, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, pointed out only a little while ago that you could effect retrenchment; you could effect Indianisation and you could effect a lot of other things. You have already effected it. Your predecessors have effected it already. I think, Sir, the only result of this attempt will be that we will get credit for being an absolutely unpractical people. I wish that that result should not happen. I am most anxious that this House should not stultify itself. The Assembly—the Legislature in India—has already achieved a reputation. It has, Sir, achieved a reputation in Great Britain. It has created a good impression on the British people. I want that impression to be maintained. I do not want that impression to be removed by any action, by any hasty action on the part of this House this evening. I implore the Members of the House to think over what they are doing. What are they doing? They are simply passing a Resolution which will not be given effect to. We cannot afford, as I said, to go without our Customs revenue. The demand will be restored. There will be no practical effect. You want to create an impression on the British people. The only impression that you will create is that you are not practical people. You talk of the principle of supplies after grievances. Sir, in my youthful days, I was also a student of history. (*An Honourable Member*: "You are not old yet".) I am glad of that compliment, but I do feel old and weary when I listen to some of the speeches in this House. (Laughter.) Well, my friend Taswell-Langmead has been quoted. My friend Mr. Motilal Nehru has quoted him. I said he has quoted my friend, because I used to know Taswell-Langmead by heart in those youthful days, those buoyant days, when there was no talk of Demands for Grants and so forth. He has pointed out that this movement was started in England in the time of Richard II and, as somebody here has pointed out, it culminated in the reign of Queen Victoria. Well, it is only three years since your reformed Parliament started. You cannot expect everything in three years; and besides, what are the implications? As has been pointed out, the implications are that you must be ready with armed revolution. My friend, Mr. Motilal Nehru, is the apostle of non-violence. He comes in the white robe of purity—of *khaddar*. He is following a bad precedent. Let him chalk out a new precedent for himself. He wants to follow the time-honoured precedent of England. It took six centuries to achieve what he is trying to achieve in three years. He must follow some better course. He must impress the people with the practicability of his proposals. He must impress both the Indian people and the British people with the practical nature of the proposals put forward in this House and not with mock resolutions like the one which he has put forward. Sir, I again repeat that I am most anxious that the constitutional progress of India should go on step by step. I do not mean in hundreds of years and in centuries. We do not want anything which will merely set us back, and I am convinced that a Resolution like this will only put us back. I implore, I make an earnest appeal, to all Members of the House to think of the implications of this Resolution and then to vote. There is no real point in this Resolution. My Honourable friend fully realises that it will mean

[Mr. A. C. Chatterjee.]

restoration. He knows that the restoration will not impress the British people. I think he is only doing something in order to make a demonstration on the floor of the House, a demonstration which will, I fear, be fraught with the most evil consequences both in this country and outside this country. I implore the House to throw out this Resolution.

(Several Honourable Members: "I move that the question may now be put.")

Mr. President: The question is that the question be now put.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 71,84,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Customs'."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Customs' be omitted."

The question I have to put is:

"That the demand under the head 'Customs' be omitted."

The Assembly divided:

AYES—63.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Ariff, Mr. Yacoub C.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
Chaman Lal, Mr.
Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
Das, Mr. Bhuvanaranda.
Das, Mr. Nilakantha.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Hans Raj, Lala.
Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
Ismail Khan, Mr.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Kartar Singh, Sardar.
Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.
Kazim Ali, Mr. M.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hosain.
Kun Maung.
Lohokare, Mr. K. G.

Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
Mehta, Mr. Jumnadas.
Misra, Mr. Sambhu Dayal.
Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
Narayandas, Mr.
Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Patel, Mr. V. J.
Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
Piyare Lal, Lala.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Muhammad.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Svamaoharan, Mr.
Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—56.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
 Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Allen, Mr. B. C.
 Bell, Mr. R. D.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Butler, Mr. M. S. D.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Chatterjee, The Honourable Mr. A. C.
 Chettyar, Sir M. C. T. M.
 Clarke, Mr. G. R.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.
 Dumasia, Mr. N. M.
 Dunk, Mr. H. R.
 Faridoonji, Mr. R.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Ghulam Bari, Khan Sahib.
 Gidney Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.
 Hailev, The Honourable Sir Malcolm.
 Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.

Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Holme, Mr. H. E.
 Howell, Mr. E. B.
 Hyder, Dr. L. K.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Lindsay, Mr. Percy
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur,
 Mr.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Moncrieff Smith, Sir Henry.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Nag, Mr. G. C.
 O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.
 Owens, Lieut.-Colonel F. C.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Percival, Mr. P. E.
 Pilcher, Mr. G.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Mukhdum Syed.
 Rhodes Sir Campbell.
 Roy, Mr. K. C.
 Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
 Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Turing, Mr. J. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND NO. 2—TAXES ON INCOME.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 61,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Taxes on Income'."

Mr. V. J. Patel: Sir, I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income' be omitted."

Sir, as stated by you in giving your ruling in regard to the motion just moved by Pandit Motilal Nehru and disposed of, it is not permissible, I understand, to reopen the general discussion, and therefore I merely content myself by placing this motion for the consideration of this House without making any speech.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett (Finance Member): Sir, now that the House has come to the statesmanlike decision that it is desirable that all steel coming in from abroad should come in without payment of any duty and that we should not make any attempt to collect 45 crores of revenue from Customs and as many of us are looking forward to receiving the goods from home, which we have at present to get at considerable expense to ourselves, without payment of Customs duty, it is with great joy that I listened to Mr. Patel's suggestion that I should be relieved of several thousands a year of income-tax. The prospect which is opened up before me is a really attractive one. I may hope to spend the year in

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

exploiting the people of India for the benefit of my pocket and I have no doubt that there are a large number of people in this House who have equally cheerful expectations owing to their delightful and carefully thought out exercise of the responsibility placed upon them by the Government of India Act. Sir, the effect of this motion which has been moved by Mr. Patel would be to throw into the streets something over a thousand Indians, I think I am right in saying, who are employed in the business of collecting income-taxes. Its effect also would be to leave the Government of India without something over 18 crores of rupees with which to carry on the Government services. I believe that it would be possible for us by executive act to increase the provincial contributions accordingly. The total income which we expect to collect, if we do what the House really wants us to do and not what it asks us to do, will be 18½ crores with which we shall hope to trouble the tax-payers of this country in spite of Mr. Patel. I should like to bring home to the House exactly what they are doing. They are suggesting that we should not collect this taxation. The Government of India has to be carried on and somebody must take the responsibility for carrying it on. I was told, when I paid a visit to the United Provinces not very long ago, that there was a gentleman named Pandit Motilal Nehru who was very popular because he was going to bring Swaraj and Swaraj meant that nobody paid any taxes. I gather to-day that that really is what Swaraj means. I said a few days ago that we were all Swarajists, but in that sense, Sir, I am not.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas (Indian Merchants' Chamber: Indian Commerce): I rise, Sir, to oppose very strongly and very vehemently the amendment moved by my friend, Mr. Patel. I wish, Sir, that I had been lucky enough to catch your eye just before the closure was applied on the last amendment, and I am extremely sorry that my Honourable friend on my right has thought it right to move this second amendment of its kind, on the first of which we spent the best part of the day. I will not, Sir, indulge in any of the reflections which the Honourable the Finance Member began with. I will only say this—and I say it with all the emphasis at my command—that the Honourable Mr. Patel will be very well advised not only to withdraw this amendment of his but all other of that character on the Agenda paper. I do not, Sir, in view of your ruling this morning, say anything more.

Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar: Sir, I beg to suggest to Honourable Members of the Assembly, that, having shown their strength on the first motion, they do refrain from further interference at this stage taking all the circumstances into consideration. It is better that we go into the merits of the several motions hereafter and deal with them as far as possible in the best interests of the country. The main point that we wanted to show, we have taken a strong stand on. That is quite sufficient, and I beg of my friends not to press this matter further on the same lines.

Mr. Bivin Chandra Pal: I want to put in only one word. I refrained from voting on the last Resolution because our friends the Swarajists wanted to enter a protest in regard to our demand for constitutional advance. That has been done, and if they continue to try to omit every item in the Budget, it will be my clear duty to vote against them and with the Government.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, I am very sorry that, so soon after the first vote, nervousness has started among several people. (*Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas:* "Not at all.") I am not going to speak on the wider question, but I cannot understand how such faint hearts can win freedom. It is not possible at this stage to argue on the merits or demerits of the question. My Honourable friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas knows very well that all this obstruction is merely a vote of censure on the Government and nothing more,—a vote of censure of the widest, the most comprehensive and the most emphatic character that you can possibly imagine. Time was, Sir, when going to a Council meant in Bombay at any rate in the early nineties that they were going there to co-operate with the Government, so that we have heard of one member seconding a proposition, seconding an amendment to it, and seconding an amendment to that amendment. That was in the early nineties. We are now here after one generation, after 30 years, when we must have the courage not to flinch from the duty which is imposed upon us. What does it matter if 1,000 Indians are thrown out on the streets? What does it matter when 200 millions are practically on the street, who owe their present position to this Government from whom only Providence takes them away by means of plague, malaria and other things? What does it matter if 1,000 Indians are thrown into the streets? My friend Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas the other day made a most eloquent appeal in the interests of the steel industry and the iron industry of Tata's. I now appeal to him in the name of the 200 millions of this country, not in the interests of the house of Tata, but in the interests of 200 millions of the people of this country . . .

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: To restore the grant that has just been thrown out, Sir?

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: I now appeal to him to join with us in this demonstration against the system that has crushed 200 million people and not merely the Tata industries. We have a most tender corner for these 1,000 Indians, if at all they go. I am not sure that they will go. We have a most tender corner for them. But we are doing this in the interests of themselves and their future progeny. We are doing it in the interests of the country, and no one here who has voted for the last item will in the interests of so-called wisdom—because it is prudence and not wisdom—flinch from his duty in the name of practicality and all that sort of thing.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: Sir, when on the last motion the vote of this Assembly was recorded in favour of the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru, we understood that majority of the Members of this House had decided to record a protest in the form of refusal to vote supplies. Now, Sir, I would ask the House to answer this question, whether refusal to vote supplies means refusal to vote supplies only under one head or all the supplies that are submitted to the vote of the Assembly? The Honourable Member from Madras (Mr. K. Rama Aiyangar) said that we have expressed our sentiment, that we have expressed our resentment by voting against one Demand, and that we can now turn back and behave in another way. I ask him, Sir, "Is it not leaving this Assembly open to the charge of being unreasonable in voting out the entire demand under Customs when Members did not mean to be courageous enough to follow the same course of action so far as the other demands are concerned? By voting against the first demand and associating yourselves with the other demands that are coming up for the vote of the Assembly, we shall only be stultifying

[Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha.]

ourselves. I say, Sir, that we are committing not only an act of inconsistency but an act which has absolutely no meaning. It can neither be the advice of a constitutionalist nor the advice of a person who is anxious to give the most effective form to our protest. This is neither fish nor flesh. I ask Members to be consistent. After having given expression to their opinion in the Votes just recorded the only logical course is to reject all demands that are coming. The first demand from the point of view of revenue was more important than the Demand under the head Income. Sir, with these words, I think that this Demand also should be rejected as the first Demand has been.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 61,32,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Taxes on Income'."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Taxes on Income' be omitted."

The question that I have to put is that that demand be omitted.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—61.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
Acharya, Mr. M. K.
Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
Aney, Mr. M. S.
Ariff, Mr. Yaacob C.
Belvi, Mr. D. V.
Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
Chaman Lal, Mr.
Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmuktam.
Das, Mr. Bhubanananda.
Das, Mr. Nilakantha.
Duni Chand, Lala.
Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
Goswami, Mr. T. C.
Govind Das, Seth.
Gulab Singh, Sardar.
Hans Raj, Lali.
Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
Ismail Khan, Mr.
Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
Jeehani, Haji S. A. K.
Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
Kartar Singh, Sardar.
Kazim Ali, Mr. M.
Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
Kidwai, Shaikh Muhsin Hosain.
Kun, Maung.
Lohokare, Mr. K. G.
Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.
Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.

Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas.
Misra, Mr. Sambhu Dayal.
Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Sayad.
Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
Narayandas, Mr.
Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
Neogy, Mr. K. C.
Patel, Mr. V. J.
Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
Piyare Lal, Lala.
Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
Ray, Mr. Kumar Senkar.
Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
Shafee, Maulvi Muhammad.
Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
Svacharan, Mr.
Venkateswaraiah, Mr. B.
Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—60.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
 Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Allen, Mr. B. C.
 Bahawal Baksh, Chaudhri.
 Bell, Mr. R. D.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Butler, Mr. M. S. D.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Chatterjee, The Honourable Mr. A. C.
 Chettiyar, Sir M. C. T. M.
 Clarke, Mr. G. R.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.
 Datta, Dr. S. K.
 Dumasia, Mr. N. M.
 Dunk, Mr. H. R.
 Faridoonji, Mr. R.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.
 Ghulam Bari, Khan Sahib.
 Gidney, Lieut. Col. H. A. J.
 Hailev, The Honourable Sir Malcolm.
 Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
 Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.

Holme, Mr. H. E.
 Howell, Mr. E. B.
 Hyder, Dr. L. K.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Lindsay, Mr. Percy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur,
 Mr.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Moncrieff Smith, Sir Henry.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
 Nag, Mr. G. C.
 O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.
 Owens, Lieut.-Colonel F. C.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Percival, Mr. P. E.
 Pilcher, Mr. G.
 Pureshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Mukhdum Syed.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Sarda, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
 Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Turing, Mr. J. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

The motion was adopted.

DEMAND No. 8—SALT.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,06,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Salt'."

Mr. Venkatapatiraju (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadian Rural): I propose an adjournment at this stage.

Mr. O. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I move:

"That the demand under the head 'Salt' be wholly omitted."

I do not propose to go on the same ground upon which Pandit Motilal Nehru went on the subject but I do propose to add to it a discussion also on the merits of the question. Sir, if I recollect what I read about 26 years ago, Cowell in his Constitutional Law of India stated that the Residents in Indian States issue commands in the guise of advice. Until this Assembly comes to a position of issuing commands to the executive in the name of the representatives of the people, I am perfectly certain that either the wholesale rejection which I have moved or the nominal reductions which our Members have tabled will be of no use.

I move for the omission on two grounds. One is the question of principle and the other is the question of merits, and I have already stated to you that the principle upon which I object is the same as has been formulated in the two previous Resolutions and I do not therefore propose to dwell on those arguments. So far as the question of merits are concerned, we have been told in the Financial Statement of this year by the Honourable the Finance Member that at last he has been able to reduce the salt

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

tax from Rs. 2-8-0 to Rs. 2. It reminds me of a Camelian psychology which probably the people of Delhi are familiar with but with which hope coming from the south are not familiar. It used to be said that, when a full load is put upon the back of a camel, it will not rise under the impression that it has been overloaded and, to make it understand to believe that there is no load on its back, a huge stone is also added to it and again thrown down and then the camel will think that there is no load and will walk on. Such is the way in which the salt tax has been reduced from Rs. 2-8-0 to Rs. 2.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member cannot discuss the salt tax under this head.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I may submit to the Honourable the President that the effect of this Resolution is to take away the salt tax itself. It is only in that view of the matter that I was making a reference to the salt tax, because, if once you abolish the department which collects the taxes, the taxes go *ipso facto*. It is only in that view that I referred to the controversy on the question of the salt tax. Sir, therefore I think I am justified in mentioning to you that the imposition of the salt tax being a tax which has been described in very strong terms by Lord Olivier as "an iniquitous and horrible form of taxation"

Mr. President: I should like to be assured about this. This demand has nothing to do with the levy of the tax. It refers to the protection of salt.

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: That is so.

Mr. President: The Honourable Member is not in order in discussing the salt tax.

Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar: I submit to the ruling of the Chair. My object in moving this motion is to prevent the Government from collecting the salt tax and I ask whether I am not justified in going into . . .

Mr. President: I have already said that the Honourable Member is not in order in discussing the salt tax. By refusing this demand he is putting in a stopper upon all operations. If he wants to refer to the salt tax he can do so under the Finance Bill when that comes on. This relates to the administration and has nothing whatever to do with the levy of taxation.

Mr. H. Calvert (Punjab: Nominated Official): Before the Assembly

6 P.M.

moves to vote on this matter I should like to call the attention of Honourable Members to certain very important facts, namely, that this vote is concerned not so much with the salt tax as with the salt itself. The vote includes all the expenditure required for actually extracting salt from the mine of Khewra and for manufacturing salt at Sambhar and, if this vote is thrown out, it means that this Assembly had deliberately refused to sanction the manufacture of salt at Sambhar or its extraction from Khewra. Now, Sir, this will involve the complete destruction of a very carefully built up organisation. I do not think any one who has not been to the Khewra mines can understand the intricacy of the organisation there. They are mines which require very skilful control and very skilful management. They are mines which are extremely dangerous to any but skilled and experienced workers. It may be answered to me that, if the skilled workers are withdrawn by Government, then the ordinary people round about will be able to enter those mines and get salt free. Well, Sir,

any inexperienced person going into those unlighted mines will be entering a death trap. Only very skilled workmen can possibly extract the salt on which the whole of Northern India depends. Now, Sir, it is not merely a question of being anti-Government or pro-Government. It is a question of the adequate provision of a necessity of life to the whole people of those northern provinces of India which depend for their supply of salt on Sambhar and on Khewra. It is not a question of getting dear salt but a question of getting salt at any price. I wish to remind Honourable Members that, if the Government organisation for the extraction, manufacture and distribution of salt is seriously interfered with, the sufferings will fall not only upon themselves but upon their children and also their cattle including the cow. All alike will suffer. It is a very intricate organisation built up by Government in the last 50 years for an adequate supply of salt to Northern India and it should not be destroyed by a vote of this Assembly. I do not wish to detain the Assembly but it does seem to me that irresponsibility can hardly go any further. The trouble already felt in extracting from Khewra the amount of salt to meet the demand is very great—so great that when the import of salt from overseas was interfered with during the war it was only by the very greatest difficulty that Government were enabled to increase the supply of salt from Khewra so as to meet that deficit; and any interference even by a moderate reduction of this vote would involve the people of Northern India in pestilence and all those wasting diseases and other ailments which follow on a shortage of salt. I do appeal most strongly to Members of this House to think twice before plunging the whole people of Northern India into the dangers into which they so lightly think they can be plunged.

Mr. K. G. Lohokare (Bombay Central Division: Non-Muhammadan Rural): In spite of all my Honourable friend has just now said about dislocating the organisation which produces salt, I see much more reason to refuse the grant at this stage. It is this organisation which has made India much more dependent upon others for its salt. We know the long continuous history of this trade and of the production of salt being kept entirely in the hands of the Government so as to leave us at their mercy as to how much salt the country should consume. The day will come when they will determine that so much salt we will consume and so much salt only they will distribute to the country. The wasting diseases that my friend has just now referred to are really due to the deficit of salt due to the control of supply by this administration which has been controlling it throughout the centuries of this rule. In no other country do we see this sight of a limited supply of salt. In India we have this restricted system leading to diseases not only to human life but also to animal life. We have scarcely any salt to give to our cattle in this country. We have been refused the necessary supply on account of this method of production. It is therefore much more necessary at this stage, even at the cost of inflicting suffering for six months or a year, that we should stop this control and refuse the grant absolutely for an administration which has made us entirely dependent on it for our supply of salt.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: Sir, I quite agree with my friend Mr. Lohokare that the very reasons which have been given by my Honourable friend Mr. Calvert are the strongest possible reasons there can be for voting against this demand. I do not wish to repeat what has already been said, but I will say one thing, that the importance of refusing the supply on this demand depends upon the action which the Government will take after the

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

demand is refused. We have already refused Demands Numbers 1 and 2. Those were Demands which we have been told by the Official Benches would be restored and our refusing them will only do us harm by discrediting us in the eyes of the British people and lowering us in their estimation, because it will show that we are unreasonable people. Now, Sir, I want to make this demand a test of whether there has been what has been known as a change of heart in the Government. I should like all Members in this Assembly to reject this grant in order simply to see, if for nothing else, whether the Government will restore the first two demands and not this one which touches the people, if my friend Mr. Calvert is right. What more evidence would be necessary to convince our people that the Government we live under is not a Government which cares for them, but only cares for running its own show?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett: Sir, I do not wish to intervene beyond stating that the Government have no intention of following foolish advice on this vote any more than on the first two.

Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas: Sir, I fully agree with the previous two speakers that some of the arguments advanced by the Honourable Member from the Punjab could be very well used when discussing the salt duty on the Finance Bill. But I am afraid, in spite of all the respect that I have for my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru, I am surprised that he recommends this House to reject this grant. For, after all, supposing this demand was rejected, I think the burden of what Mr. Calvert pointed out to the House was that you cannot get any salt. You want salt from the Khewra mines, you want salt from the other sea-side places, and it is the demand which is now before the House which will enable the Government to have the salt manufactured or won from the mines and made ready for sale in the market. I will not discuss the question whether it is desirable or not to have salt made absolutely free. But even granting that it is desirable to make salt absolutely free, even granting that it is best in the interests of India to have no restrictions on salt, still my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru will recognize that it wants at least one or two years before the Government can change their policy. Therefore, Sir, unless this House is to stultify itself, and unless those who vote for this call, absolutely call, for further avoidable certification, I submit that this House must pass and approve of this grant. I do not wish, Sir, to say anything more. All that I will say is that if the Honourable Pandit wanted to make a gesture he has made it in plenty. If he wants a continued and consistent policy of rejection of the grants, I am afraid the House will not be able to reconcile itself with that request of his. Salt is the one thing in the manufacture of which representatives of the people in this House ought not to come in the way. I should have thought, Sir, that that was the wisest recommendation that could be made by anybody to this Assembly. With these words I recommend this demand to the strong support of this House.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: Sir, I come from a district which manufactures salt and I am able to speak with greater authority than Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. He talks of the manufacture of salt and the interests of the consumer. I say that, even in the interests of the consumers, it is desirable that the Salt Department should be given a 12 months' holiday, because they have had their innings last year when the salt tax was doubled, and, if only to make things even, let there be no salt tax at all this year.

There is another thing. Both in the Thana District and on the Veramgam-Kharaghodu side and thereabouts where salt is manufactured, that Department has several times proved undesirable. For instance, at the time of the auction—I will not use a very strong term—much favouritism is shown in the matter of tenders, and I think it is better that this Department should cease to exist for 12 months so that we may have a choice of better officials next year. (Laughter.) And in 12 months time I hope the Government will have realized that this is more than a joking matter. I am glad the Official Benches are laughing. He laughs best who laughs last. By his laughing the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey is proving that the Government of India Act is the laughing stock of the world.

The Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey: I was smiling at the Honourable gentleman's argument. That is something different.

Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta: If he is laughing at my argument I hope he will also laugh at the Government of India Act which is definitely coming into ridicule as the result of the vote of this House. Well, Sir, the people will be free to manufacture salt. This Department has restricted the manufacture of salt. We can manufacture salt without any assistance from Government. It would be free salt for a year. And, if there is suffering, it will be only in order that Swaraj may come nearer, when there will be no taxation on salt. (*The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:* "Will you make your own salt?") Yes we can make it and I will take you to the Thana District and show you how to make it. (*Sir Campbell Rhodes:* "How much will you charge for it?") Well, let us wait and see. Let us have 12 months' experience. (Laughter.) The best thing would be to have that experience. (Laughter.) (*The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:* "I want my salt.") You will get it. I can guarantee a supply from the Thana District if the Honourable Member is willing to take it. (*The Honourable Mr. A. C. Chatterjee:* "I cannot go to the Thana District.") I will send it by post. (Laughter and Cries of "There will be no Postal Department.") If the Postal Department goes, I will come and deliver it in person. I do not know what will happen to the Railways, but, if they go too, I will trudge on foot if you like. I personally guarantee to deliver salt to the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee by walking on foot from Bombay to Delhi. I do not know though what will happen to him in the meantime. (Laughter.) That is not my look out. But I hope and trust that I have made clear to the House that no assistance from this Government Department is necessary for supplying salt to the people. It is a great necessity of life, and, if as a result of this vote the Swaraj Party is able to convince the country that for 12 months at least the salt will not be taxed, then I think we will have partly achieved the object which brought us here. I do hope the House will repeat its opinion.

Mr. President: The original question was:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,06,55,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Salt'."

Since which an amendment has been moved:

"That the demand under the head 'Salt' be omitted."

The question I have to put is that the Demand under the head 'Salt' be omitted.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—62.

Abdul Karim, Khwaja.
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoub C.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
 Chaman Lal, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Mr. Bhubanananda.
 Das, Mr. Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gulab Singh Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lal.
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Kartar Singh, Sardar.
 Kazim Ali, Mr. M.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Kidwai, Shalikh Mushir Hossain.
 Kun Maung.
 Lohokare, Mr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.

Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas.
 Misra, Mr. Sanjhu Dayal.
 Misra, Pandit Harkarao Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Sayad.
 Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Narayandas, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishonlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
 Piyare Lal, Lala.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarde, Rai Sahib M. Harbilas.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Syamscharan, Mr.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

NOES—53.

Abdul Quyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Allen, Mr. B. C.
 Bahawal Baksh, Chaudhri.
 Bell, Mr. R. D.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Butler, Mr. M. B. D.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Chatterjee, The Honourable Mr. A. C.
 Chettiyar, Sir M. C. T. M.
 Clarke, Mr. G. R.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Dalal, Sardar D. A.
 Datta, Dr. S. K.
 Dumasia, Mr. N. M.
 Dunk, Mr. H. R.
 Faridoonji, Mr. R.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Fraser, Sir Gordon.
 Gidney, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.
 Hailey, The Honourable Sir Malcolm.

Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.
 Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Holme, Mr. H. E.
 Howell, Mr. E. B.
 Hyder, Dr. L. K.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Lindsey, Mr. Darcy.
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Moncrieff Smith, Sir Henry.
 Muhammad Imsail, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.
 Nag, Mr. G. C.
 O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.
 Owens, Lieut.-Colonel F. C.
 Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
 Percival, Mr. P. E.
 Pilcher, Mr. G.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Setalvad, Sir Chimandal.
 Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Turing, Mr. J. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

The motion was adopted.

(Several Honourable Members: "Let us adjourn till to-morrow.")

DEMAND No. 4—Opium.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,07,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Opium'."

(Several Honourable Members: "I move the adjournment.")

Mr. President: As many as are of that opinion will say "Aye."

(An Honourable Member: "No.")

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member ought to listen when I am putting it from the Chair. Those of the contrary opinion will say "No." I think the Noes have it.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: The Ayes have it.

Mr. President: Order, order. The Honourable Member ought to listen. I called order several times.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: But we cannot hear.

Mr. President: Order, order. I warn the Honourable Member from Bihar and Orissa that he is very near the displeasure of the Chair.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,07,31,000 be granted to the Governor General in Council to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1925, in respect of 'Opium'."

The Assembly divided.

AYES—57.

Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
Aiyar, Mr. A. V. V.
Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
Ajab Khan, Captain.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.
Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
Allen, Mr. B. C.
Bahawal Bakst, Chaudhri.
Bell, Mr. R. D.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
Burdon, Mr. E.
Butler, Mr. M. S. D.
Calvert, Mr. H.
Chatterjee, The Honourable Mr. A. C.
Chettiyar, Sir M. C. T. M.
Clarke, Mr. G. R.
Cooke, Mr. H. G.
Dalal, Sardar B. A.
Datta, Dr. S. K.
Dumaia, Mr. N. M.
Dunk, Mr. H. R.
Faridoonji, Mr. R.
Fleming, Mr. E. G.
Fraser, Sir Gordon.
Ghulam Bari, Khan Sahib.
Gidney, Lieut.-Col. H. A. J.
Hailey, The Honourable Sir Malcolm.
Hindley, Mr. C. D. M.

Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
Holme, Mr. H. E.
Howell, Mr. E. B.
Hyder, Dr. L. K.
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
Joshi, Mr. N. M.
Lindsay, Mr. Darcy.
Lloyd, Mr. A. H.
Mahmood Schammad Sahib Bahadur,
Mr.
Moir, Mr. T. E.
Monorieff Smith, Sir Henry.
Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
Saiyid.
Nag, Mr. G. C.
O'Malley, Mr. L. S. S.
Owens, Lieut.-Colonel F. C.
Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.
Percival, Mr. P. E.
Piloher, Mr. G.
Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
Rajan Bakhsh Shah, Mukhdum Syed.
Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Setalvad, Sir Chimanlal.
Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.
Turing, Mr. J. M.
Willson, Mr. W. S. J.

NOTES—62.

Abdul Karim, Ehwaja.
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Aney, Mr. M. S.
 Ariff, Mr. Yacoob C.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Bhat, Mr. K. Sadasiva.
 Chaman Lal, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Das, Mr. Bhubanananda.
 Das, Mr. Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Govind Das, Seth.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar
 Hans Raj, Lala
 Hari Prasad Lal, Rai.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Jinnah Mr. M. A.
 Kartar Singh, Sardar.
 Kazim Ali, Mr. M.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Kidwai, Shaikh Mushir Hosain.
 Kun, Maung.
 Lobokare, Mr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kan:

Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
 Misra, Mr. Sambhu Dayal.
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi,
 Sayad.
 Nambhiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Narayandas, Mr.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.
 Piyare Lal, Lala.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Senkar.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafec, Maulvi Muhammad.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Svamacharan, Mr.
 Venkatanastiraju, Mr. B.
 Yakub, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

The motion was negatived.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, the 11th March, 1924.