

Tuesday, 8th September, 1925

**THE  
COUNCIL OF STATE DEBATES**

**Volume VI**

***(20th August to 17th September 1925)***

---

**SIXTH SESSION  
OF THE  
COUNCIL OF STATE, 1925**



**CALCUTTA : GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
CENTRAL PUBLICATION BRANCH  
1925**

	Page
Resolution re Grievances of Postmasters—Withdrawn by leave of the Council ... ..	126—1
Resolution re Restriction of Opium Cultivation—Negatived ...	140—1
Amendment of the law relating to Interest Bill—Introduced ...	160—1
Resolution re Interest on deposits in Post Office Savings Banks opened by Muhammadan depositors—Withdrawn by leave of the Council	162—16
Resolution re Indianization of the Establishment of the High Commissioner for India—Not moved ... ..	164
Date for discussion of the Resolution re the Reforms Inquiry Committee's Report ... ..	164—1
<b>WEDNESDAY, 2ND SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Question and Answer ... ..	
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the Table ...	
Indian Succession Bill—Passed ... ..	167—
Indian Succession (Amendment) Bill—Withdrawn ... ..	172—
<b>THURSDAY, 3RD SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Transfer of Property (Amendment) Bill—Introduced ... ..	
Resolution re Inquiry into the condition of the Cotton Mill Industry—Withdrawn ... ..	175—
Special Laws Repeal Bill—Motion to consider negatived ... ..	176—
Statement of Business ... ..	234
Resolution re Bounty to be paid on steel manufactured in India ...	23
<b>MONDAY, 7TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	2
Bills passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the Table	237—
Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	
Religious Endowments (Amendment) Bill—Passed ... ..	238—
Salt Law Amendment Bill—Passed ... ..	239—
Legislative Members Exemption Bill—Passed ... ..	240—
Sikh Gurdwaras (Supplementary) Bill—Passed ... ..	241—
Statement of Business ... ..	
<b>TUESDAY, 8TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Resolution re Indianization of the staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India—Adopted as amended ... ..	243—266
Transfer of Property (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended ...	267—272
<b>WEDNESDAY, 9TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	273—276
Resolution re Franchise for Women—Adopted ... ..	277—286
Resolution re Bounty on Steel manufactured in India—Adopted ...	286—306
<b>THURSDAY, 10TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers ... ..	307
Bill passed by the Legislative Assembly laid on the Table ...	307—308
Resolution re Protection of the rights of Indians in South Africa—Adopted as amended ... ..	308—321
Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended ...	329—3
<b>FRIDAY, 11TH SEPTEMBER, 1925—</b>	
Member sworn ... ..	34
Resolution re Recommendations of the Majority Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee—Discussion adjourned till the 12th September, 1925	367—4

## COUNCIL OF STATE.

*Tuesday, the 8th September, 1925.*

The Council met in the Council Chamber at Eleven of the Clock, the Honourable the President in the Chair.

### RESOLUTION *RE* INDIANIZATION OF THE STAFF AND ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR INDIA.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA (Bombay: Non-Muhammadian): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken to Indianize the staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom."

One of the most important changes effected by the Government of India Act was the creation of the office of High Commissioner in the United Kingdom for India, a position analogous to similar appointments made in the United Kingdom by the different self-governing Colonies and Dominions. When the reforms were on the anvil, a Committee on Home Administration of Affairs was appointed, which is better known as the Crewe Committee. That Committee had to inquire into the organization of the India Office and the relations between the Secretary of State and the Government of India. The Committee recommended that the time had arrived for the appointment of a High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom who should be paid out of the Indian revenues and whose work should be that of an agent to the Government of India. The exact words in which the Committee made the recommendation are as follows:

"We are satisfied that the time has come for a demarcation between the agency work of the India Office and its political and administrative functions, and that the step would commend itself to all classes of opinion in India as marking the stage towards full Dominion status."

In accordance with this recommendation, the Government of India embodied a provision in the Act for the appointment of a High Commissioner for India in England. This appointment could only be made by His Majesty by an Order in Council. On the 13th of August 1920, such an Order was issued by His Majesty in Council authorising the Governor General of India in Council, with the approval of the Secretary of State for India in Council, to appoint a High Commissioner to work as an agent and to perform all the duties pertaining to agency business in England.

This Order empowered the High Commissioner to appoint all officers, clerks and servants in his office. The Order, however, was not unrestricted. There were two limitations. The first was that these appointments should be in consonance with any general or special orders passed by the Governor General in Council, and secondly, it was laid down that any person who was

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna ]

transferred from the establishment of the Secretary of State for India to the High Commissioner's office would have a right of appeal to the Secretary of State against any orders by the High Commissioner in regard to his removal, his suspension, his pay, allowances, promotions, etc. Further, it was laid down that a person so appointed was, for the purposes of section 67A of the Act, to be regarded as a person appointed by the Secretary of State. In other words, the salaries and pensions of these men were non-votable.

I have thus briefly explained the statutory provisions relating to the High Commissioner's office and establishment. On the 14th of February 1924, I asked Government in regard to the cost of the High Commissioner's office and establishment. The Government replied that the cost in 1921-22 including all contingencies was £175,855. They further informed me that the revised estimate of the cost for 1922-23 was £166,400. I am sorry I have not with me the cost of the High Commissioner's office and establishment for later years, but if the Honourable Mr. Chadwick in the course of his reply is in a position to give those figures I am sure the House will appreciate it. On the same day, I put another question in regard to the number of staff in the High Commissioner's office. The Government replied that as at 30th September 1923, there were 248 persons in the permanent staff and 319 persons on the temporary staff, making a total of 567 people. The temporary staff consisted of messengers, labourers, packers, etc. I am obliged to my Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick for the information he has given me that in the High Commissioner's office to-day, they have exclusive of warehouse men, messengers, packers, etc., a total of 365 persons. This would leave out the lower staff, and I take it that this number of 365 corresponds with the number of 248 in the permanent staff as given to me at the beginning of last year.

Now, Sir, out of these 365, 245 were transferred from the office of the Secretary of State for India to the High Commissioner's office, and since the establishment of the High Commissioner's office, as many as 120 new appointments were made. This gives a percentage of a little over 6. The total number of Indians out of these 365 is only 23. So that out of every 100 on the staff of the High Commissioner, about 7 are Indians and the remaining 93 are non-Indians. Of these 23, five were amongst the 245 transferred from the Secretary of State's office, so that out of the 120 new appointments only 18 Indians were appointed. Twenty-three out of 365 represents, as I have said, a percentage of a little over 6. But I would like to point out to the House that whilst the percentage of the number of persons employed is a little over 6, the percentage of salaries paid to these persons is very much lower than 6 per cent. for the good reason that the great majority of these men are filling minor, and I may add, very minor positions.

My object in bringing forward this Resolution is to ask the Government to Indianize the High Commissioner's office as much as and as quickly as possible. The principle of the increasing association of Indians in the different branches of the administration is now fully recognised and firmly established.

It is in the forefront of the policy enunciated in the pronouncement of the 20th of August, 1917, and embodied in the Preamble of the Government of India Act of 1919. The High Commissioner is merely the Agent for the Governor General in England. Personally, I should very much prefer that his duties were not what they are but that they were confined to his representing India at big social functions. I have advanced this view on one or two previous occasions in this House and I repeat it again to-day. The agency business for the Government of India, which is carried on by the High Commissioner in London, should preferably and advisedly be carried on in this country. I am not alone in this view. It is the expressed wish of both Indians and Europeans and they have conveyed this to Government by a Resolution in the Assembly. Government have not carried out the wishes of the Assembly in this respect to any large extent so far, but I hope they will do so by degrees. In the meantime, I quite realise that Government will—I am referring, Sir, to the Resolution in which they asked for rupee tenders and tenders in India,—but I say until that is done, the High Commissioner's office will certainly require a large staff in England itself. The High Commissioner's office is essentially an Indian Department, the cost is borne by India, and yet a large part of its expenses are outside the vote of the Assembly, which I am sure the House will regard as a very anomalous position indeed. Except for the very highest appointments on the staff, the whole establishment of the High Commissioner's office corresponds to any work that is done in any of the Departments in the Government Secretariat in India or in the provinces, and there is no reason why the personnel should therefore be so enormously non-Indian as it is. In fact, from the figures I have given to you, I regard it as scandalous, and I am sure the House will agree with me that out of a total of 365 there should be only 23 Indians.

I recognize that the agency work of the Secretary of State's Department which was done previously by about 245 men was work of a kind to which these men were accustomed, and consequently they could not be thrown over and I have no grievance against these 245 men, including the 5 Indians, having been taken over by the High Commissioner in his establishment. But I do not regard as at all satisfactory the fact that, out of 120 new appointments, so few as 18 should have been given to Indians, and this I regard as one more illustration of sacrificing the interests of the Indian to that of the Britisher. In view of the fact that the Department is Indian, that the cost is borne by the Indian Exchequer, and as many as 240 non-Indians were taken over from the Secretary of State's office, justice demanded that of the new 120 appointments, if not all, the major portion should have been given to Indians. Sir, the figures I have quoted reveal the position of affairs and I think the House will agree that this position requires to be ended. There is no reason why the High Commissioner's office should not be manned by Indians. Whether the Government will agree with me or not in the suggestion that all future appointments should be made only of Indians, I am sure the Government will concede that the present percentage is very low indeed and constitutes a very serious injustice.

Take the case of the offices of the other High Commissioners. The other High Commissioners have certainly not as large establishments, but I can

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

inform the House as a result of personal inquiries that the offices of the other High Commissioners have imported from their respective self-governing Colonies or Dominions the majority of their men in the higher positions. It is only men in lower employ, menials and others, who are engaged locally and there is no reason why we should not do the same in our High Commissioner's office.

There are five senior appointments in connection with the High Commissioner's office. There is that of the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, the Chief Accounting Officer, the Director General of Stores and the Deputy Director General of Stores. Of these five, only one office, namely, that of Secretary, was at one time, I believe, for a period of three years, held by an Indian, an Indian of great promise—I mean Mr. J. W. Bhore,—who discharged his duties remarkably well and to the satisfaction of all concerned. I regard it as a very fortunate circumstance that India should have had till now three eminent men filling the post of High Commissioner for India. The first of them was the late lamented Sir William Meyer. Sir William Meyer was a very distinguished member of the Civil Service. He fought the battles of India as best he could. I will plead guilty to having in this House once very strongly attacked him for neglecting the interests of the tax-payer in this country and for having given away orders to British manufacturers at much higher rates when he was able to get the same orders placed on the Continent at considerably lower figures.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK : May I ask what that has to do with the Indianization of the staff ?

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA : Sir, I am referring to the fact that Sir William Meyer rendered great service to India. I am explaining my position that I did say certain things and I know I was pulled up by the Member for Commerce, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, but I have this consolation that Sir William Meyer sent me word that the Resolution moved in this House strengthened his hands in fighting against vested interests in the City and he would welcome similar proposals in this House or in the other place. That, Sir, is the reason of my mentioning the name of the late Sir William Meyer and with great deference to him for all that he did for India. The next incumbent of the office was Sir Dadiba Dalal, who was most painstaking and rendered equally efficient services to India, and it is a matter of great regret to this country that he deemed it necessary to resign his appointment, for reasons with which we are not yet acquainted but which I hope will some day be made public. To-day we are represented by another Indian gentleman, who is an official, but, although Sir Atul Chatterjee is an official, it is a matter of gratification to find that he is discharging his duties in a manner which is proving equally satisfactory.

If suitable Indians can be found to fill the most responsible positions in this country, there is no reason why equally suitable Indians should not be found to fill the higher positions that I have enumerated, and I have said that so far only one Indian has filled the office of Secretary for some little time, and I would certainly suggest that more Indians be put in these higher

positions. Whilst I am on the subject of these higher positions in the office and establishment of the High Commissioner, I should like to refer to what I understand is a difference that has arisen in regard to the interpretation of the rules. This House is aware that some years ago, when there were differences between employers and employed and it was not easy to settle those differences, the Home Government appointed a committee to suggest ways and means whereby such differences could be settled. That Committee was called the Whitley Committee, because it was presided over by Mr. Whitley, the present Speaker of the House of Commons. The recommendation of that Committee was that every large establishment of Government should have a departmental committee and that differences may be settled by such departmental committees, and, if unsuccessful, that they may then be referred to a national committee. Such departmental committees and the national committee bear the Chairman's name, the first is known as the Whitley Departmental Committee and the other as the Whitley National Committee. I understand that the members who were transferred from the Secretary of State's to the High Commissioner's office now claim that they alone had the right to these higher appointments which I have enumerated, with perhaps the exception of the Chief Accounting Officer and the Secretary. I further understand that this question was referred to the Whitley Departmental Committee on which there are representatives both of officers and of the men, and because they could not come to an understanding, it was referred to the Whitley National Committee. The Whitley National Committee very rightly replied that the High Commissioner's office cannot be regarded as a Department under the Home Government, and that as it was purely a Department under the Government of India, this question could consequently not be decided by them. All I should like to know from the Honourable Mr. Chadwick is if any concession has been made to the men in the manner they desire, or if the High Commissioner will continue to have the right to appoint anybody he pleases, Indian or non-Indian, to fill the offices that I have enumerated.

Sir, besides the senior appointments, the service is divided into five different grades. The first is called Administrative, the second and third Higher and Lower Executive, and the fourth and fifth Higher and Lower Clerical. As I have informed the House, out of the 23 Indians, the great majority fill the minor posts in these grades, and it is time now that Government should lay down a rule that from now onwards any future vacancy will be filled, as far as possible, by suitable Indians, whether they are employed permanently in London or whether they are transferred from this place to London for a period of three years. I personally would prefer the latter course in regard to the higher appointments. It will give the men here a chance of knowing the work there and it would also give a chance in London to people having anything to do with India to know our requirements first hand from men who have worked in this country. I think I have been able to show that in the appointments that are made in the High Commissioner's office, Indian interests have been ignored, sadly ignored, and I hope, therefore, that in future Indians will be appointed in far larger numbers, not only in the minor but also in the more important positions. I conclude with the hope that the Government will regard my Resolution as reasonable, fair and equitable.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK** (Commerce Secretary) : Sir, I intervene in this debate at this early stage as I think it might assist the House and clarify some of the issues. I was glad to hear from my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna—in fact, I expected it from him—that in moving his Resolution he had no idea whatever of throwing over the men who had come over from the India Office when the High Commissioner's office was started. He is not proposing, I gather from him, that this Resolution should be carried into effect at the expense of the men who have already served India in this office or its predecessor for a number of years, it may be for a longer or shorter period. Many of these just joined and served India in the India Office, when they thought that they were engaged entirely by the Secretary of State for India on similar terms as others employed at home, namely, in the English Civil Service. It is not unnatural, when you take over a large body of men from one office to another, that they should make inquiries regarding what their future is likely to be. I will return to that later, but I am certain that the House will be pleased to see that the Mover had no idea of dispossessing or turning these men into the street. If he had any such idea, I am perfectly certain that this Council would not endorse it.

Now, Sir, we have been charged with sacrificing Indian interests. This is the proposition which the Honourable Member definitely put forward. He said that the Government of India should lay down rules that all future appointments in the High Commissioner's office should be filled by Indians. That was the proposition he put before the Council. That is how he described the meaning of his wording "Indianization". I was somewhat puzzled, at first, I must say, in endeavouring to understand what he meant by that word. Now I know and this House knows what he meant by that expression. He has definitely stated to the House that every new appointment in the High Commissioner's Office should be given to an Indian, I expect, excluding messengers and *chaprasis*. He laid a great deal of stress upon the percentage figures. He said that 120 new posts had been created and altogether there were only 23 Indians out of a total staff of 300 odd. That, he said, was a scandalously low proportion. I have ascertained from some of the other High Commissioners their figures. First of all, I must point out about these 120 new appointments, that they were new appointments only in the sense that they for the first time came on the High Commissioner's establishment. They were really to a large extent the transfers as a result of extra work taken over by the High Commissioner in connection with accounts, income-tax and in connection with the conversion of the East Indian and Great Indian Peninsula Railways into State Railways and the closing down of the offices of those companies. It cannot be suggested that the whole of the staff which was employed in those offices and which was accustomed to railway work should be at once dismissed and their places filled by Indians. It was necessary for continuity of work to take over men who had been at the work, and that is how the increase in appointments came about. They are due to the taking over of this additional work.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA** : Are they not permanently appointed ?



**THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK :** No, Sir. They were taken over on exactly the same terms as those on which they were engaged when the transfer took place, but the majority of them are temporary. In the High Commissioner's office, a large number of men are on temporary scales. Many of course are also on permanent scales.

The next point the Honourable Member made was that the existing proportion of Indians was scandalously low. He said he knew it from personal inquiries he made in the High Commissioner's Office. Before I come to that, let me first of all give the figures. Mr. Chatterjee gives his staff, a few weeks ago, excluding messengers, as 368, of which 30 are Indians, that is to say, 8 or 9 per cent. I also asked the High Commissioner to address the other High Commissioners and to inquire how their offices were staffed. I am authorised by the High Commissioners of the other offices—I naturally asked for such permission—to make public these facts. Those offices, the Council will understand, have been in existence for the best part of 20 years. Australia, there are 18 Australians out of a total of 196—10 per cent. South Africa, 14 are born in South Africa out of a total of 128—11 per cent. Several others have temporarily visited South Africa. New Zealand, 16 born in New Zealand out of a total staff of 119—13 per cent. 10 others have visited New Zealand at some time or other. Ireland, which is only one day's journey and not 6,000 miles away, the senior men are from Ireland but the whole of the clerical staff are from London. Therefore, the analogy collapses completely. The basis, the foundation stone upon which he has erected his edifice has been pulled out.....

**THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA :** Do not be so sure.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK :** Now, Sir, I come to the total cost. If the Honourable Member wants the budget figures I will get them for him. But that is not the point at issue. The point at issue is only one of staff and the rates at which they are paid. I have not added the *chaprasis* and staff of that kind. The number that I have given is 368. That is a large figure. 210 of that 368 are on grades of pay of which the maximum does not exceed £250 a year, that is, Rs. 277 a month. Another 128 are on grades of pay whose maximum is Rs. 444 a month. That comes to 338 out of 368. Now, Sir, those are mostly lower grade or what we would call routine clerks. I have given you an idea of the maximum to which they can rise. They rise to that maximum after 15 years or in some cases 20 years' service. It may be a matter of remark why there should be such a large number in the clerical grade. As a matter of fact, there is an enormous amount of routine work to be done in the High Commissioner's office. His office work consists mostly of agency work, accounts, leave, pay, pension, income-tax, and stores. A vast amount of the work that is discharged in that office is not the higher administrative work or the higher executive work which we have in offices in India, but work which has to be done by routine clerks. Take the clerical grades. They start on the equivalent of Rs. 66 a month. We are not going to get men to go from India to London to do that kind of work on anything like that figure. In fact, the truth of the matter is that with education so much more widely diffused in England than it is in India, the pay of men of equal

[Mr. D. T. Chadwick.]

educational qualifications is on the whole lower in England than in India. I do not say that invariably but it happens so in many or in most of the grades. And that is definitely so, naturally so and inevitably so when certain technical qualifications are also required as is the case with many of the posts attached to the Stores Branch. Take for a minute the shorthand typists. I do not think that my Honourable friend will say that the shorthand typists you can get in London are inferior, incompetent or careless. They are extremely good. The pay that a shorthand typist can rise to in the High Commissioner's office is equivalent to Rs. 152 a month. In my own Department here, in the Commerce Department, the stenographers start on Rs. 175 a month. Is it more businesslike to engage men locally or to send them over from here where they can get a starting pay higher than the maximum pay in the High Commissioner's office? From the point of view of business, from the point of view of the interests of India, which is the more preferable course? My Honourable friend says that every single appointment that falls vacant in future should be given to an Indian so that every post in that office is held by Indians. My Honourable friend is the head in India of one of the finest insurance companies in the world and all honour and respect to him for it, for he well deserves the position. The headquarters of that office is not in India. Would it be business economy and would it be in the best interests and increase the popularity of his office in Bombay if he imported Canadians for every single appointment from typist upward in his Bombay office? It is not practical politics. I have not endeavoured to work out the cost of his proposals.

I now come to the 30 odd posts which carry more than Rs. 555 a month. Only 6 of those reach Rs. 1,100 a month. Many of them are naturally senior controlling posts held by those who came over from the India Office who have already 10, 15 and 20 years' service to their credit. The period of service in England in the Home Civil Service is, I think, not certainly 25 years, but is I think 35 or 30. My Honourable friend says that those men are not to be dispossessed. He inquired whether a guarantee had been given to those men who had come over from the India Office that every senior post as it fell vacant would be given to them. None. Sir William Meyer in the discussion with the staff in the Whitley Committee made it perfectly clear that he reserved to himself the discretion and the right to bring in any man from outside whenever he found it suitable or desirable. He did that definitely and he has left it on record. There are only 30 appointments on and above Rs. 555 a month out of 368, and naturally most of the vacancies must be in the lower grades. You cannot help it, but the point I wish to make is that there is an Indian to be found in every grade and not only in the lowest grades. As vacancies occur in the higher grades they are brought in as and when they come. Therefore, I say that my Honourable friend has no justification for the remarks he has made that the state of things is scandalous. We leave the question of appointments to the High Commissioner. He has no justification for saying that our High Commissioners have neglected the interests of India or denied opportunities to Indians.

Now, Sir, I would like to show the practical effect and the bearing of it if this Resolution were accepted. I have shown that Sir William Meyer used to

leave openings specially for Indians in his time, and that has been the policy of successive High Commissioners. Of these appointments, there are six posts the salaries of which would rise above Rs. 1,111 a month. Three of the incumbents of these posts just reach that figure. Of the 3 above it, two posts have been perpetually filled by men with Indian experience. I do not say that these posts were filled necessarily by Indians, but I say they were filled by men with Indian experience. In fact at one time all three posts were filled by men with Indian experience. They were Mr. Bhore, Mr. Ryan, and myself as Indian Trade Commissioners, all men senior in service who were lent and have since returned to India. Well, Sir, if you have got an establishment numbering 368, in which only 3 posts carry a salary of over Rs. 1,111 a month, and two of those posts are permanently filled by men from India, and at one time all three of them were so filled by men with Indian experience, I do not think that it can be urged that the permanent staff that has been taken over has been unduly favoured for the higher posts. Now, Sir, many Indians when joining the office do not remain very long, although they are given an extra £50 a year. Sir Atul Chatterjee during the last 12 months has recruited 12 Indians, of whom three have since resigned. Yet continuity of service in the office is necessary. Employment in the office cannot be used merely as a means of allowing Indians temporarily resident in England to supplement their resources. I will give the principle which Sir Atul Chatterjee follows. It is a principle, which, I think, this House will endorse. We wish to get in Indians in that office and have the office closely linked with India, but I cannot agree that it is to the interests of India either financially or for their reputation in London to endeavour to convert the High Commissioner's Office into an Indian colony in London, to make a strictly closed enclave in the metropolis of the Empire. Sir Atul Chatterjee's principle is this "Indian candidates considered to be qualified and suitable are appointed, whenever possible, to vacancies on the establishment" and he endeavours to get Indians whenever he can. That I think, Sir, is the right principle. And I go further. My Honourable friend has rightly and very truly said that every High Commissioner has had the interests of India at heart. I was glad to hear the reference that was made to Sir William Meyer, because he was once my own personal chief, and I hold no man in higher regard or in greater respect. The Honourable Mover says that the successive High Commissioners for India have had the interests of India at heart, Sir William Meyer, Sir Merwanji Dadiba Dalal and Sir Atul Chatterjee, and we expect that the future High Commissioners who will hold office will be animated by a similar spirit.

Sir, this matter of recruitment to their office is entirely in their own hands. We do not want to make any definite rules for an office which is 6,000 miles away. And, Sir, I suggest to this House that, having cleared away, I trust, some of the misapprehensions that may have existed in the minds of some Honourable Members, they will be content to leave the High Commissioner to work upon a principle which he has already followed and which he will be able to follow and carry out more fully as time goes on.

**THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY** (Central Provinces : General): Sir, when I first read this Resolution, I confess I was in a predicament, and could not understand the exact aim of my Honourable friend

[Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy.]

Mr. Sethna. I was in the same difficulty which the Honourable the Commerce Secretary has pointed out. But my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna in the course of his speech made it very clear that all he intended was, to use his own words, "as much and as quickly as possible to Indianize the High Commissioner's Department". Those words relieved me a good deal. My Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick has also fully traced the history of the High Commissioner's establishment and has given us valuable information regarding the total number of employees, the character and nature of their service, how many of them fall under the category of the higher staff and how many fall into the ranks of clerks and others. Sir, the idea of Indianization is dear to every Indian, and I am sure there is not a single Indian either in this House or in the other House who would have anything to say against his own countrymen being advantageously and more extensively employed in the service of the State. I have as such entire sympathy with my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna. But I also see various difficulties in our way, one or two aspects of which have not been referred to by the Honourable Mr. Chadwick. The Honourable the Commerce Secretary has rightly pointed out that so far as the menial establishment is concerned, it would not be in the interests of India financially to send a large number of Indians to work in the Department of the High Commissioner in England when men of equal qualifications or probably of superior qualifications and ability can be found on a much lower salary.....

THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY (Bengal : Nominated Non-Official) : I do not think Mr. Chadwick said that.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The Honourable Member will have his opportunity to explain it.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : Much as I would like to see the Indianization of the High Commissioner's office, I do feel that, if I supported the Resolution as it stands, I would be involving India in a financial burden which no Member of this House will be justified in doing. Probably my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna was not fully conversant with the total constitution of the 365 men who are employed in the office of the High Commissioner. It has been rightly pointed out that out of these 365 persons, a number of them had to be taken over from the Secretary of State's service when certain departments were transferred and brought within the cognisance of the High Commissioner. I am therefore perfectly clear in my mind that, so far as the lower establishments are concerned, we could not profitably interfere in the matter. If we sent out Indians from this country, we will have to pay their passages, we will have to give them furlough and even casual leave to come back to their country again after certain periods of service. They cannot be expected to stay indefinitely there. I fully realise, therefore, what will be the cost to the country of these men whose travelling allowances, furlough and other allowances will have to be paid. My friend, the Honourable Mr. Chadwick has told this Council that there are 30 people employed on the staff, but he has not told this Council that these 30 people get extra allowances and a bigger rate of pay than the men locally employed.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK : What allowances ?

THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : You give an increased pay to Indians who are employed there. I understand they receive some kind of additional overseas allowance.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA : Only £50 overseas allowance. All Indians get that.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK : They do get a little extra ; allowances somewhere about the neighbourhood of £50.

THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY : So this will also commit the country to a sort of extra expenditure. There is another aspect of the case, so far as the higher appointments are concerned ; it must be clearly understood that the High Commissioner's Department has to deal with many technical matters in which special knowledge and training are absolutely necessary. You are not going to send people from this country to go through their apprenticeship in the High Commissioner's Department before they are qualified to manage those departments and do the work. There is technical knowledge required, and as such it is not possible that the men drafted from this country will be in a position to turn out the same quality of work and be as useful as the men you could get from that country. Therefore, both on the grounds of efficiency and economy, the Resolution as it is drafted does not commend itself to me. All the same, my friend Mr. Chadwick has rightly pointed out that the three High Commissioners so far have done their very best in the matter and have preferentially employed Indians in these departments as far as practicable. That is perfectly commendable. But there is no guarantee that in future this policy will be consistently followed. Fortunately the two last High Commissioners have been Indians. There is no rule definitely stating that only Indians are to be appointed to that exalted office. It is quite conceivable that the successor to the present gentleman might be a European. It is quite possible that, though the Government of India now feel and are anxious that higher posts should, as far as possible, be filled up by Indians, this policy might be overlooked some time or other and it is therefore advisable that some sort of expression of opinion of this Council should remain on record with regard to the Indianization of the High Commissioner's establishment so far as the higher appointments are concerned, provided they are compatible with economy and efficiency. It is for this reason I think if I move a small amendment to the proposition of my Honourable friend, Mr. Sethna, I trust it will be acceptable both to the Honourable Mover and to Government whose policy Mr. Chadwick has so fully and carefully described. My amendment will be consistent with the policy of the Government as enunciated by Mr. Chadwick to-day I therefore move, Sir, the following amendment :—

“ That after the word ‘ taken ’ in the first line the following words be inserted :  
‘ as far as compatible with economy and efficiency ’ ;

and in the second line, for the word ‘ staff ’ the words ‘ higher staff ’ be substituted.”

The Resolution will thus read :—

“ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken, *as far as is compatible with economy and efficiency*, to Indianize the *higher* staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom.”

I trust my amendment will commend itself to the Council.

THE HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY (Bengal : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, I am sorry I cannot give a silent vote on this motion. I was one of the witnesses before the Crewe Commission and I think, Sir, that, representing the Moderate Deputation, I was the first man to propose the creation of the office of High Commissioner. And in this connection I should like to tell the House that the Honourable Mr. Chadwick who sits there on the Treasury Bench was the forerunner of the High Commissioner as he was the Trade Commissioner before him in Old Bond Street. Mr. Chadwick and I had conversations about the High Commissionership long before it took shape and I always found in him a warm supporter of the idea. When the question of the High Commissionership was before the Crewe Committee, we were put to a searching cross-examination by Sir James Brunyate ; the details were discussed, the question of establishment was discussed, and we had to concede, in London—, Mr. Samarth and I,—that the Indianization of the High Commissionership would be one of slow growth. The High Commissionership, as this House is aware, was established in October 1920. In the beginning the opportunities were very few and the Indian candidates were also very few. In recent years, however, I know from personal experience that Sir Dadiba Dalal did his best to attract Indian recruits. So did Sir Atul Chatterjee. As Mr. Chadwick has told the House, from October last year Sir Atul Chatterjee took no less than 12 Indians in his office, of whom I believe 9 are working and 3 have left. Perhaps the House would like to know the scale of wages there. For a beginner the wage is £2 10s. a week with £50 at the end of the year as a prospective bonus. This is not a tempting salary for Indians who live in London.

Then, Sir, reference has been made by my friend Mr. Sethna to the practice of other Dominion offices. In my short experience I have seen many Dominion offices, and I know one or two very distinguished High Commissioners, and the figures which Mr. Chadwick gave I knew already unofficially, and at least I know that in one High Commissioner's office there is not a single national of his own serving in that office. The Dominion High Commissioners make it a strong point of filling all responsible offices that are charged with direction and control by their own nationals and with experts possessing local knowledge. And the same should be our effort. But at the present moment our High Commissioner's office compares very favourably with other Dominion offices. We have an Indian High Commissioner, an Indian Secretary for the Students Department ; the Secretary to the High Commissioner is a distinguished public servant in India, but I cannot, I am sorry, say the same thing of the Chief Accountant as well as the head of the Stores Department.

I therefore, Sir, support the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment.

THE HONOURABLE MR. V. RAMADAS PANTULU (Madras : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, when I read the Resolution of my Honourable friend this morning, I too felt a sort of hesitation in making up my mind to vote for it ; not because I was oppressed by any doubts such as those which the Honourable Mr. Chadwick and my Honourable friend, Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy entertained. I was not oppressed by the fact that a large number of Englishmen would have to be replaced by Indians because I consider that, as the High Commissioner's staff is paid entirely out of Indian revenues, as many Indians as possible ought to replace Englishmen in that office.

But I had this feeling in my mind about the High Commissioner for India.

12 noon.

According to section 35 of the Government of India Act and the Order in Council promulgated by His Majesty in pursuance of the provisions of that section, he is merely an agent of the Government of India, and really a Department of the Secretary of State for India's office, and he speaks only on behalf of the Government of India and the Secretary of State and not on behalf of Indians as other High Commissioners and Ambassadors do in England, and his policy is largely guided by the dictates of the Secretary of State and the Government of India. Under such circumstances I felt a hesitation in advocating the Indianization of the staff, which would necessarily involve a higher expenditure. Reading the Lee Commission's Report, I found that they had given a sort of overseas compensation to Indians. When they recommended higher salaries to European civil servants, they said that if Indians are employed out of India, they would also get concessions by way of compensation. If my countrymen are to be employed in the High Commissioner's office, that would necessarily involve India in higher expenditure, and I doubted whether it was desirable to involve India in this higher expenditure if the advantages that would accrue to India were few. But, Sir, I found on a closer scrutiny of the functions of the High Commissioner and the way in which he discharged them in the past that it would certainly be an advantage to India to have an Indian staff in his office though it may involve a higher expenditure to the Indian Exchequer. I do not know how far the High Commissioner has protected the interests of India in the past, but of late, I have been reading the statements published for the use of Honourable Members of this House and the other House in the official reports of the Legislative Assembly, and these tables are arranged under three heads. Part A—cases in which lower foreign tenders, including British tenders, for foreign made goods have been set aside wholly or partially in favour of British tenders, Part B—cases in which discrimination is between British firms only, and Part C—cases in which discrimination is between foreign firms only. Having read very carefully the first head, namely, cases in which lower foreign tenders, including British tenders, for foreign made goods, have been set aside wholly or partially in favour of British tenders, I found in the last column the reasons for acceptance of higher tenders from British firms in preference to lower tenders from foreign firms. Certain reasons are given in each case. The reasons, Sir, if scrutinised, are to my mind very unsatisfactory. Some of them are that the delivery would be delayed, the quality of the articles is not so good and so on. I thought that most of these office notes would be put up by the higher staff of the High Commissioner's office and by the subordinates, who would try to find some fault with foreign tenders if those tenders affect British interests. Therefore, I thought that if Indians were there in large numbers, they would see to the interests of India in a larger measure and not try to put forward such frivolous objections, as I find some of them to be, against foreign goods in preference to British goods. So, the net advantage to India by having an Indian staff would be a large gain in the purchase of stores and other articles, which the High Commissioner has got to purchase very frequently. An Indian atmosphere in the High Commissioner's office is itself a great advantage. You know, Sir, that in India we have been advocating that the Secretaries to the Government must be

[Mr. V. Ramadas Pantulu.]

Indians, as far as possible, with a view to the fact that they would be able to influence the policy of the members and the Departments to whom they are attached. It will also serve an equally advantageous purpose if Indians in the higher grades and the lower grades staff the Indian High Commissioner's office. His policy will be largely influenced by Indian advice and an Indian atmosphere and Indian interests. That is the main reason why I want to support this Resolution.

With regard to finding Indians in England, I do not think that you need import every Indian from India to England. On the other hand, there is a large number of Indians in England from various provinces, particularly from Bengal and also Bombay, and a few from each of the other provinces, either as students or as persons who are in minor employments. They will be willing to serve in the High Commissioner's office if opportunities are afforded. An increasing number of Indians are going to England, and there is a large question of unemployment in India for Indians who return to India. I go further. Very brilliant graduates who return from England are unable to get the small salary of which my Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick spoke rather sneeringly. Rs. 150 or 155 is not to be obtained by many a graduate in India, and there are several such people in England who would be content to serve their motherland on such a salary instead of returning to India and joining the band of unemployed here. Therefore, seeing that the total expenditure of the High Commissioner's office is met from the Indian Exchequer, and having regard to the fact that there are many Indians who will be found willing to serve in England itself, I think it will not be disadvantageous to India to Indianize the High Commissioner's staff. Even if it involves a higher expenditure that would be more than compensated by the fact that the atmosphere of the High Commissioner's office would be Indianized and the advice to the High Commissioner will be Indian, and that will serve to protect the interests of India. Therefore, instead of leaving the Resolution as it is, I propose a further amendment:—

“To add at the end of the Resolution, the words; ‘as much and as quickly as possible’”.

The Resolution will then read:—

“This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken to Indianize the staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom *as much and as quickly as possible*.”

I move, Sir, that these words may be added at the end of the Resolution as an amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** I think, in order to enable the debate to proceed on proper lines and to dispose of these amendments one way or the other, it would be advisable for the Honourable Mover and the Honourable Member in charge of the Resolution on behalf of the Government to indicate to the Council the views they have on the first amendment of Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy so that I may put that amendment. I presume they want to speak on it.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA:** Sir, I am not inclined to favour Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment. He proposes the addition of the words “as far as is compatible with economy and efficiency.” As



regards economy, the Honourable Mr. Chadwick has explained that an Indian employee of the High Commissioner's office is entitled to the same salary and emoluments as the English clerks. The only difference is £50 overseas allowance. Assuming for argument's sake that all the 120 employed by the High Commissioner after the opening of his office were Indians, it would cost 50 times 120, or £3,000, which I do not consider as very large. The second reason is on account of efficiency. I hold, Sir, that the work in the High Commissioner's office, with the exception of the five higher appointments that I have enumerated, is not of a kind which requires any special training. I go further and say that many Indians will be found in the different parts of Government service in this country who will be able to discharge the work required of them, if transferred to England, as well and better. Then, Sir, with regard to my Honourable friend, Mr. Ramadas's proposal I am perfectly willing to accept his amendment. I hope however I shall have the right of reply.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Certainly.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Sir, I gather there is a difference of opinion about my Honourable friend, Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment. My Honourable friend Mr. Sethna says that there is no technical work, no special work in the High Commissioner's office except in the first five highest appointments. I do not know what he will call the Inspectors of Stores, what he will say of a Surveyor of Shipments, the Examiner of Medical Stores, or the Inspector of Motor Transport. Special technical qualifications are required in many of those appointments. Where you require technical qualifications it is well to remember that facilities for education in England are so much superior and that many men are available and consequently not only is there a larger field of selection but salaries are lower. My Honourable friend says that if the whole 120 men had been appointed from India it would only cost another £6,000. I must point out that those 120 were not men in the senior grades. There are only 30 of the whole 368 in the senior grades and a majority of the 120 were lower paid posts of which I have already spoken.

I am afraid I did not give Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy a complete answer to the point that he raised. It is perfectly true that Indians who are domiciled in England are paid £50 more because they are Indians. If Indians were sent from the Services in India—it has not been done to any extent, there is only the case of Mr. Bhore who was on a fixed salary as I was as Trade Commissioner—if men were sent out from the Indian Services, then the principle of extra allowances to which my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy referred would apply and would be considerably higher than £50 a year. That £50 is a differentiation in favour of Indians against their English brethren both of whom are resident in London. The allowance will be higher for sending men from India. I am perfectly prepared and I ought to make it perfectly clear, that we wish to get an Indian complexion in this office, that the presence of Indians is desired. That is the policy of Government and I agree with much of what my Honourable friends Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy and Mr. K. C. Roy said. But we must not do damage to or hurt those men who are already there. With that reservation I am prepared to accept the amendment of my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT:** The House will observe that it will not be able to accept both the amendments which have been moved to this Resolution. Had I known that the Honourable Mr. Ramadas desired to move an amendment which was not entirely compatible with the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment, I should not have called him at that stage, and I think I might take this opportunity of asking Honourable Members to let me know early in their speech if they propose to put forward an amendment, because in that case had the Honourable Mr. Ramadas taken that course I should have stopped him and asked him first of all to let the Council arrive at a decision on the first amendment moved to the Resolution. Honourable Members will observe that at this stage they must confine themselves to the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. MANMOHANDAS RAMJI** (Bombay : Non-Muhammadan): I rise to support the Resolution as moved by the Honourable Mr. Sethna. The Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy said that if Indians were employed wholly or in large numbers in the High Commissioner's office it would swell the cost to this country, which it could not bear. May I ask him what is the principle in private peoples' concerns, in commercial offices and others? What do we find in Bombay? All the Japanese offices are principally manned by their own people. All the Greek offices have invariably Greeks to look after their affairs. It is not a question of cost. It is a question of getting people in whose interests the Department is run to look after that department whenever it is required of them. If the question of cost, the question of quality and of technical knowledge were trotted out, we do not know when there would be a chance for any man to be qualified to serve in a particular position. That is the argument put forward by the Honourable Mover of the Resolution, and that is the object with which motions are brought forward in both Chambers. We want Indians to look after their own affairs. We want Indians to have an opportunity of looking after their own affairs, and we want Government to create and give those opportunities. With these few words I support the Resolution,

**THE HONOURABLE MR. K. V. RANGASWAMI AYYANGAR** (Madras : Non-Muhammadan): I submit that even with regard to the question of cost and of efficiency there can be no two opinions. I think there will be young men forthcoming who will be willing even to forego voyage allowances and serve in England for the very same pay that is offered there. (*An Honourable Member:* "Will you give a guarantee?"). I think even on the question of efficiency a competitive examination like the I. C. S. may be held and young men selected without showing any preference. On these two points I do not think that there is any ground for supporting my Honourable friend, Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment. Sir, the House is grateful to my Honourable friend Mr. Sethna for bringing forward very valuable Resolutions and motions before this House and I daresay that this is one of them. I should like to associate myself with this Resolution, and I heartily support it.

**THE HONOURABLE SIR DINSHAW WACHA** (Bombay : Nominated Non-Official): I am afraid we are all groping in the dark while we want more light. A variety of suggestions is made for the Indianization of the office of the High Commissioner for India in London. Now, Sir, the Government of

India have very loyally accepted the principle of Indianization. The Indianization of the Services is going on slowly but steadily, and I think if you go on slowly but steadily and patiently all my Indian friends will be undoubtedly convinced that the Government are loyally carrying into effect their cherished aspirations. That being the case, what I want to impress upon my colleagues here in this House is this. Government have so far loyally accepted their wishes that they have now appointed, at least they have appointed for a second time, an Indian gentleman to be their High Commissioner. That Commissioner, or at least those Commissioners, have been in the confidence of Government. Their selection has been approved of by the Indian community at large, and they are gratified that Indians are now put at the head of that responsible office. This being the case, the question is, why not invite a comprehensive report from the High Commissioner himself, what he thinks of these two suggestions from his own practical experience. Can he not make a report and say, "The Indianisation of my Department should proceed on such and such a line—these will be the higher appointments reserved for Indians—and as regards the subordinate appointments they may be given to those younger men in England who can do the work better, and that on a smaller salary and with greater efficiency". If we get a full and fair report from the High Commissioner as to what the wants of his office are, and how far Indianization can still be effected in the superior staff of his office, I think we shall be in a better position later on to give our opinion on the subject. At present, of course, a variety of suggestions have been made, but those suggestions throw no additional light whatever than already discernible. So far, I do not think we can proceed further with complete satisfaction. Therefore, I think it is better to have more light. By the aid of that light which can only be furnished by the High Commissioner in England, in whom we have every confidence, we shall be able to determine once for all the broad and sound lines on which Indianisation can be effected. Let Sir Atul Chatterjee make a report, and let it be placed before this House, so that we may carefully consider and arrive at a just decision on it. That is the right and proper way, I submit, to proceed. I consider that by adopting the present method we are merely frittering our time, and shall be hardly achieving the good object we have in view.

The HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR (Bombay : Non-Muhamadan) : Sir, I rise to support the Resolution.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : I would ask the Honourable Member to confine himself for the moment to the amendment moved by the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy.

The HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR : Very well, Sir. I oppose the amendment of my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy. In doing that, I would refer to the information which was supplied to this House by the Honourable Mr. Corbett in answer to question No. 346 put by the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri. He asked :

"Will Government kindly furnish a statement, with reference to the office of the High Commissioner for India and the departments under him, showing the number of European and the number of Indian officials drawing salaries :—

(i) of £500 a year and above ;

[Mr. R. P. Karandil ar.]

(ii) of £250 a year and above, but below £500; and

(iii) of £100 a year and above, but below £250.

In answer to this part of the question, we have been supplied with this statement.

	No. of officials drawing £500 and above.	No. of officials drawing £250 a year and above but below £500.	No. of officials drawing £100 a year and above but below £250.
Europeans .. ..	31	76	204
Indians .. ..	1	4	9
Total ..	32	80	213

Now the second part of the question was :

"Are there any rules or instructions for the guidance of the High Commissioner in filling up vacancies in the establishments under him, such, for instance, as that he should advertise them in India as well as in England or that he should apply to the appropriate departments in India for the loan or transfer of suitable officers before recruiting in England"? To this the one simple answer given was "No".

The last part of the question was :

"If not, will Government make such rules or issue such instructions as will bring about the progressive Indianization of the establishments."

The answer to this was :

"I think the Right Honourable Member is sufficiently familiar with the conditions in England to realize that the High Commissioner's establishment could not at present be Indianized without greatly increasing the cost of the office. Suitable Indians would not ordinarily be willing to accept appointments in England on the pay which is sufficient for Europeans. There are, however, a certain number of Indians already in England who are content with European rates of pay, and it is understood that it is the practice of the High Commissioner to appoint such Indians to fill vacancies in his office when possible."

The date of this answer is 3rd September 1924. But the statistics supplied in the first part of the answer referred to 1st October 1923. It is obvious that there must have been some additions and alterations in the statistics which were supplied on 3rd September 1924. And it would have been a matter of great delight if we had been supplied with further information in addition to what was conveyed by the answer which I have just read to the House. Undoubtedly, I quite agree that it would not pay India to send her young people from here on such a poor salary which begins on Rs. 66 a month. As I have read the statement, however, it does not strike me that the pay would rest there, because we have got appointments here which are preferable. As was emphasised by one of the speakers, there were students there and there are still students in England, who would be quite content with having some modicum of income in addition to what they are getting from their homes in India.....

**THE HONOURABLE SIR MANECKJI DADABHOY :** But these are all whole-time appointments.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR :** I agree with what has fallen from the Honourable Parsi Knight. I agree with him, but it is just the question that these students along with other people can get instruction at any time of the day or night in Great Britain, and so they would be quite content to work whole time if it is necessary to work in the India Office and elsewhere, because they would be able to gather that sort of education which will fit them to benefit their mother country when they return to this country. I was in England, and I know the conditions in India. I therefore agree to the Resolution as proposed, and I oppose the amendment.

I do not think that the Honourable Mr. Sethna ever contemplated for a moment that he should throw an extra burden on the Indian revenues. As far as is compatible with economy and efficiency, that is the principle on which all posts are to be filled. I never for a moment contemplate that the Honourable Mr. Sethna would ever agree to any proposition to burden India out of proportion. My Honourable friend Mr. Ranji has been perfectly accurate. I have always been complaining of the foreigners in India, not because they are foreigners, but because when they leave India, they deprive India of their stock of knowledge which they have gathered during their service of 25 or 30 years. That is the greatest loss to India. If gentlemen of the Indian Civil Service were to make India their own home, I would be the last to complain, because they would one day be able to establish better relations between Indians and Europeans by the spread of knowledge and by acquainting Indians with the knowledge which they have acquired in the course of their service : they would be able to instruct the Indian people in the proper way, and also to tell them how to carry on agitation on proper lines. What I complain of is this, that when these officers retire, they carry with them all the experience which they have gained during their whole period of service in India. We have not got trained men here to lead us, and to tell us where the necessary information would be available. Similarly, great advantage will be gained by Indians if larger numbers are employed in the High Commissioner's office in England. It may be that they will mean an additional cost to India, but when these people return to India, they will be able to enlighten people here and tell them the realities of the situation. Our deliberations suffer for want of proper information. I am for having all the advantage for Indians. Europeans have come out here, served here, stayed here. In that view we welcome them. But when they go away from here do they enlighten their own countrymen as to the realities in India, do they ever try to correct the ignorance that prevails among the English population ? They do not try to correct that at all. I would therefore not mind any additional cost which India may have to suffer in consequence of the pay they might there deserve. I have been going through the List of the India Office for the year 1925. I find that there are numerous appointments indeed. I do not know that the publishers have given the latest information. I find that there are no corrections bringing us up to date, though the List is dated 1925. Still I find there are numerous people on the establishment, and the few Indians could be counted on the tips of one's

[Mr. R. P. Karandikar.]

fingers. Now, what strikes me is that, having had that answer in September 1924, one would have liked to know what progress has been made. I know, Sir, from the remarks which fell from my friend here that on 12 occasions endeavours were made to put in Indians, of whom 3 left the service or resigned for what reason, we do not know, while 9 remained on. If that is so,....

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Might I explain, Sir. I think my Honourable friend missed what I said. The number of Indians in the High Commissioner's office now, as reported by Sir Atul Chatterjee, is 30.

The HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR: I gathered from the evidence that was given on this point by the Honourable Mr. Roy.

The HONOURABLE MR. K. C. ROY: What I said was that since October last Sir Atul Chatterjee has taken 12 men, of whom 9 are working and 3 have left.

The HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR: Now, with that advance, is that the Indianization that is claimed for the idea underlying the principle of Indianizing the whole service? If a real and efficient endeavour were being made by the India Office and the High Commissioner, we should hear better reports. Therefore, there is no reason for not supporting the Resolution that has been moved by the Honourable Mr. Sethna. He puts it in a nutshell.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The Honourable Member is now doing what I asked him not to do. For the moment the Resolution is not before the House.

The HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM CURRIE (Bengal Chamber of Commerce): Sir, I rise to support most cordially the amendment proposed by the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy. In fact, if I had had an opportunity of speaking to him before the Council sat this morning, I should have suggested underlining the words "economy and efficiency". One of the Honourable speakers this morning made a comparison with private enterprise in Bombay, namely, the Greek Office and the Japanese Office. One cannot, I think, in fairness compare a private enterprise with a Government Department. In the one case, if a Japanese wishes to start a firm in Bombay, he starts with his own money. It is at his own risk and, if he thinks that he can maintain efficiency and economy with people of his own race, then he is perfectly entitled to do so. But with regard to a Government Department, we are the people who pay for it, and we are entitled therefore to appoint the staff of such office in such a manner that we can say it is being efficiently and economically run. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The original question was:

"That this Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken to Indianize the staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom."

Since which an amendment has been moved :

"That after the word 'taken' the words 'as far as is compatible with economy and efficiency' be inserted, and for the word 'staff' the words 'higher staff' be substituted."

The question I have to put is that that amendment be made.

The Council divided :—

AYES—26.

Abbot, Mr. E. R.  
Aftab Ahmad Khan, Sahibzada.  
Aman Ali, Khan Bahadur.  
Amiruddeen Ahmad Khan, Nawab Bahadur Sir.  
Chadwick, Mr. D. T.  
Charanjit Singh, Sardar.  
Commander-in-Chief, H. E. the.  
Currie, Sir William.  
Dadabhoy, Sir Maneckji.  
Dutt, Mr. P. C.  
Fazl-i-Husain, Mian Sir.  
Froom, Sir Arthur.  
Laird-MacGregor, Mr. E. G. L.

MacWatt, Major-General Sir Charles.  
McWatters, Mr. A. C.  
Misra, Pandit S. B.  
Mitra, Mr. K. N.  
Mitter, Dr. D. N.  
Parsons, Mr. A. A. L.  
Raza Ali, Mr.  
Roy, Mr. K. C.  
Sarma, Sir Narasimha.  
Sen, Mr. B. C.  
Tek Chand, Diwan.  
Umar Hayat Khan, Col. Nawab Sir.  
Zahir-ud-din, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.

NOES—8.

Ayyangar, Mr. K. V. Rangaswamy.  
Borooah, Srijut Chandradhar.  
Ismail Khan, Haji Chowdhuri Muhammad.  
Manmohandas Ramji, Mr.

Ramadas Pantulu, Mr. V.  
Ram Saran Das, Rai Bahadur Lala.  
Sethna, Mr. Phiroze C.  
Vedamurti, Mr. S.

The motion was adopted.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: That decision of the Council makes it unnecessary for me to put to the Council the amendment moved by the Honourable Mr. Ramadas Pantulu. The question before the Council now is :

"That the Resolution, as amended, be adopted, namely :—

"This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken, as far as is compatible with economy and efficiency, to Indianize the higher staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom."

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: Sir, the acceptance of the amendment of my Honourable friend Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy and Government supporting it is a clear indication that the principle underlying my Resolution is worthy of consideration. I opposed Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment for the reasons I gave. As the Resolution is amended, it will give an opportunity to Government always to take shelter under the words "as far as is compatible with economy and efficiency". However, I am sure that after the discussion which has taken place to-day, the Indianization of the High Commissioner's office will proceed at a faster rate than it has done till now.

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna ]

The Honourable Mr. Chadwick is perfectly right when he said that I had no intention whatever of turning into the streets the 245 men whom the High Commissioner had taken over from the Secretary of State's office. But what I do complain of is that these men should still be under the authority of the Secretary of State and the High Commissioner should not have the right to remove them, to suspend them or to decide in regard to their pay, promotion, etc. I am glad of the assurance Mr. Chadwick gave towards the end of his speech, that the one point which these 245 men urged, namely, that they should take precedence over others in the matter of the higher appointments, has not been agreed to. This is satisfactory.

The Honourable Mr. Chadwick has told us that the 120 men are not permanently appointed. I wish he had told us how many were permanent and how many were temporary. He has to-day given the total strength to be 268 and of them 30 are Indians. I think I mentioned in my opening speech that I was obliged to my Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick for the information he conveyed to me about two or three months back that the full strength was 365 and that the total number of Indians was 23. It would appear, therefore, that within the last few weeks, the total number has increased by 3, but what is very gratifying to me is that the number of Indians within this short space of time has increased from 23 to 30. Perhaps this is the indirect result of the notice of motion which I gave to this House.

We shall now come to the figures in the other offices, which my Honourable friend gave. He said that after knowing those figures the foundation upon which I built my edifice would certainly collapse. I shouted at the time, "Do not be so sure", and I will give my reasons for that interruption. Mr. Chadwick has told us that in the offices of the High Commissioners of Australia, South Africa and New Zealand, there are respectively 196, 128 and 119 men. Mr. Chadwick has not told us whether these numbers include messengers, packers and others in menial employ. The same were included in the reply given to me by Government more than a year ago and including these people, the total number on that date was 567. I should like to know from my Honourable friend whether these men are included or not in the numbers of the staff employed by the other High Commissioners. I assume they are not. Even assuming, for argument's sake, that he is correct, I would refer him to the point made by other Honourable Members. He told us that there are only 18 Australians, 14 South Africans and 16 New Zealanders and the rest Britishers. But the point of great importance to this House would be to know whether or not these 18, 14 and 16 persons hold the highest positions in the offices of the different High Commissioners or not. That is our contention. The higher appointments, I contend, and I say so after information I have secured myself, or the majority of the higher appointments are filled by men of the countries represented by those respective High Commissioners. Will my Honourable friend say that there are 18 Indians holding the higher posts in the High Commissioner's office?

I am extremely grateful to the Honourable Mr. Karandikar for very valuable information which I had lost sight of in the preparation of my speech. He referred to the answer given by the Honourable Mr. Corbett to the Right



Honourable Srinivasa Sastri. He said that it was given in September, 1924. Perhaps there was a mistake in the year, because the Right Honourable Srinivasa Sastri was not a Member of this House this time last year.

THE HONOURABLE MR. R. P. KARANDIKAR: It is so printed.

THE HONOURABLE MR. G. A. NATESAN: He was here last year.

THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA: I stand corrected. Now, Sir, Mr. Corbett distinctly gave the House to understand that there was one Indian official (Mr. Bhore), who got a salary of more than £500, only 4 Indians out of 76 on a salary of between £250 and £500 and 9 on salaries between £100 and £250. That is a point I very particularly want to refer to, namely, that the majority of the 23 Indians, or 30, as Mr. Chadwick told us the present number is, are filling very minor positions, and that the percentage of the pay—I want to lay stress on this fact—drawn by these 30 Indians cannot be even 3 per cent. of the total pay—indeed, much less. Therefore, if my Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick quotes the instance of the other High Commissioners I trust the Government of India will follow the example of the other High Commissioners and see that the higher appointments are filled by Indians and not by others in the office of the High Commissioner for India and that is a point upon which I lay great stress.

I have disposed of the point with regard to the higher cost in employing Indians because I have already referred to this before now. It cannot be a prohibitive cost.

My Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick was good enough to refer to my connection with a large insurance office. I am proud of that connection for the good reason that it is an office which does the largest business of any British office throughout the world year after year. My friend further went on to ask if I am appointing Canadians in India and why not. My answer is what the Honourable Sir William Currie referred to. Here we have a say in the matter of the appointments in the High Commissioner's office. In my own office perhaps I am not a free agent and I cannot do as I please, and yet, it will interest my Honourable friend Mr. Chadwick to know that whilst I could employ Indians in those posts, out of deference to the wishes of my employers I do employ as many as a dozen men who have connections with Canada and Great Britain. As the Honourable Sir William Currie very rightly pointed out this is the tax-payer's money which you are paying to the staff of the High Commissioner, and you have got to respect the wishes of the tax-payer.

Mr. Chadwick referred to the minor appointments and did not want poor Indians to go to London for those minor appointments. Mr. Corbett has replied to this point, and I am again grateful to the Honourable Mr. Karandikar for drawing my attention to it. Mr. Corbett says that there are Indians available in England itself, who are content with the pay paid to Europeans. This is so. I am sure Mr. Chadwick knows from his own experience that there is a large colony of Indians there who will be very glad to get the equivalent of Rs. 150 a month. There again, I say that the Government have not made out any case for not appointing Indians to these appointments. In the case of such Indians there will be no question of passage money referred to by my Honourable friend, Mr. Chadwick.

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

Now, Sir, I think I have answered all the points of my Honourable friend, Mr. Chadwick.

It is some consolation to me to know from a remark that fell from him that the Government would like an Indian complexion and an Indian atmosphere in the High Commissioner's office. They have not had it so far to any appreciable extent, but I hope as a result of the discussion to-day, no matter however much it has been whittled down by the amendment made by the Honourable Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy, that it will have a desirable effect on the Government of India and consequently on the High Commissioner in London.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK : I do not think the House expects me to speak again. But there are one or two points arising from my Honourable friend's last speech on which I desire to say a few words. In the first place, I am very sorry to disappoint him again. It is true that in the letter I sent him last April when he asked me how many Indians were in the High Commissioner's office I replied 23 or 24 from the information I then had. I worked it out from the latest establishment list I had. The 30 I gave is as a result of my writing to the High Commissioner and asking him to let me know what the latest figure was. Those 7 were not recruited hurriedly as a result of my letter. They had been recruited before. I do not think that the figures I gave for the other High Commissioners' offices included messengers, packers, etc., because in my letter to the High Commissioner I asked him for particulars of staff excluding those, but I will not be dogmatic on the point. It does not affect my point that the staffs of these offices were not wholly Australian, South African, etc.

My next point is that the House will be interested to see that my Honourable friend in his last speech has changed his ground very considerably from his first speech. In fact, he accepted the tenor of Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's argument, namely, that he was referring to the higher appointments and not to complete Indianization. The House will remember that in his first speech he definitely said that every appointment in future should be given to an Indian—every new appointment. I think I have made the position of Government clear. Its policy is that embodied in my Honourable friend, Sir Maneckji Dadabhoy's amendment, that is the policy which commends itself to Sir Atul Chatterjee, and which I have not the slightest doubt will be followed by successive High Commissioners.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The question is :

“ That the following Resolution, as amended, be adopted :—

‘ This Council recommends to the Governor General in Council that steps be taken, as far as is compatible with economy and efficiency, to Indianize the *higher* staff and establishment of the High Commissioner for India in the United Kingdom.’

The motion was adopted.

## TRANSFER OF PROPERTY (AMENDMENT) BILL.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA** (Bombay : Non-Muham-  
madan) : Sir, I rise to move that the Bill to amend the Transfer of Property  
Act, 1882, be taken into consideration.

It is a small measure consisting of two clauses only. The necessity for  
the Bill is fully explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It  
arises from the fact that from the law as it stands at present, it is not clear  
whether assignments without consideration of certain actionable claims,  
those for example which consist in life policies, are governed by section 123  
or by section 130 of the Transfer of Property Act. To make my point clear  
I will read both these sections. Section 123 runs as follows :—

“ For the purpose of making a gift of immoveable property, the transfer must be  
effected by a registered instrument signed by or on behalf of the donor, and attested by at  
least two witnesses.

For the purpose of making a gift of moveable property, the transfer may be effected  
either by a registered instrument signed as aforesaid, or by delivery.

Such delivery may be made in the same way as goods sold may be delivered.”

Section 130 runs as follows :—

“ The transfer of an actionable claim shall be effected only by the execution of  
an instrument in writing signed by the transferor or his duly authorised agent, and shall be  
complete and effectual upon the execution of such instrument, and thereupon all the rights  
and remedies of the transferor, whether by way of damages or otherwise, shall vest in the  
transferee, whether such notice of the transfer as is hereinafter provided be given or not.”

Then follows the proviso with which I need not trouble the Council.

Now, the House will have noticed that the words used in section 130 are  
simply “ the transfer of an actionable claim ”. The word “ transfer ” is not  
qualified, and therefore the expression may include “ transfer of an action-  
able claim *without* consideration ” or “ transfer of such a claim *with* considera-  
tion ” and, therefore, it might well be held that transfer, by way of gift of  
an actionable claim comes within the operation of section 130 and can be effect-  
ed by a written instrument which need not be registered. This would seem  
to have been the intention of the Legislature, and indeed it stands to reason  
that when a man assigns his life insurance policy to his wife or other relative,  
a mere written instrument ought to suffice, and that he should not be put to  
the trouble and expense of getting the instrument registered. If the trans-  
fer of an actionable claim with consideration does not require a registered  
instrument, as it certainly does not under section 130, there does not seem  
to be any reason why registration should be compulsory if the transfer of an  
actionable claim is *without* consideration. As a matter of fact, Life Insurance  
Companies have been making payments to assignees to whom life policies  
have been transferred simply by instruments in writing which have not been  
registered. On the other hand, however, section 123 would seem to be cap-  
able of an interpretation which might make registration compulsory in the  
case of written instruments transferring without consideration actionable  
claims. In this country, no distinction is recognised between “ good ”  
and “ valuable ” consideration, and therefore it might be said that transfers  
without consideration of actionable claims, such as assignments of life policies  
in favour of a relative are gifts *inter vivos*, and as they are not gifts *inter vivos*

[Mr. Phiroze C. Sethna.]

of tangible moveable property, such as can be effectually made by delivery of possession, they must be made by registered instruments. Thus, though it seems to be clear that such transfers of actionable claims are really governed by section 130 and that the Legislature intended that they should be so governed, there would seem to be, at all events, an apparent inconsistency so far as this particular question is concerned, between the terms of section 123 and those of section 130. It is this inconsistency which my Bill seeks to remove. It is intended to clarify the existing provisions of the law so that all doubt may be set at rest and no room may exist for unnecessary or avoidable litigation. With this object in view, the Bill adds an *Exception* to section 123 of the Act making it quite clear that a transfer by way of gift of an actionable claim if made by an unregistered instrument in writing is complete and effectual.

The motion was adopted.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question is :

"That clause 2 do stand part of the Bill."

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: I beg to move :

"That for clause 2 of the Bill the following be substituted, namely :—

'2. In sub-section (1) of section 130 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, after the words 'authorised agent and' the words and figures 'notwithstanding anything contained in section 123' shall be inserted.'"

I must explain to the House how I come to be moving this amendment. The Honourable Mr. Sethna in his speech on the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration has explained the scope of the alteration in the law which he wishes to effect. He has in mind the transfer by gift of a life insurance policy during the life of the person assured, as for instance, the gift of a life insurance policy from a man to his wife. He wishes it to be made clear beyond all possible doubt that such a transfer of a life insurance policy should be completely effected by a mere written endorsement. That is his point. Now, Sir, that is very largely the general practice. The Government agree that it should be so, and Government have always been of the opinion that that was what the law said. Section 130 of the Transfer of Property Act deals with transfers of actionable claims. The words are perfectly general. That section covers all transfers of actionable claims. A gift is only one form of transfer. Sale is another form of transfer and section 130 says that a transfer of an actionable claim is complete if effected by an endorsement in writing. However, there is another section in the Act, that deals with gifts. The legal advisers of some of the insurance companies feel a doubt in these cases which section ought to be followed though we do not think there is any doubt about it at all.

No case has so far been fought out in the Courts, and so there is no ruling on the point, but we are perfectly ready to remove our friend's apprehensions in the matter and make the law quite clear.

1 P.M.

The only reason why I am moving this amendment is this. The Honourable Member's Bill was examined, and our trained draftsman pointed out that the Bill was not

drafted in the way in which all amending Bills are usually drafted, and that it would certainly be simpler and much clearer if the Honourable Mover accepted the suggestions the Government draft man made. I have discussed this amendment with my Honourable friend, and he agrees with the amendment which I am now making. He did not however withdraw his Bill and put in a new Bill, because he had not time under the rules of business to do so if the Bill was to come for discussion in this Session. I am sure if he had had the time and opportunity he would have done so. I therefore propose certain amendments in section 120, so that that section will read as follows :

"The transfer of an actionable claim shall be effected only by the execution of an instrument in writing signed by the transferor or by his duly authorised agent, and notwithstanding anything contained in section 123 shall be complete and effectual."

We wish to insert the words "Notwithstanding anything contained in section 123". The insertion of these words will remove all doubt in the matter, and therefore, Sir, in agreement with my Honourable friend opposite, I propose the amendment which I have read out.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Amendment moved :

"That for clause 2 of the Bill the following be substituted, namely :—

'2. In sub-section (1) of section 130 of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, after the words 'authorised agent and' the words and figures 'notwithstanding anything contained in section 123' shall be inserted.'

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

The question is :

"That clause 2, as amended, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK (Commerce Secretary): Sir, I beg to move :

"That in clause 1, sub-clause (1) be numbered clause 1, and that sub-clauses (2) and (3) be omitted."

This, Sir, is a purely formal amendment and consequential. I do not think I need say much about it.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Amendment moved :

"That in clause 1, sub-clause (1) be numbered clause 1 and sub-clauses (2) and (3) be omitted."

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

The question is :

"That clause 1, as amended, do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: The question is :

"That this be the Title of the Bill."

**THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK :** I beg to move, Sir ;

"That the following be inserted as the Title of the Bill, namely :—

' A

BILL

Further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 "

That is the usual form which is adopted.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** The question is :

"That the following be inserted as the Title of the Bill, namely :—

' A

BILL

Further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882.

The motion was adopted.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** The question then is that that be the title of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

The Title, as amended, was added to the Bill.

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** The question is :

"That this be the Preamble to the Bill."

**THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK :** Sir, I beg to move :

"That for the Preamble to the Bill, the following be substituted, namely :—

' WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, for the purpose hereinafter appearing ; It is hereby enacted as follows.'

This is also the customary form, Sir, and that is why I propose this amendment.

**THE HONOURABLE MR. SAIYID RAZA ALI (United Provinces East : Muhammadan) :** May I say two words, Sir ?

**THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT :** I will put the question first and then the Honourable Member can speak.

The question is : "That for the Preamble to the Bill, the following be substituted, namely :—

' WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, for the purpose hereinafter appearing ; It is hereby enacted as follows.'

**THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI :** Sir, I entirely agree with the draftsman of the Government of India that for the purposes of the Honourable Mr. Sethna, it was not at all necessary to amend section 123 of the Transfer of Property Act, as that object can be satisfactorily achieved by accepting the amendment of the Honourable Mr. Chadwick. But I cannot equally congratulate the Government draftsman on the amendment to the Preamble that has been drafted by him. Now, Sir, what is a Preamble, and what is the definition of a Preamble ? In legal language, Preamble means the introductory part of a Statute. The Preamble as such gives notice of the definite point that is going to be raised and dealt with in a Statute. I am free to confess that the Preamble proposed by the Honourable Mr. Sethna was rather lengthy, but, Sir, the Preamble proposed to be substituted by the Honourable Mr. Chadwick

does not fulfil the definition of a Preamble at all. Now, what is the Preamble that is proposed to be substituted? It says:—

“WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, for the purpose hereinafter appearing.”

Now, Sir, we are absolutely in the dark as to what is the point that is going to be dealt with in the Bill, and what are the amendments that are going to be incorporated in the Bill. This is really the first preamble of its kind that has ever to my knowledge found a place in an Act. In all other Acts, Honourable Members will find that the Preamble gives some indication of the points that are going to be discussed in the Bill, whereas here the reader is left to go through the whole Bill to discover for himself what is the precise point. I freely acknowledge that the Bill is a short one, and it will not take the reader a long time to see what the real point is. But still, I am afraid, the change proposed, from the drafting point of view, is far from satisfactory. I do not think that at this late stage it is desirable for me to bring forward a counter amendment to the one proposed by the Honourable Mr. Chadwick, but I may say, Sir, that it would have been much better if the Government had omitted the words “for the purpose hereinafter appearing” and substituted some such words as “relating to the transfer of actionable claims”. This is a measure dealing with the transfer of actionable claims, and therefore, if the Government had said in the Preamble—

“WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, relating to the actionable claim.”

that would have been quite satisfactory. It would also have been consistent with the practice that has been established in such cases. I do not know whether the Honourable Mr. Chadwick will be prepared to accept these words, but to me, Sir, it seems that the language of the Preamble is extremely defective, and does not speak much about the skill of the Government draftsman.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT: Strictly speaking, an Honourable Member is not entitled to reply on an amendment, but as the Honourable Saiyid Raza Ali has asked for a reply, I think it will be a matter of courtesy to the Council to ask the Honourable Mr. Chadwick to make a reply.

THE HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK: Thank you, Sir, for your courtesy. I am sorry if I have offended my purist friend by the terms of this Preamble. As for precedents for this form of drafting, I see that in Act IX of 1924, the Preamble reads,—

“WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Indian Ports Act, 1894, for certain purposes hereinafter appearing; It is hereby enacted as follows:—”

Then again the Preamble to Act X of 1924, reads thus:—

“WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Indian Coinage Act of 1867, for certain purposes hereinafter appearing; It is hereby enacted as follows:—”

So I think we are correct in the terms of the Preamble which we have adopted.

THE HONOURABLE SAIYID RAZA ALI: I believe the same draftsman was responsible for drafting all these Preambles. But in any case it is not a very long Bill. I think anybody can find out its meaning and I suggest to the Council that we need not trouble ourselves at this moment, in trying to devise legal phraseology even for the Preamble.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The question is :

“That for the Preamble of the Bill the following be substituted :—

‘ WHEREAS it is expedient further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, for the purposes hereinafter appearing ; It is hereby enacted as follows :— ’ ”

The motion was adopted.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The question then is that that be the Preamble to the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

The Preamble, as amended, was added to the Bill.

The HONOURABLE MR. PHIROZE C. SETHNA : I beg to move, Sir, that the Bill, as amended, be passed.

The HONOURABLE MR. G. A. NATESAN (Madras : Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, the Council will remember that on a former occasion it was my painful duty to oppose the introduction of a Bill proposed by my friend Mr. Sethna with regard to Insurance policies as I thought in that case it might add to the difficulties of people in recovering from the companies the amount due to them. I rejoice that on this occasion I am able to congratulate him on this measure, because it affords facility to policy holders to transfer the same to people to whom they may wish to make it over as a gift. On this occasion I am glad that this effort of my Honourable friend has had the cordial co-operation of Government and others. I am sure that many people will be greatly obliged to the Honourable Member for undertaking this piece of legislation.

The HONOURABLE MR. D. T. CHADWICK (Commerce Secretary) : I would like to say, Sir, if I may, that the Government are in agreement with Mr. Sethna in considering it very desirable that there should be no doubt as to the manner in which these life policies may be transferred.

The HONOURABLE THE PRESIDENT : The question is :

“That the Bill further to amend the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, as amended, be passed.

The motion was adopted.

The Council then adjourned till Eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 9th September, 1925.

---