

19th February, 1925

THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES
(Official Report)

SECOND SESSION

OF THE

SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1925



SIMLA
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS
1925

CONTENTS.

VOLUME V, PART II—16th February, 1925, to 6th March, 1925.

	PAGES.
Monday, 16th February, 1925—	
Questions and Answers	1051-88
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1088-90
Demands for Grants—Suggested form of Amendments	1091-93
Demands for Supplementary Grants	1093-1105
Election of Panels for Standing Committees	1106-09
The Prisons (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1110
The Cantonments (Amendment) Bill—Introduced	1110
The Contempt of Courts Bill—Circulated for opinion	1110-15
Tuesday, 17th February, 1925—	
Question and Answer	1117
Resolution <i>re</i> Debt position of India—Debate adjourned	1117-59
Resolution <i>re</i> Establishment of a Supreme Court in India— Negatived	1160-80
Resolution <i>re</i> Provision of Indian Refreshment Rooms on the East Indian Railway—Not moved	1181
Resolution <i>re</i> Establishment of a Military College—Discus- sion adjourned	1181
Wednesday, 18th February, 1925—	
Questions and Answers	1183-86
Unstarred Questions and Answers	1186-88
Message from the Council of State	1189
The Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Report of Select Committee presented	1189
Election of the Panel for the Standing Committee on Emigra- tion	1189
The Indian Tariff (Amendment) Bill—Referred to Select Committee	1190-99
The Legislative Assembly (President's Salary) Bill—Passed... ..	1190-1207
The Obscene Publications Bill—Considered and Debate adjourned	1207-18
Thursday, 19th February, 1925—	
Statement of Business	1219
Committee on Public Petitions—Presentation of the Report on Petitions relating to the Indian Penal Code (Amend- ment) Bill (Age of Consent Bill)	1219
Resolution <i>re</i> Establishment of a Military College—Adopted, as amended	1220-73
Friday, 20th February, 1925—	
Questions and Answers	1275-90
Unstarred Question and Answer	1291
Receipt of Petition relating to the Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill (Age of Consent Bill)	1291
Statement laid on the Table	1291-95
Railway Budget for 1925-26	1295-1307

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 19th February, 1925.

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

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): Sir, I wish to make the following statement in regard to the probable course of Government business in the ensuing week.

It has already been announced in this House that Monday, the 23rd February, has been allotted by the Governor General for the general discussion of Part I of the Budget in respect of Railways and that the 25th to 28th of February have been allotted for voting of demands for grants. Part II of the Budget will also be presented on the 28th as already announced.

As Honourable Members are already aware, there will be a meeting of the Legislative Assembly on Tuesday, the 24th February, on which day it is proposed to hold elections for the four Departmental Standing Committees and also for the election of the Standing Committee on Emigration. It is also proposed on that day to undertake the following legislation:

To consider and pass the Prisons (Amendment) Bill and the Cantonments (Amendment) Bill, which were introduced on the 16th February;

To move for leave to introduce the Bill entitled the Cantonments (House-Accommodation) Bill; and

To take into consideration the Indian Merchant Shipping (Amendment) Bill as reported by the Select Committee.

On that day Government also propose to give time, after the disposal of official business, for the discussion of Rai Sahib Harbilas Sardas's Resolution regarding the establishment of a Legislative Council for Ajmer-Merwara.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC PETITIONS.

REPORT ON PETITIONS RELATING TO THE INDIAN PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT BILL (AGE OF CONSENT BILL)).

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar (Madras City: Non-Muhammadian Urban): Sir, I beg to present the report of the Petitions Committee on certain petitions relating to the Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, commonly known as the Age of Consent Bill.

RESOLUTION RE ESTABLISHMENT OF A MILITARY COLLEGE—*contd.*

Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, resuming the discussion on the Resolution which I moved the other day, namely:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that early steps be taken for starting a well equipped Military College in a suitable locality to train Indians for the commissioned ranks in the Indian Army Service and the necessary amount be sanctioned to start the preliminary work."

I may say, Sir, that I stand on firm ground in moving this Resolution, because this Assembly accepted this Resolution with the full concurrence of the Government of India both in the year 1921 and in the year 1923. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief perhaps shows dissent that it has not got the full concurrence of the India Government. I can quote chapter and verse to show that I have got the assurance that it has got the full concurrence of the Government of India. In the year 1921 when a Resolution was moved by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer an amendment was moved to his Resolution by Munshi Iswar Saran to the effect that, as soon as funds are available, steps should be taken to establish in India a military college such as Sandhurst, and the desirability of establishing in India training and educational institutions for other branches of the Army should be steadily kept in view. These are the two points. One is to start a military college on the lines of Sandhurst and the second to keep in view training in other branches of the Army, to which His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief at page 1754 in the last four lines said:

"I hope that at no very distant date funds can be made available, though at the present moment they are not very plentiful,"—(that was in the year 1921)—"and that we shall be able"—('we,' representing the Government of India)—"to establish a college on these lines as suggested in the Resolution. For that reason, we accept the Resolution as amended."

And it was adopted. That was in the year 1921, Sir. Again, on the 2nd July 1923, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer put a question with reference to what effect had been given to the Resolution passed on March 28th, 1921, and the answers given by Mr. Burdon on behalf of the Government of India were as follows:

With reference to the recommendation No. 9 "that as soon as funds are available, steps should be taken to establish in India a Military College such as Sandhurst", Mr. Burdon said:

"This recommendation has not yet been agreed to. Amongst other things, the financial condition laid down has not yet been satisfied."

I do think that in 1925 we are very much better than we were in 1921. Then with reference to the latter part of the Resolution regarding the desirability of establishing in India training and educational institutions for other branches of the army, Mr. Burdon said:

"It is impracticable at present to take any definite action towards carrying out this recommendation."

Not being satisfied with these halting answers, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer moved another Resolution on the 4th July 1923, which ran as follows:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he will be pleased to urge upon the Imperial Government the necessity for promptly giving effect to Resolutions 7, 8, 10 and 11 of the Assembly passed on the 28th of March, 1921, in connection with the Escher Committee's Report with the concurrence of the Government of India."

In support of this Resolution, Sir Sivaswami Aiyer stated:

"These Resolutions were passed with the concurrence of the Government of India, and they have not yet been fully given effect to, and the Government should urge upon the Imperial Government the necessity of promptly giving effect to the Resolutions of the Assembly passed on the 28th March 1921."

Mr. Burdon, the Army Secretary, on behalf of the Government of India stated:

"Well, Sir, as my Honourable friend has pointed out, these Resolutions were adopted with the concurrence of the Government of India, and I may say that the proposals were duly laid before His Majesty's Government. But they have not been accepted."

Therefore, I think I am perfectly right when I state that we passed those Resolutions not only with the full concurrence of the Government of India but with the full concurrence of the ablest General, His Excellency Lord Rawlinson, the Commander-in-Chief in India, who stated that he would start a College in India. He went further and stated that he fully sympathised with our aspirations and that he would do all that lay in his power to see that something was done before he left the shores of this country. I am now moving this Resolution because I am anxious to see that His Excellency may be able to carry out his promise in this matter and that he may be pleased to lay the foundation-stone of a military college on the lines of Sandhurst in India before he leaves the shores of India. One of the objections advanced by Mr. Burdon in 1923 was that the peace and security of the Empire rested not with the Indian representatives but with the British Parliament. In 1921 we were a happy family, both the official benches and the opposition benches, because whatever Government wanted in the way of taxation was readily granted by us. The Government met us half way in meeting our wishes. That was the occasion when Mr. Montagu was the Secretary of State, and in the year 1923 he has gone, and therefore Mr. Burdon came in with an apology that he could not accept our recommendations, because he said that the Imperial Government stood in the way on the old hackneyed excuse that the security of India rests not with Indians or Indian representatives but it rests with them, the British Parliament and the British Cabinet. He also said that, as the British officers have secured the confidence and affection of the army, as they have been trained in the best schools in England, as they have got the best traditions behind them and as they have kept up the efficiency of the army, we cannot accept the risk of replacing those officers to any large extent by substituting Indians in their place, which would necessitate the starting of a College in India. That was one of the objections Mr. Burdon raised to our recommendation. But I would remind this House that when we were discussing the question of self-government in this House, Sir William Vincent, the Home Member, twitted us and said "How can you have self-government in the country unless you are in a position to defend yourself". Now, in order to meet that argument, Sir Sivaswami Aiyer made a number of very valuable suggestions in order to render our people fit to defend the country, to which His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief readily agreed. I may also mention to the House that when the Duke of Connaught was commanding the western army in Bombay, on more than one occasion he assured the people there that he would be glad to see a Military College in India. Now it may be asked, what is the object of having a Military College in India when we have the Sandhurst College in England, which is by all accounts a well equipped, useful and also a renowned institution? My reply to that is this. How long are we to depend on Sandhurst, and how

[Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju.]

long are we to send our children thousands and thousands of miles away for getting military training? Should we not have a similar institution in our own country? Sir, it is not a matter of mere sentiment. With the help of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief we have so far succeeded in starting a training institute,—I would call it a preparatory school—the foundation stone of which was laid by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales at Dehra Dun. But that is not a Military College at all. It has got as much significance as the Holy Roman Empire, which is neither holy, nor Roman nor an Empire. It is not a college at all. It is only what I may call a public school on the lines of public schools in England, it is a preparatory school to train our students before they can proceed to Sandhurst. Therefore we cannot be satisfied with this Military College at Dehra Dun.

Then another objection which is raised is that it would be too costly to start a properly equipped Military College in India. But I may mention for the information of those who are not acquainted with the army budget, or who never care to look into it that though we are only spending about 2 lakhs of rupees for the maintenance of the Dehra Dun Preparatory School, as I call it, we are spending money to the tune of about 1 crore and 25 lakhs of rupees annually for a number of institutions in India which are not open to Indians, excepting to a very very select few commissioned officers here and there. For instance, our military educational and instructional establishments cost as follows:

Supervising staff	1 lakh.
Staff College at Quetta	8 lakhs.
Small Arms Schools at Satara	5 „
Physical Training School at Ambala	1½ „
Equitation School, Saugor	3 „
Senior Officers' School, Belgaum	2½ „
Machine Gun School at Ahmednagar	1½ „
School of Artillery at Kahmi	1½ „
Tank Corps School, Ahmednagar	3½ „
Mechanical Training Transport Centre	3½ „
Army Signal School, Poona	1½ „
Practice for artillery	22½ „
Small Arms ammunition	55 „

Besides this, we are opening regimental schools for British troops and for Indian troops at a cost of 12½ lakhs and 5 lakhs, respectively. We are spending for the post-graduate course Rs. 125 lakhs annually and we are spending only Rs. 2 lakhs in order to train about 70 students annually, of which they expect about 10 students annually can be trained to be sent to Sandhurst, because they expect the annual wastage or what they call decrement will be only 10 persons in the eight units already sanctioned. For that purpose they think 70 students can be trained in six years. But what we want to know is, should we or should we not expect the Indianisation of the Army within our generation? Will it not be at any rate within 40 years? If we have only 8 units sanctioned in the year 1922, it will take 200 years and more and not 40 years to Indianise the army. They might say, what is the scope for your college unless we give you additional

commissions? We want them to give us additional commissions. That is perfectly true, we cannot start a college without having a decent number of students. These students are not useful for any other purpose except a military career and they can be used only if Government give them King's Commissions. Now we are arguing in a circle. How can we get on unless you give us additional cadetships thrown open to Indians? I ask, why should you confine it to 10 Indians? Why give us only 10 and not 50? If you give 50, or even 40, why should we not have a college? We have a post-graduate course, why should we not have a college? The instructions at Sandhurst only extend for a period of 18 months, less than two years. In the year 1876 in Canada they started a Royal Military College at Kingston, and they are spending only Rs. 12½ lakhs a year on it. Instead of following the English practice, they are training their boys there for four years on the American system and on account of their long training, you are giving them one year's seniority over the British trained cadets in England. They are spending only Rs. 12½ lakhs in Kingston, and those persons are being freely admitted into the commissioned ranks. I have got the book with the facts here. Why should we not be given the same privilege? But in order to give us those privileges the Government of India must be prepared to recommend, and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief should be willing to follow his promise of helping us in recommending a larger number of units to be Indianised, and naturally a larger number of cadetships should be thrown open to Indians. After all if we are spending 55 crores annually for military purposes, we do not grudge spending out of it even 50 lakhs, or for the matter of that, if necessary, even a crore. I do not want any second-hand institution in India; I want an institution which can stand on its own feet and compete in efficiency with Sandhurst or Woolwich, or any other institution in the world, and when the country is prepared to spend 55 crores, cannot we spend half a crore or even a crore? After all we need not depend on Sir Basil Blackett for any additional grant. It lies with His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief because the Retrenchment Committee has suggested the giving up of three British cavalry regiments by which you can save Rs. 74 lakhs annually. And I understand the Government of India recommended the same course to be taken and only the War Office stood in the way, and therefore we are not able to secure a saving of Rs. 74 lakhs by the reduction of three British cavalry regiments. And the Retrenchment Committee suggested reducing the peace establishment to what it is in every other country, by which we can save 2 crores annually. These recommendations were practically acquiesced in by the Government of India in accepting the proposals of the Incheape Committee, but the War Office must be in our way. I do not think in such a matter of national importance money is any consideration, when we are spending money like water on the military. Within the last 10 years we have spent not less than 500 crores on account of military expenditure. Can you not spend something on such a useful institution to train Indians in our own country? Therefore that objection does not stand.

The second objection raised is perhaps that, if Indians are trained wholly in India, the people who are trained in England might look down upon the Indian-trained people. I humbly ask whether the Indian Members appointed to the Executive Council are looked down upon by the English gentlemen who are sitting by them as their colleagues? It all depends on the rank and the status given to them, and it depends on the self-respect and self-confidence shown by the Indian members, when they are placed there to be looked up to, not looked down on. That is no argument.

[Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju.]

And, Sir, the third objection is, can we get proper instructors? I submit, Sir, when we have got efficient instructors, able to give the men a post-graduate course, as we call this additional training here for these officers, after their 18 months' study at Sandhurst, can we not also give this training by appropriate and proper persons at whatever cost? Necessity knows no law. When the war demanded it, you started a school in Indore. You prepared men there; you gave 28 permanent King's Commissions, and 39 temporary commissions at Indore. If you want it you can start one here. To-morrow His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief wants it, he can have a number of people trained in India, who will be quite as efficient as any other. And therefore the first point is, we must have it, whatever be the cost. And the other plea is we cannot have instructors; we cannot have a higher level of training. When the Japanese wanted to start their own institutions, they had three sets of schools, beginning with a preparatory school and then a cadet school and ending with a post-graduate school or staff college. They have obtained instructors from England, Germany and France. They are able to secure men by paying them. In the early days of the Chino-Japanese War the Japanese were looked down upon as mere monkeys, but when they showed their mettle they were respected, and later on when they thrashed soundly the biggest giant in Europe, Russia, everybody admired them and admitted that the Asiatic nations had got some mettle. Therefore we can train our officers as the Japanese trained theirs. And it is not difficult to find material in India, because, when you started Indian Army to begin with the nucleus of the Indian Army was the Rajput Regiments manned by Rajput officers, but you have others later on as well. In Bengal and the United Provinces you have Brahmin regiments. Do not think the martial races are confined only to the Punjab. In Southern India we won the decisive battle of the world at Kondur in 1759. These they won for you and gave you a stand in Southern India. If you read the account, you will see that in 1759 they were able to do it as ably as any other martial race. Neither in Madras nor in Bombay nor in Poona are men wanting who can show their mettle. Only, as it was put by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, you have emasculated the whole nation. It is for Your Excellency as the Commander-in-Chief to place us on our legs, so that we may show what we are capable of. While on this subject I may state that the other day when an unstarred question was put by Sardar Mutalik, the reply given by the Honourable Mr. Burdon was to this effect:

"The Government of India have submitted proposals to His Majesty's Government for the training of Indians at Woolwich and Cranwell, in order to qualify them for employment in the Royal Engineers and in the Royal Air Force. As regards the Royal Tank Corps the Government do not propose to train young Indian officers in this difficult and highly technical branch of the service"—*I do not know whether that is the view of Mr. Burdon himself or he is only echoing the sentiments of the War Office*—"until they have attained to greater experience and efficiency in the commissioned ranks of the cavalry and infantry now open to them."

Now, Sir, in England every person is admitted by the Universities into the Officers' Training Corps (O. T. C.) and an embargo is only placed upon Indian students because they say the War Office will not allow Indians to enter the Officers' Training Corps; and therefore Indians in spite of the large sums they spend are not allowed to enter these institutions. We are thankful to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that he has now paved the way by suggesting that Indians may enter those institutions; and his very suggestion resolves one of the difficulties raised

by him in a previous reply given in 1923 that all these Services are British and it is impossible for him to suggest that any steps be taken to admit Indians into these British units. Why not then have Indian units for the Indian Army? Otherwise if they want British units, let Britain pay for them as suggested by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer. When we are paying crores and crores of money for these units they should be our units just as much as theirs and there should be no embargo of any kind. I appeal to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that he has accepted our recommendation; he made the Government of India accept it and the members of the Indian Cabinet must have accepted it when they allowed you to accept our Resolution. The trouble arose in the War Office. Just as in the currency question the Treasury Office stands in our way, so also the War Office stands in our way whenever we want this question settled. Before His Excellency leaves our shores let him fight for our cause and let him start an institution in India. It is not as if the Government Benches were opposed to us: we are for once all sailing in the same boat. There is some other obstacle. But let us stand shoulder to shoulder and remove that obstacle, by persuasion or by every other means possible; and that is why I have great pleasure in moving this Resolution that early steps be taken for starting a military college and the necessary amount be sanctioned to start the preliminary work; because this year I am practically certain there will be a saving of some 6 or 7 crores without considering the saving by reducing the British units or by the other economies which have been suggested. There should not therefore be much difficulty in providing a few lakhs out of those savings for this purpose. If that is not feasible and His Excellency wants it, we will suggest ways and means to provide whatever amount is necessary. Let not some excuse or other be put in the way of this important object of starting a college, and, therefore, I appeal to everyone in this House to say let us all unanimously carry out this Resolution.

Mr. E. Burdon (Army Secretary): Sir, I was anxious if possible to have an early opportunity of speaking in this debate because the subject which the House is discussing has a technical aspect on which I think I may safely say the majority of Honourable Members naturally do not possess as much information as is available to my Department and I wish to place at the disposal of the House at as early a stage as possible all the relevant material which Government have had at their disposal in determining the policy which they are now following. For the questions which the Resolution raises are of very great importance and it is in my opinion especially desirable, indeed essential, that both Honourable Members and Government themselves should get the utmost out of this debate in the way of ascertaining both what India really requires and what it is practicable to undertake in the matter of facilities for training officers for the regular army. An incorrect conclusion might be fraught with very serious results indeed. The question of the best means of providing officers for the army, the question of the best means of training officers for the army, to lead it, to organise it and to instruct it, are matters of vital consequence to every country. Here in India these questions have a special importance and, if I may say so, a special difficulty, at the moment, in that you are seeking to replace a class of officer, the British officer, who has occupied by himself a cardinal position in the Indian Army for many years, and has admittedly been extremely successful, and of great value to India, in one of the most honourable and arduous fields of human enterprise. The Honourable Member in bringing forward his proposition is, I know, looking forward to

[Mr. E. Burdon.]

the time when India obtains responsible government, and in consequence must be prepared to be increasingly independent of the military assistance which she has derived from Great Britain in the past. To provide adequately and surely for the defence of India, in the future which is here envisaged, is a task of no small responsibility; and perhaps the most difficult part of the problem is to ascertain the best means of securing an establishment of officers no less efficient than those who have served the Indian Army in the past.

- Now, Sir, my Honourable friend has referred to the fact that in March 1921 a Resolution advocating the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst was adopted by the Legislative Assembly with the concurrence of Government: and he has very naturally drawn certain inference from the fact that Government have shown no sign of carrying out the proposal. Obviously these facts require some explanation, and I propose to tell the House very frankly what happened on the occasion to which my Honourable friend has referred. The Assembly were engaged at the time in considering the Esher Committee's Report. They first appointed a Select Committee to go into the report in detail, and this Committee framed a series of propositions in the form of Resolutions which then came before the Assembly as a whole for discussion. One of the Resolutions put forward by the Select Committee was that the desirability of establishing in India a military college such as Sandhurst should be kept in view. I think I had better read out the original Resolution:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that adequate facilities should be provided in India for the preliminary training of Indians to fit them to enter the Royal Military College at Sandhurst; and

That the desirability of establishing in India a military college such as Sandhurst should be kept in view."

Now, to this Resolution Government did not wish to take exception because they recognised then, as they recognise now, that an Indian Sandhurst is a thing which is bound to come in time, which must be established in the course of time; but during the discussion of the Resolution an amendment was put forward to the second part of the Resolution in the following terms:

"That as soon as funds become available, steps should be taken to establish in India a military college such as Sandhurst, and the desirability of establishing in India training and educational institutions for other branches of the army should be steadily kept in view."

Well, Sir, the actual fact is that owing to some misunderstanding or some accident neither His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief nor my predecessor found an opportunity of speaking on this amendment and it was carried. (*An Honourable Member*: "What was the misunderstanding?") The Resolution came forward shortly after the President had given a reminder—apparently it was at the end of the day—to the House that unless they expedited their proceedings they would never get to the end of the day's business. In any case, Sir, this is my real point. It will be apparent, I think, to Honourable Members that a proposition which amounted to the immediate establishment of an Indian Sandhurst was one which the Government with a due sense of responsibility could not accept without, at any rate, speaking their mind upon the subject in the Assembly, and giving reasons why they were prepared to assent to such a far-reaching departure of policy. I must remind Honourable Members in this connection

that the grant of King's Commissions to Indians was an arrangement which had only been in force for a short time, and Government had in 1921 little or no experience on which to determine whether it was necessary to abandon suddenly, after so short an interval, the original plan of training Indians at Sandhurst and not in India. The plan which Government had laid out for themselves, including the establishment of a college at Dehra Dun for training preliminary to Sandhurst, had not been tried out, and in all the circumstances it will, I think, be clear that Government's silence on the occasion in question could only have been due, as it was due, to accident. I would further point out that the Assembly themselves, if I may say so, were on that occasion not entirely consistent, since the Resolution which they had passed immediately before included a recommendation that the bulk of commissions granted to Indians should be given to cadets trained at Sandhurst. At no time in the course of the discussions on the report of the Fisher Committee were the implications of the two rival propositions—Sandhurst or an Indian Sandhurst—fully developed, compared or reconciled. All this, however, is not really material to the business before the House to-day. It is only relevant to the suggestion that Government have been inconsistent or negligent. The inconsistency, if there is one, is apparent and not real, and I should like to tell the House that the facts which I have stated on this point only recently came to my knowledge. I was not a Member of the Assembly in 1921. The Government have certainly not been negligent in the matter for I may tell the House that the question of an Indian Sandhurst has on many occasions been examined with the greatest care and attention. I propose now to make some preliminary observations which will serve to indicate how the present policy of Government has been determined. When, in 1917, it was proposed that Indians should be eligible for the superior commissioned ranks in the Indian army, the quality of the new privilege to be given was assessed ungrudgingly. In this spirit, and from this point of view, it was decided that Indians should have exactly the same commissions as British officers of the Indian army have always held, namely, King's Commissions in the army carrying the power of command over British troops; and the principle was then adopted which has been adhered to unswervingly ever since, namely, that Indian officers and British officers in the Indian army should be on an equal footing, enjoying the same privileges and subject to the same obligations. In accordance with this principle and as much by way of conferring a privilege upon Indians, as requiring them to qualify by those tests alone which would make them as efficient as the British officers of the past, it was decided that they should be trained at Sandhurst. Indian boys who qualify at Sandhurst receive, as I have said, the King's Commissions in the army, the highest type of commission in the British Empire. In exactly the same way as British boys, they are attached in their first year of probation to serve with British regiments and thereafter they are posted to units of the Indian army.

Now, Sir, at the time of which I am speaking, 1917-18, the idea of an Indian Sandhurst was considered and rejected, and I am sure the Assembly will agree that the decision of that time was absolutely right. No one, I take it, will wish to quarrel with the decision to give to Indians the King's Commission in the army; and, this being so, it was essential that Indians should be given the same opportunities as British boys to qualify themselves to hold that commission worthily. They were not to be segregated from British officers in the Indian army. British officers were to continue to

[Mr. E. Burdon.]

serve in the Indian army side by side with Indian officers. It was therefore to the interest of the Indian cadets themselves that they should commence before entering the army the association and comradeship with British boys, which they would have to continue in their army life. The purpose was to eliminate the possibility of racial prejudice on either side, by establishing mutual liking and understanding at the earliest stage. Again, the principal qualities required in an army officer are a capacity for leadership, strong personal character and strong personal influence for good; and it was equally essential that Indians should be given opportunities of acquiring these at the institution which has devoted itself for years to the cultivation of these qualities, and has succeeded in turning out as good officers as there are in any country in the world. I need not remind my Honourable friends that in matters of defence there is only one standard of efficiency. It must be a standard higher if possible than that of every potential enemy; and, so far as quality in officers is concerned, there is only one safe standard to aim at, namely, the highest standard. Government did not overlook the possible dangers and disadvantages of sending Indian boys to a foreign country for their education at a young impressionable age, and of depriving them at that young age of parental care and control; nor did Government overlook the expense to private individuals which training at Sandhurst necessarily involves. But in their judgment the risk of Indian boys coming to harm in England was greatly reduced by the fact that at Sandhurst they would acquire a sense of discipline which would affect the whole of their lives, and while actually at Sandhurst they would be under rigid and wholesome control. Supervision during the holidays could be specially arranged for and the boys proceeding to Sandhurst would, therefore, be much better off in this respect than the Indian boys who have for many years gone to England voluntarily for educational, medical, legal and engineering training. In these cases the period of separation is longer and the tutorial control exercised is in all cases less effective than that which is exercised at Sandhurst; in many cases of the kinds which I have mentioned control does not exist at all. The objection on the score of expense was held to be met by the fact that Government would provide a certain amount of pecuniary assistance in the shape of paying passages to and from England and also that as many of the boys would be likely to receive King's India Cadetships they would be entitled to receive the pecuniary concessions which accompany the grant of such Cadetships. The risk of money being wasted was greatly reduced by the establishment of the Dehra Dun college and also by holding the entrance examination for Sandhurst in India.

The above were the results of the exhaustive consideration which Government gave to the matter: and it was in this way that it was decided that Indians should be given the King's Commission and should be trained for it at Sandhurst. They secured, if I may say so, a very great privilege compared with anything of the kind that had been done in the past. We have now had some 5 years' experience of the policy: and I think it will be acknowledged that this is a very short time in which to determine the best way of building up either a national army or an establishment of officers for the national army. In any other problem of life I feel sure that it would be regarded as premature to abandon after so short an experience a policy which has *prima facie* so much to recommend it. As, however, my Honourable friend has raised the question, we can with certain large

reservations review the position. At any rate, we know a little bit more about the subject than we knew in 1918, and we can see more clearly than we did then the advantages of Sandhurst and the disadvantages of an Indian Sandhurst. I have already spoken of the former and the judgment of Government in regard to the advantages of Sandhurst has undergone no material alteration. The disadvantages of an Indian Sandhurst, on the other hand, have more clearly emerged.

Now, in the first place, if it were to be definitely proposed to His Majesty's Government that all Indian candidates for commissions in the Indian army should be trained at an institution in India and not at Sandhurst, there is a possibility—I will not say more than this—there is a possibility that the question would be raised whether such Indian candidates should continue to be eligible for the King's Commission in the army or should, instead, be granted a local or Dominion commission. I would put the matter to the Assembly like this. Would it be a reasonable or an unreasonable proposition for India to ask His Majesty's Government to agree to the establishment of an Indian Sandhurst and to bind themselves to give the King's Commission in the Army, carrying with it the power of command over British troops on the basis of a separate Indian course of education conducted under Indian conditions and according to methods which must necessarily be determined, to a very large extent, by the ideas held from time to time by the Indian authorities? I wish to refer here to an argument which I know has sometimes been used, namely, that just as certain of the Dominions have their own military colleges, so India should have a military college of her own too. There is a flaw in this argument. For no British troops of the Imperial Army are employed in those Dominions and the Dominion military colleges in the great majority of cases merely train boys for the grant of Dominion commissions. Indians, on the other hand, claim to receive the King's Commission in the Army and indeed must receive such Commissions unless they are to be placed in a position of definite inferiority to the British officers with whom they are serving. (*A Voice*: "Let us have both.") That is hardly practicable. But, Sir, even if this question of the rival forms of Commission, the King's Commission and a local Commission, were not to be raised, supposing for the sake of argument that Indians though trained at an Indian Sandhurst were still to be allowed to hold the King's Commission, even then I say a distinction which could only be regarded as racial would be introduced and it would be a distinction to the disadvantage of Indians. Honourable Members of the Assembly need have no doubt upon this point. Officers trained at Sandhurst would be regarded as bearing the hall-mark of a superior article. The traditions of Sandhurst alone would ensure this quite apart from the greater efficiency of Sandhurst which I very much fear we could not hope to reproduce in India. (*Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha*: "Why?") I shall explain that a little later. Some Honourable Members are no doubt aware that during the war we were compelled, as a temporary make-shift, owing to the necessity of training large numbers of officers at as many centres as possible, to establish cadet colleges at Wellington and at Quetta. British cadets were trained there and the officers trained there have never been regarded as equal to the officers from Sandhurst, and for the reason which I have given and for the further reasons which I will now give, they could not pretend to have received an equally thorough training. I would like, while on this point, to read out a few particulars of the organisation at Sandhurst.

[Mr. E. Burdon.]

The Commandant of Sandhurst is always a specially selected officer of the rank of Major-General, and each of the Company Commanders is a selected officer of the General Staff who has been through the Staff College at Camberley. The Warrant Officers and Staff Sergeant Instructors are the finest men in the Army, mostly picked men from the Brigade of Guards. Physical training, boxing, fencing and swimming instructors are picked men of the Army Gymnastic Staff at Aldershot. Equitation Officers are the best horsemen and instructors in the army, and the Warrant Officer Instructors are the pick of the British Cavalry and Artillery. To ensure that French is well taught, officers of the French Army are lent by the French Government and are attached to the staff at Sandhurst.

What I say on this point applies with greater force to Woolwich. Cadets of the technical arms, for which training is received at Woolwich, learn Electricity and Magnetism, Physics, Optics, the Chemistry of Explosives, and are made acquainted with every type of gun and explosive used in the Army, many of which do not exist in India. Proximity to Woolwich Arsenal is essential to their proper instruction. Now, Sir, I think Honourable Members must frankly recognise that it would be an uneconomical arrangement to establish an Indian Sandhurst, so long as only 10 commissions a year are available for Indians, and it would still be uneconomical even if the whole supply of officers required for the Indian Army were in the first place to be trained at an Indian Sandhurst. This is a very important point on which it is impossible to lay too much stress. Sandhurst caters for 620 cadets at the present moment. We take 70 cadets from Sandhurst for the Indian Army out of 620. The overhead charges which would be common to every military college can obviously be spread more economically over the larger institution. I do not, however, propose to develop this argument in detail. For one thing, the fact is self-evident and for another I know that the Honourable Mover of this Resolution is not prepared to accept any argument based solely on expense.

Now, Sir, I turn to another practical aspect of the matter, which also arises out of the fact which I mentioned just now, the number of boys trained at Sandhurst. There are 620 boys at Sandhurst and 240 boys at Woolwich, and because of these numbers it is possible to organise the cadets into battalions, companies and platoons, and I think the House will recognise at once that if proper military education is to be given, it is absolutely essential to have a sufficient number of boys to reproduce in the School actual army conditions. A boy can then be trained in drill, as a private soldier, as a non-commissioned officer and as an officer. He can actually be trained with troops in miniature. This of course would be quite impossible in an Indian Sandhurst. With 10 Commissions a year—I do not think I need say anything more, and even if you take the whole of your supply from an Indian Sandhurst, the number of boys in training would be 120 or 140 and you would not be able to form even one company out of these for training. Another aspect of the same matter is that in

12 NOON. a smaller institution it would be impossible to develop the same *esprit de corps* as you can in a larger institution, and it is impossible in a smaller institution in particular to get that competition out of which *esprit de corps* arises—the competition between different companies and competition between different platoons. At Sandhurst this competition between platoons and companies in work, games, sports, conduct and everything else is very great. The champion company at Sandhurst

carries a special colour on parade, and the interest of officers and cadets to be the champion company is tremendous. Now, Sir, I have already dealt with the disadvantages of Sandhurst from the Indian point of view. There is the disadvantage consisting in separation of the boy from his family and the disadvantage of expense. But we have done a good deal to meet this difficulty of expense and we hope to do more and I personally hope that the efforts of Government will before very long be reinforced by the establishment of scholarships to be endowed by patriotic Indians who are anxious to further the creation of a national army. As regards the moral dangers of sending boys to England at an early age, we have had little or no experience of any untoward results of this kind in the short period of which we have experience. Indian boys who have been to Sandhurst and have returned with commissions have been very happy there and they have liked the life there and we hope for even greater success when all the boys that are sent to Sandhurst are boys who have been through a preliminary course of training at Dehra Dun. As Honourable Members are aware, Dehra Dun has only been in existence for some three years. The full course of training there is 6 years and there is not the slightest doubt that boys who had been through Dehra Dun feel less unfamiliarity with the conditions at Sandhurst when they go there than boys who have had merely an early education on purely Indian lines, without the special features which are to be found in the College at Dehra Dun.

Now, Sir, I wish the House clearly to understand that I have not been attempting to argue this case in a contentious way, because I feel in agreement with the Honourable Mover that the benches over there and the benches on this side are really pursuing the same object, (*A Voice*: "Question?") and it is a question of finding out the best method. As I say, I do not wish to present the case in a contentious way; I have no reason for doing so. I have made it my object to explain some of the difficulties that would be attendant upon the creation of an Indian Sandhurst and to explain some of the benefits which we have at present but which might be lost if an Indian Sandhurst were to be substituted—*substituted* I say, for Sandhurst. I am perfectly certain that the House will give due attention to the facts which I have mentioned and I feel that they will be glad to have these facts in their possession. I have no doubt that the House only wish to get out of this debate and out of Government what is best for India. But I wish once more to repeat the argument which I have used once or twice already, namely, that any action would be precipitate which did not provide for our waiting until the Dehra Dun College has produced boys to go to Sandhurst who have had a full course of the preliminary education.

One word more, Sir, and I have done. As I have said before, the question we are discussing is one of vital importance, but it is not a question which can be settled in this House, it is not a question which the Government of India can themselves decide. It is a question in deciding which His Majesty's Government must have a very loud voice, the reason being that, so long as His Majesty's Government are responsible for the defence of India, in the manner and to the extent which I have stated on many previous occasions to the Assembly, they must have a great deal to say as to the method of training Indians as officers, and they must have, if I may say so, almost the sole voice in deciding what the course of education should be for boys who are to be trained to hold the King's Commission in the army.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): I agree with the Honourable Mr. Burdon that the question which is before the House is one of very great importance and I agree with him that we should approach it with all the calmness and caution that the subject demands. What he has said about the final decision resting with His Majesty's Government is a mere truism. No one will dispute it. What he has said about the importance of Indians holding King's Commissions is also a point on which there will be no difference of opinion. The King of England is the King-Emperor of India, and Indians have a right, so long as they continue to be the subjects of the King-Emperor of India, to hold the King-Emperor's Commissions. Whether the arrangements for their education are made in India or whether they are made in England makes or ought to make no difference in regard to their right to hold His Majesty's Commissions, and I hope they will hold those Commissions in larger numbers in the years to come. As regards the advantages of Sandhurst and the disadvantages of an Indian Sandhurst, I think many people will agree with the Honourable Mr. Burdon; they will be admitted without much discussion. Sandhurst, Sir, has been a long established institution. Years, decades, centuries of thought and labour, of imagination and effort, of knowledge of military science and tactics, have gone to establish, to rear up that institution. It is an institution of which Englishmen are rightly proud, and no Indian is so unwise as to think that an Indian Sandhurst which would compare with the Sandhurst of England could be established in a short time or without an enormous amount of expenditure. We can, therefore, without any hesitation, concede that it will be a long time before we can establish an Indian Sandhurst like the one that is in England. I also concede that it will require a very great deal of expenditure. But, Sir, there is such a thing as an overpowering necessity for every nation. The age has not yet come when people will be guided merely by righteousness, when they will be content to act according to the dictates of reason and conscience, when they will be content to possess whatever is rightly their own and not cast evil eyes or lay evil hands upon the possessions of others. (*A Voice: "There is the League of Nations."*) The League of Nations is at present an unreality so far as India is concerned. But taking things as they are, the age has not yet come when Englishmen will be content to remain within the borders of England, when all Englishmen will agree to the establishment of self-government in every other part of the world, particularly in India. There are Englishmen who feel that England should have her sway over India for all time. There are other Englishmen who feel that Parliament has committed itself to a policy of responsible government being established in India and they feel honestly that that policy has to be given effect to. There are Englishmen, I know, Sir, who honestly and truly wish to stand by that announcement and to work up for it. My remarks will be addressed to only this class of Englishmen. Those who do not belong to this category I must overlook. I must not think of them, but I speak of Englishmen who honestly feel that responsible government has to be established in India within a reasonable time. Many people are thinking of the year 1929 when there is to be a commission to inquire whether conditions have so far changed that responsible government should be established in India. Whether it will be established in full measure in 1929 or whether it will be established in full measure in 1939 is a matter upon which no man

can dogmatise, but upon one matter I think all honest Englishmen and all earnest Indians can join, and that is in believing that in a few years' time responsible government will be established in India as it is in His Majesty's Dominions. Now taking that as a proposition about which there is agreement on both sides let us consider what the implications are. No one can imagine India enjoying full responsible government unless Indians are prepared to take up the full burden of defending their own country. They must defend their own country. They must be prepared for it, if they want to have the full right of government in their own domestic affairs. How are they to acquire this power to defend themselves? Is it to be obtained by the means suggested by the Honourable Secretary to the Army Department? If it is to be attained by that means, what is the period of time during which it will be possible to attain it? If ten commissions or 20 commissions a year are obtained by Indians sent to Sandhurst, what a long period will it require to officer the Indian army with Indians? And unless the officers of the Indian army are to be Indians fully trained in India, what kind of an army will you create? Will it be an army upon which any responsible man can depend to defend this vast country against invasions from outside? I say it will not be. You will start Indians whom you will train at Sandhurst with a great handicap. You will constantly keep before their minds the idea of inferiority, of belonging to an inferior country which does not possess even a military college of its own to train the officers of its army which is to be relied upon to fight an enemy and to uphold the honour of the country. Select ten, twenty, thirty or forty Indians. Send them to Sandhurst to receive their training. Tell them that they must be separated from their home and country and kept in a distant foreign country for a long time before they can be educated up to the standard of an officer. You will not create in them the right spirit. I would not have such officers if this is to be a permanent arrangement. I value the training given at Sandhurst. I appreciate it whole-heartedly. I know what a long time it takes to make an English officer. I honour an English officer. He is one of the finest men you can think of in the world. His training has been a training of not less than 20 years. He goes to school. He receives training at the ordinary country school which fits him to join the army school. At the army school he receives special training, and even after he obtains a King's Commission, his training continues. He is under control and supervision until he rises to the top. If he fails at any step he is condemned to remain at a lower stage and not permitted to go up to the higher rungs of the ladder. That is the kind of training which an English officer receives. We want that the same kind of training should be available to Indians. It is not possible to have that training given to Indians unless you create a military college in India. The first thing an Indian aspiring to a career in the army should be helped to possess is the right feeling; there is the military college in my country. I want to be trained up at that college. I must qualify myself in the right way in order that I may gain admission to that college. In England you have schools in the counties. They select and recommend young men for the army school. Some of your young men receive their military education at the Universities, the bulk of them go on to Sandhurst where they receive the best training which they can. The idea of going there fills them with enthusiasm. It gives them a broad outlook. I want to create that outlook in the first instance in our Indian students.

[Panjit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

If you send a few of them to England they will not have that outlook in order that there should be the right spirit created in an Indian lad, that he should look forward to being trained as an officer of the Indian army, you must create an atmosphere wherein he would feel that he is as much a free man as any of his English fellow subjects. That is the first thing. Therefore, whatever the advantages of Sandhurst and whatever the initial disadvantages of an Indian Sandhurst, we must, Sir, take the total of the advantages into consideration and taking that into consideration, I have no doubt that every thoughtful Indian and every earnest Englishman who will devote any thought to the subject, will come to only one conclusion, namely, that there should be an Indian Sandhurst established in India.

Now, Sir, what is the way in which other people have gone about this important business. Look at Japan. Japan wanted to train officers for her army. Japan started a school for military training. Japan invited officers from outside to give the necessary training to her young men, and Japan has thus been able to present to the world the spectacle of being one of the great powers of the world. Japan did it all in twenty years time. India has to follow the same example. We want that we should all feel that this is an important business which has really to be done, that this is not a matter in which mere sentiment has to be satisfied, that it is not merely a question of getting a few commissions more or a few commissions less. The advantages of holding the King's Commissions are many. The advantages of military education at Sandhurst are many, but I think we must deliberately choose to give them up for the time being in order that we may have larger advantages. (*H. E. the Commander-in-Chief*: "We cannot afford it.") I agree with His Excellency that we cannot afford it altogether. But if he waited to hear what I was going to say, he would probably agree with me that we must temporarily give up some advantages. Those advantages will have to be made good eventually to some extent. We shall have to require that our students should be sent to England in order that they should live in the atmosphere of England after they have received the necessary training in India and have the advantages of meeting their English fellow subjects at Sandhurst on an equal footing. The lack of facilities here can thus be made up to a large extent by sending our trained young men to England for such time as may be thought desirable. So long as the connection of England and India lasts Indian young men who want to be officers in the army should be required to go to England for a few months, if not for a year or two. That will be an advantage. We have no objection to it. But what we want is that the main training, the training which will qualify them for the King's commission, should be given in India. When they have received that training, they may be sent to England for six months, or a year. I do not object to the period. But my point is that the main training which will qualify them for the commissions should be given in India. The question of expense, Sir, is a very minor question. If we look at the problem even from the purely economic point of view, the amount of money which we have to pay in pensions and in the extra salaries to the officers who come to India is an enormous one. If we get Indian officers to officer the Indian army, the expense will be very much less than it is in the case of English officers. It will be very much less. The salaries, transport charges,

pension allowances, etc., have largely led to the increase of military charges and of taxation during the last few years to the extent of 40 crores. There will be a saving under all these heads. So far as the establishment of the college is concerned, Sir, it may cost 10 lakhs: it may cost 20 lakhs: it may cost 50 lakhs: it may cost a crore of rupees. But what is a crore of rupees where this important question of the national self-defence of India is concerned? It may cost even five crores of rupees. But even on the simplest considerations of economy it will be good economy to spend five crores of rupees to establish a military college. If we are prepared to pay the money we shall get the commodity we want. We do not contemplate that the connection of England and India is going to end; we contemplate that we are going to work together as fellow subjects for a long long time. If that is so, I am certain that there will be Englishmen who will be willing to serve at the Indian Sandhurst; there will be English officers who will be willing to come out to India to train their fellow subjects in the art in which they have excelled for such a long time. And if we can obtain their co-operation in training Indians, in giving the highest training to Indian officers, I do not think that that money will be misspent. So far then as the question of equipment is concerned, it is purely a question of funds, and I am certain that every Indian sitting in this House will gladly vote whatever sum will be needed in order to establish, equip and maintain a first class military college of which India and England may be proud; a college which the representatives of other nations might wish to come to see and examine. I do not know that there are many countries which have such fine cantonments as we have in India. I should like to know how many countries in the world have a cantonment like that of Rawalpindi; and there are other cantonments. And I do not see why there should be any difficulty in starting a first-class military college at one of our best cantonments where all the necessary equipment should be provided: where an army in miniature would always be available and the atmosphere of the army would always be found; where students can receive their training from some of the finest men who have seen many wars, and fought many battles, who have won distinction and honour in the service of the King. That is what we want. Let there be no misgiving in the mind of any Member of the Government on the question of expense. We do not want to do it cheap. We want to do it on a sound and proper basis, and whatever expense has to be met India will not grudge it. Sir, during the last war India contributed 150 crores to England, and she will certainly find what will be required for an Indian Sandhurst for she considers it is necessary to establish it. I say with the greatest confidence that the people of India will bear whatever expense will be found to be necessary for establishing, equipping and maintaining a first-class military college. I submit, therefore, that the question should be approached from a large point of view. It is true that the decision of it does not rest with the Government of India. We recognize that; we regret it. I think, Sir, and I mean no flattery, that if it was left to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief he would, with the generous instinct of an Englishman, agree that there should be a military college established in India where Indians should be trained as other people are trained in their own country. We know, and I say this without any disrespect to the War Office,—we know that the War Office dominates and decides these questions and that the Government of India are simply unable to succeed in any of their views against the War Office. We regret it, and we request the Government of India and

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to make it clear to the War Office that they should not exercise the power which they undoubtedly possess over us, their humble fellow subjects, in a wrong way, in an unrighteous manner; that they are exercising the power which they possess over us in an unrighteous manner when they are keeping us out of military training in our own country. Let us think of the extent of this great Empire. This vast Indian Empire requires a large army to maintain order and peace within and to fight its enemies on the frontier. That this country should have to depend for all its officers upon a distant country, so distant as England, that there should be no provision for training officers of the army in the country, is a proposition which would be unthinkable were it not that it is unfortunately a reality. Is there a country in the world of one-fifth of the dimensions of India which is without a military college? The Dominions have established them. Mr. Burdon made a great point about Indians running a risk of being deprived of the right to hold King's Commissions if an Indian Sandhurst were established. Well, Sir, I honour the King's Commission, but we know that it is not a thing which is given to us in abundance. It has been a thing doled out only to tantalize us, only to tell us that we hold an inferior position. While the proclamations of Sovereigns and Acts of Parliament have said that Englishmen and Indians shall be treated as equal fellow subjects, the King's Commissions are there to tell us: "You belong to an inferior race; you are a subject population." We wish that we could wipe out that disgrace, and if the King's Commission are only to remind us that we hold an inferior position as subjects of His Majesty, then I say I should bid good-bye to the King's Commissions. I should like to have the King-Emperor's Commissions instead. We want a fair, open and equal contest with our English fellow subjects. I want our lads of Indian Universities and Indian schools to be put in competition with the English lads in all the items which go to make up a military education. I want them to compete on equal terms. If Indians fail no Indian will complain. But if the Indian succeeds in competition with his English fellow subject, I am sure every honest and reasonable man will agree that the Indian should have the King's Commission just as much as any other of His Majesty's subjects. If they do not win it, we will not complain. We only want a fair chance. Let both have the same facilities, the same education; that is what we want. But the problem will not be solved by looking at it in the way in which Mr. Burdon has tried to look at it. His was a case, I am sorry to think, of very special pleading. Undoubtedly he put it very lucidly. He put it in a manner which would attract, which would enlist sympathy; but unfortunately, Sir, the inherent weakness of his case was so patent that I do not do him any injustice in saying that his argument had no effect upon the minds of most of us here. We recognize all the difficulties he has pointed out. We wish to rise above those difficulties. We wish to establish the right conditions for training Indians for the army, and that is, Sir, the proposition for which I ask His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's support. Other peoples were situated in a worse position than we are at present. I will again refer to the case of Japan. When the Revolution took place in 1868 they had no army worth the name. It is because they had no army that other nations, France, America, and England, were able to dominate the situation. The Japanese saw the danger; they organized an army and began to train their officers, and in the course of twenty years they won distinction in the war with China and ten years later

they won higher distinction when they defeated Russia. Give us the chance and I hope, Sir, that our Indian soldiers will give a similar account of themselves and be able to produce good officers for the service of their King and country. We want only a chance; we want an opportunity and that is what I plead for. I hope every Englishman who is sitting here will realize the reasonableness of our demand and stand up wholeheartedly to support it. If that support is forthcoming, all the difficulties which Mr. Burdon pleaded so specially for will disappear and in a few years time we shall have the glorious, gladdening spectacle of seeing Indian youth being honourably and properly trained in India for the service of their King and country and giving a very good account of themselves. I hope, Sir, the Resolution will yet meet with a cordial response from His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and the Government Benches, and I hope that every Member of the House will lend it his wholehearted support. (Applause.)

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): Sir, I would like to ask the House to consider what is the object of the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend. It professes to be a desire to start in India a military college, and by that he has explained to us that he means a Sandhurst. But underneath and underlying that Resolution there comes a larger question—that of the more rapid Indianization of the officer establishment of the Indian Army. Now I would like to call the attention of the House for one moment to what is the actual position as regards officers of the Indian Army at the moment. Now the establishment of officers in a British battalion is I believe 28, and the establishment of officers in an Indian battalion is 29. Of that 29, 17 are already Indians and 12 are British. The problem therefore comes down to this fact that the 12 British officers hold the higher appointments in an Indian battalion and our object is the gradual elimination of that British element. That, I take it, is the object of the House. Now what is our problem? We are trying to build up in India an army completely Indian, capable of undertaking the self-defence of this country, and in endeavouring to find out the best methods in which we can solve the problem, it is essential that we should recognize some of the factors which enter into the problem.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: May I know who will solve that problem?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I take it all of us in this House. I want you to consider for a moment some of the factors that underlie the solution of this problem. We have already a certain amount of experience of completely Indianized units in the final test of war, and the Government have referred with considerable admiration to the very fine effort of the Imperial State Forces during the late great war, but from that and from our actual experience in the war we find that there are considerable difficulties. Those Indian State Force regiments, when they went to the war, were completely commanded by Indian officers and had been trained under Indian officers. They did not, however, pull their full weight in the war until they had been provided with a considerable establishment of British officers to assist them. (*Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal: "Why?"*) My Honourable friend, Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, says why, and in that I think he has possibly the whole of our difficulty. The fact is that in your British officers, and I say this without any desire to exaggerate and with all modesty, you have possibly the finest stamp of leader that you can get to-day in the world. Whether we can breed and train a similar

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

stamp of officer in India remains yet to be seen. I am not prepared myself to say that it is possible. (*A Voice*: "Why?") We must first have the actual experience of war to put our experiment to the test. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah*: "Will you wait until we have a war?") I am afraid, probably you will have to. (*Sir Hari Singh Gour*: "We want to make a beginning.") The point is this, that we have undertaken, or rather the Government have already undertaken, the training of Indians as King's commissioned officers, and they have further set aside 8 Indian units which in the process of time will be completely Indianized; and I hold that this House would be extremely rash in an important Department such as the Army to expand their experiment until they have put to the final test of war those completely Indianized Indian battalions without the support of one Britisher or one British bayonet. I trust that they will be successful, but until they have proved, in war, that they are successful—and Mr. Jinnah thinks that that would be a very long time—I am afraid, knowing the dangers of the frontier, that opportunities may arise far sooner than he expects.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: How can they prove that they will be successful, without any training?

Colonel J. D. Crawford: I have already said that these officers are already having exactly the same training as British officers.

Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha: Very few of them.

Colonel J. D. Crawford: Only such number as you can take into the 8 Indian units. Do you intend to throw away the whole of your Army before you are absolutely certain that you have a safe substitute? However, that is one problem, and when we look into the question of Indianization and the Indian commissioned officers now entering the Army we are faced with certain difficulties. The first thing is that many of them refuse to serve in the Indianized units, and I would ask the House to consider for one moment what is the reason underlying that refusal on their part. To my mind it arises from a considerable mistrust of one another. (*Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal*: "Hear, hear".) I do not know exactly what is the reason for their saying that, but they do say that—I am absolutely certain some of them say that—"serving without British officers, we will not be dealt with in accordance with our merits. Questions of religion, questions of caste, will enter into the consideration of the manner in which we are dealt with." That is a view that they take themselves. You have, therefore, before you are going to get completely Indianized regiments, to establish that feeling of trust between Indians themselves. That is one of your difficulties which you have to face. Another point is that many of these young men who have taken the King's Commission in the Army find that the life of the British officer is not as easy as they were led to expect. It is a far harder life than I think most Members of this House realize, who look upon it probably as consisting solely of going to the club in the evening. But life on the frontier and the conditions which officers in the Army in India are called upon to serve under are some of the hardest which men can be called upon to face; and we have to harden up our men, our young men, before we can expect that they will stand up to the conditions. The importance of this Resolution has already been emphasized by Mr. Burden. There are two particular points. One is that in the successful solution of this problem of making an Indian army completely officered by Indians lies the

eventual hope of self-government in this country; and the second point is that if we deal with it rashly, if we deal with it without looking at all the factors, we are liable to a most disastrous failure. Failure in this Department, if it comes, will be a disaster from which we cannot recover. Failure in other administrative Departments does not open us to that very serious risk, and we must remember that in India we maintain an army not for any theoretical reasons but for the very practical reasons that along our frontiers we are daily faced with the business of actual fighting. There is probably no country in the world which is faced with the same position that India is faced with—the thought that at any day, at any moment, there may come a war on us—and therefore our military machine must have a standard of efficiency that we cannot risk lowering. Now it is not possible to take any man and say, "Come along, you will make an admirable soldier". The men that you will have to find for your army in India must be taken from the martial races, and amongst your martial races to-day you have a lack of educated men to fill the post of officers. Now I mentioned at the beginning of my speech that over 50 per cent. of your officer establishment of the Indian Army to-day is already manned by Indians—men whom any British officer would look upon with the very greatest admiration, men who are full of courage, full of loyalty and full of training, but without education. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah*: "And without pay.") And without sufficient pay if you like—I would agree with you. They are without, as I say, education and I think if we are going to tackle this problem properly, before we get down to the question of the military college, we should get down to the training of the youth of the nation. I believe the solution of the problem lies in getting your young men at the age of 9 and bringing them into professional colleges built up in the nature of our public schools at home; and here I would quote from the speech of the Honourable Mr. Rangachariar on the Lee Commission. He stated there:

"My own experience, having recently been in England, is that the English people are what they are on account of their educational institutions and we are what we are on account of the educational institutions which these gentlemen have provided for us."

I thoroughly agree, Sir. I have always said that the educational system in India has failed; what we want is to provide something much more in the nature of English public schools. From that we will get a stamp of men who will be able, I believe, to fill posts in every administrative department as well as in the Army; and I believe the first thing we have got to do therefore is the establishment of these professional colleges of which Dehra Dun is to-day an admirable example. I would like myself to see Dehra Dun expanded not against the military budget but against our educational budget, so that it can provide men not only for the Army but for the other various services of the Government. I cannot agree with my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya that we should give up the advantages obtaining from sending our young men to Sandhurst. Those advantages are very valuable. There they meet with young men throughout the Empire and they get that polish and that *esprit de corps* which is essential to any successful body of officers. Were we to train them only in India I believe they will be exactly in the same position as the boy at home who is brought up privately by a tutor compared to a boy who has the training of a public school. There is no doubt that we are all endeavouring to find a solution of this problem. I understand the Government of India have under consideration the establishment of King George's colleges, of a Kitchener college, which will train

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

the sons of Indian Army officers, who stood by the Army so well, to make them a better stamp of men and better officers in the junior ranks of the Army. I believe herein lies a method whereby we may eventually establish that Army officered by Indians; but the position is exceedingly difficult and in view of the great risk that we run, it must be tackled with the greatest caution. I cannot believe that we can to-day or within 15 years completely Indianise the Army. We will be undertaking a risk having in view our responsibility towards the country. I think it is a thing which must grow gradually and we must prove to our own satisfaction that it is a possibility before we launch on any great scheme.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer (Madras: Nominated Non-official): Sir, I have listened to the remarks which fell from my honourable friend Mr. Burdon with all the respect which they generally deserve, but I have not been able to understand exactly what his attitude or that of the Government is; whether it is one of opposition or unwillingness to accept, or inertia or what else I cannot understand. My Honourable friend referred to the fact that this Resolution of 1921 was passed at the end of the day and he also pathetically referred to the fact that he himself was not in the Assembly. Possibly if he had been at the elbow of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief a different result might have followed the debate. Possibly the fact that it was at the end of the day might have had some influence over His Excellency but I am not aware of it. But one thing I may say, that the force of that Resolution cannot possibly be weakened by any of the circumstances to which my friend has referred. There was a later opportunity when this Resolution came up for discussion. That was in July 1923 when I urged the Government to make a fresh representation to the Imperial Government. And I distinctly stated that this Resolution which had been passed with the concurrence of His Excellency as spokesman of the Government, had made no progress during the three years. Now, no attempt was made to belittle the force of the Resolution which the Assembly had passed with the concurrence of the Government. Now, Sir, we have had another two years since the Resolution of 1923 and what are the reasons now brought forward and what is the attitude of the Government at the present moment? I do not believe that my friend Mr. Burdon is really opposed to the spirit of this Resolution. I am quite willing to credit him with a desire to do what he can to move a stage further. But how far exactly he is prepared to go I do not quite understand. Now, Sir, what are the reasons which have been brought forward by Mr. Burdon in his speech against this Resolution? He refers to the fact that the training given at Sandhurst is of such a superior character that in the interests of our cadets it would be wrong to deprive them of the opportunity of a training at Sandhurst. Now, we do not wish to have any institution here which will impart training of an inferior character. We wish to produce here the same conditions that prevail in Sandhurst in England. Of course, we know we cannot reproduce the atmosphere of England, but that is a thing which we cannot help. But short of that, we desire that the training here should be of exactly the same standard as in England, that our instructors should be recruited from the best military experts in England, and that the training should in no way be inferior to that which can be obtained in Sandhurst. It has been pointed out that the object of the Government is to put the Indian commissioned officer and the English commissioned officer on an equal footing, that if the Indian

commissioned officer obtained his training in India and his English confrere obtained his training in Sandhurst in England, there would not be that equality of status, real or supposed, which would alone be conducive to a real spirit and sense of equality. I do not know, Sir, how far it is necessary to give weight to this sentiment. It is quite possible, and I am willing to concede, that the man who has been trained in England may consider himself superior to the man who has been trained in India. But, whether he is really superior or not will depend not upon the one man's belief or feeling of superiority but upon the actual facts. If the training here is really as good as that given in England, then this feeling of superiority, which may perhaps exist for some time, will be found later on in actual experience to be not justified by the facts. It seems to me to be a factor of quite negligible importance. Now, if this training at Sandhurst is so superior to the training to be had elsewhere in the world, why is it that the Colonies like Australia and Canada have their own military colleges, and why do they not send their young men to England for the purpose of holding offices in the Colonial Army? The argument really to my mind proves too much. If it is so good that the training given in any colonial institution or anywhere else cannot approach it, then all the Colonies ought to send up their cadets to Sandhurst. But the Colonies have had their own way, they have had their colleges and their armies of officers of young men trained in their own military colleges. Then, Sir, it is said that, if the training is all imparted in India, the Imperial Government may not be willing to grant King's Commissions to the young men who are trained here because King's Commissions carry with them the power of command over English troops or any troops of His Majesty anywhere in the world. That is perfectly true. But our ideal should be an army modelled on the lines of the Dominion armies. We shall be quite content if our commissioned officers can exercise authority and control over troops in our own country. No doubt, in theory, a King's Commission has a much higher status and at first sight the idea of holding a Commission which will enable you to exercise control over any part of His Majesty's land forces in any part of the world may be attractive, but let us look at the facts. Do Indian commissioned officers as a matter of fact exercise any authority over British troops in other parts of the world or in British units? It is only as a matter of theory that this King's Commission is attractive. I see Mr. Burdon shaking his head. I admit that it does carry with it in theory the right to control, but I am not aware that Indian commissioned officers have been allowed to command British units or have been allowed as a matter of fact to exercise control over units of the British army in other parts of the world.

Mr. E. Burdon: Has not my Honourable friend forgotten the command of mixed brigades and of divisions of mixed troops in this country?

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: I am not aware that any Indian officer actually exercised any command over British troops here.

H. E. the Commander-in-Chief: They certainly have command over British troops here. The young officers who come out from Sandhurst and are attached to British units in this country have command over British troops of cavalry, of British sections and British companies, and their training, and the King's Commission entitles them to do that.

Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer: But generally, Sir, apart from the period of attachment for training, the Indian officers have not had the opportunity of commanding British troops.

[Sir P. S. Sivaswamy Aiyer.]

Now, Sir, whatever the advantages of a King's Commission may be, the ideal which we aim at is a Dominion army modelled on Dominion lines and we are in no way anxious to obtain the power of command over other units of His Majesty's army serving in other countries. The other arguments in favour of not taking action upon this Resolution or allowing Indians to be sent to Sandhurst are not, I think, of such a character as to be convincing. It is not merely a question of sentiment. There are serious disadvantages in sending young men in the most plastic period of their lives to a foreign country with all its temptations. I am sure His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is aware of the depth of sentiment in India which prevails upon this question, and the desire that is universally entertained that we should train our young men in this country itself for King's Commissions. I am aware, however, that there may be difficulties in the solution of this question and I am quite prepared to make allowance for these difficulties. Apart from the financial aspect of the question, to which Mr. Burdon rightly referred, there are other aspects which may require consideration. For instance, the question of the number of commissions which we throw open to Indian cadets every year is undoubtedly intermixed with this question of a training college. If you are going to grant, say, 10 or 15 places every year, it would certainly not be expedient or desirable even from an educational point of view to have a separate college here. That I can see. But if you can increase the number of commissions to be thrown open every year, and if you can increase the number of students to be trained every year to at least 40 per annum, as, for instance, by training cadets belonging to the Indian States—there are Indian State forces and officers have to be trained for the Indian States—I am sure the feasibility of starting an educational institution here would be looked at from a different standpoint. I am aware also that there may be difficulties of the kind referred to by Mr. Burdon with regard to the character of the commissions to be granted, and so on. But these are not difficulties of an insuperable character. While I am quite prepared to agree that there may be some necessity for having the subject properly considered and inquired into, we cannot agree to treat the question of the desirability of starting a college here as an open one. That question was concluded by the decision of the Assembly in March 1921; and as to the desirability of establishing a college, there can be no doubt or difference among Indians at any rate. The only question is whether, in view of the other difficulties which may present themselves, as for instance, the number of commissions, the cost of starting and equipping a college, and the character of the commissions to be conferred, it would not be desirable to have a preliminary inquiry. That, however, is quite a different matter. We do not want to leave the question of the desirability or the expediency of having a college here treated as a perfectly open question, and allow the Government to come to the conclusion that no college should be started here. We do not want to see the Government go back upon the Resolution which was passed in 1921 for the early establishment of a military college.

With these remarks, Sir, I have great pleasure in supporting the Resolution which has been moved by my friend Mr. Venkatapatiraju.

Captain Ajab Khan (Punjab: Nominated Non-official): Sir, it will be the desire of every patriotic Indian to agree with the spirit of the Resolution moved by my Honourable friend Mr. Venkatapatiraju, but in putting it into practice there are very many difficulties which may not have occur-

red to many Members in this House. When I read the announcement of 1917 about the goal of the British Government in India I for one could not realise how far responsible government would go without an Indianized defensive army for India. On the other hand, the demand for the establishment of a military college in India, giving candidates, who pass out of it the King's commission, with the same privileges and rights as the candidates who pass out from Sandhurst, will not be agreeable to the other officers who get their commissions from Sandhurst, and as such we, who are on our way to responsible government, will have secured the prerogative which is wanting even in the Dominions at the present moment. Moreover if, according to the proposal of Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, we start a college and give dominion commissions in India, I do not know how it will work when we have a composite brigade of British units and Indian units. In one case certain units will be commanded by British officers with the King's commission, and the other units will be commanded by Indians trained in India and that will mix up matters and lead to many complications as to power of command, etc. Of course it is a very difficult problem and it will require many expert brains to solve it. It is not a matter that we can do easily. I know in Lord Curzon's time they started a college at Dehra Dun. They commissioned some cadets there, and they, to the best of my knowledge, had no recognised position. They had the same privileges and pay I would say, but they were not recognised in any special category of a commission,—and when this new rule was brought in 1919 and the King's commission was opened to Indians, their position was recognised and they started their qualifying service from that date. As to the history of the Indian Army, all of you know that the Indian Army was created in 1778 and it has ever since served the British Government with honour and loyalty and has played a great and vital part in extending British rule. The number of British officers in an Indian regiment before the Mutiny was only three, the Commanding Officer, the Adjutant and the Quarter Master. (I say this subject to correction). The Commanding Officer had to decide all important cases of military law, the Quarter Master used to indent for stores, and the Adjutant was in charge of training. All the other power was vested in Indian officers. With the development of the Indian Army and after the Mutiny the quota of British officers gradually increased, so that there were 8 British officers and 16 or 17 Indian officers in 1893 and when I joined the Army the system under which a unit was organized in command of wings was in vogue. Then they introduced the double company system and each double company was commanded by a British officer who had another British officer to assist him.

In the great war the platoon system came into use which deprived the Indian officer even of the command of a company and the latter was turned into a platoon commander, while the number of British officers increased to 12, 16 and even sometimes to 28 per unit. When we look at other departments of the Government, such as the Judicial or Civil administration, created much later, we see that Indians have risen in them to the very highest positions and the most responsible posts. However, I do not wish to discuss that point; but I can safely state that the training and the scope of command of the Indians in the Indian Army, Sir, have been all the time curtailed and neglected in the past. I would not say that capable Indian officers were not forthcoming; but they had not been given sufficient scope. The number of Indian candidates that are being sent to England is 10 per annum now. Out of these 8 or 7 may be successful or say the whole 10 are successful. In 20 or 22 years' time, which is the average length of service

[Captain Ajab Khan.]

for an army officer to retire, we shall have only 220 Indian officers in all. With admission at that rate we shall never get beyond 220 Indian officers in the whole of the Indian Army; and therefore I say the number of Indian candidates admitted to Sandhurst every year is very small.

Now the proposal for the establishment of a military college sounds very well in words but very very great difficulties have to be overcome before we can give it practical shape; and I would suggest to the Honourable Mr. Burdon and to other Honourable Members that we require a small committee of experts to look into this question very carefully and make recommendations as to what should be done to surmount the various difficulties which stand in the way of it. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and everybody else realise that there are difficulties which have to be solved. It is not a question of what suits the interests of Indians alone. Other wider and vested interests have to be looked into also. It will be up to the committee to see whether they can suggest something on the lines of the Indian Civil Service or something else of that kind, requiring military cadets trained in India to go to England for one or two years' training or some other scheme which I am not in a position to suggest now. But they will have to look into the whole question very very carefully and make their recommendations to Government. I think that is the only practical form that could be taken up. I know that the position of the British officer in the Indian Army has been very honourable and he has rightly won and commanded the confidence and esteem of the Indian sepoy. I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with Colonel Crawford when he said that the present establishment of Indian units being 17 Indian officers and 12 British officers, is equally shared by both classes in the officers' grade. I know that the Indian officer holds a very unimportant position and has no say of any importance at all in the internal economy of his unit. He commands a platoon but he cannot get beyond that as things are; whereas the British officer can aspire to and achieve the highest post in the Army. I know that in the great war the Indian officer has done very well and I have seen cases where Indian officers of mature experience have guided young British officers for all practical purposes in the field, although their scope and their power of command was limited. In most cases it is true lack of education stood in their way and they were not able to get any further. I hope the time will come when these men will be able to get on better. As far as the establishment of a military college in India is concerned I have every sympathy with it. At the same time I do not know how the practical difficulties that stand in the way of it can be got over. Sir, if such a committee were appointed, we should be able to solve most of the difficulties. With these remarks, Sir, I close my remarks about the Resolution.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah (Bombay City: Muhammadan Urban): Sir, before I got up, I was thinking whether I should address this House or whether I should address Mr. Burdon, the Army Secretary, or whether I should address His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, or whether I should address the War Office or His Majesty's Government. (A Voice: "Not the Chair?"). Through the Chair. I am puzzled, Sir, whom to address: I do not know. Now, Mr. Burdon in his speech, which was long, full of phrases, couched in beautiful language, full of caution, full of statesmanship with a little bit of sermonising, never told us from his seat what is the position that he, representing the Government of India, wants to take up with regard to this Resolution. Why does he not frankly tell us—I can

see it from his speech—that he is nobody, and that he cannot do anything? (His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: “No”.)

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: He meant that he did. What did he mean? What is the attitude, I want to know definitely, what is the attitude of the Government of India with regard to this question? I want an answer. (A Voice: “You will have it.”) Either say, as Mr. Burdon did, in 1923 that you cannot do anything—or give us a frank answer as to what you can do. This is what Mr. Burdon said. Speaking on the 4th of July 1923, Mr. Burdon said:

“The principal recommendations which remain unfulfilled are as follows:

- (1) The proposal that Indians should be admitted to the commissioned ranks of the Royal Artillery, Royal Engineers and the Royal Air Force.
- (2) The proposal to increase to 25 per cent. of the annual total the number of commissions granted to Indians”—(this is the important portion).
- (3) The proposal to establish an Indian Sandhurst”—(that is the one with which we are immediately concerned in this Resolution).

Then what did he say? This is what he said:

“Well, Sir, as my Honourable friend has pointed out, these Resolutions were adopted with the concurrence of the Government of India, and I may say that the proposals were duly laid before His Majesty’s Government. But they have not been accepted.”

The proposals have been duly laid before His Majesty’s Government, but they have not been accepted. That was in July 1923. What does Mr. Burdon say now? What is His Majesty’s Government’s verdict on this question? We heard nothing. When that Resolution was passed, Mr. Burdon said that it was a mishap. The amendment that was moved was probably a mishap. Now, Sir, I have got the record here. I would particularly draw the attention of the House to the difference between the original Resolution and the amendment which was adopted. I am only reading the portion referring to this particular subject, because there are other things in the Resolution:

“(b) the desirability of establishing in India a military college, such as Sandhurst should be kept in view.”

So, the Mover of the Resolution was very cautious and I think it would satisfy even the ambition of Colonel Crawford. But some rash Member of the Assembly, not following the wisdom of Colonel Crawford, with which I shall deal very soon, suggested an amendment. The amendment was as follows:

“That as soon as funds be available steps should be taken to establish in India a military college such as Sandhurst and the desirability of establishing in India training and educational institutions for other branches of the army should be steadily kept in view.”

The amendment was accepted by the House. And it was after the amendment was accepted and it then became the Resolution, that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief with full knowledge of that fact, got up and addressed the House and he gave his reasons, with which I do not agree. What he said was:

“For these reasons we accept the Resolution.”

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: Not the Resolution as amended.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Certainly, Sir.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: Certainly not.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Well, Sir, then I should advise the Commander-in-Chief to have some legal advice before he gets up. The Commander-in-Chief forgets that the moment the amendment was carried by the House, that was the Resolution. The other went. I dare say that perhaps with the soldierlike attitude of His Excellency—frank, I quite agree—he honestly believed that he was really accepting what was rejected by the House.

But, Sir, now let us really get to this question, the question of establishing an Indian Sandhurst in this country. That is a question which is full of implications of very serious and far-reaching consequences. The first question that arises is this; that, if we are going to establish an Indian Sandhurst, it must by implication be understood that we must have a definite scheme, a scheme for the purpose of reorganising the army, its constitution, its future composition, a scheme which will be a practical workable scheme, which will Indianise the army in the course of a reasonable period. It is no use merely having an Indian Sandhurst idea, because as I say, what is the Indian Sandhurst going to do? (*His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief:* "The foundation of it".) Yes, the foundation of it. Yes, but if you are going merely to train up 10 Indians a year, I am afraid the Indian Sandhurst will be wasted. If it is only going to be established for the purpose of training up 10 Indians a year and out of that 10 a few might be qualified to get King's commissions what is the good of it? And that was Mr. Burdon's argument. This is what Mr. Burdon said: What is the good of having an Indian Sandhurst? I do not want to read the whole of that portion, he will correct me if I am wrong. I am giving the substance of it. He said: What is the good of an Indian Sandhurst if you only want ten men to be trained up? Therefore, Sir, the questions which arise to my mind are these. I do not care who is to be blamed. I do not care who is standing in our way. I do not care whether it is a Secretary or whether it is the War Office or anybody else. I am concerned with the Government. It is no use saying that the Government of India are doing their very best but that the War Office are putting obstacles in their way. It is no use telling me that His Majesty's Government are against it. It is no use telling me that His Majesty's Government are not agreeable. That is no solace, that is no consolation, that is not meeting the point. Do you honestly, I put this question in all seriousness and in all earnestness, do you honestly wish India to take up the defence of her country within a reasonable time? The answer is "Yes." Mr. Burdon says, "We are not inconsistent; we are not negligent." Sir, let me tell you frankly you are something much worse than that. If it was merely negligence, I could forgive you. If it was merely inconsistency I could overlook and forgive you. But let me tell you, and I tell you quite frankly and fearlessly, that the charge against you is that you are not honestly convinced that you should help India to take up the defence of her country. I tell you that it is not merely I who say so, but even sober men who have grown grey, men who have been loyal to the Government of India, men like Sir Krishna Gupta, who have served you, say so too. I would ask the Commander-in-Chief to read his statement in the *Indian Review* of January, 1925. What does he say? He doubts your *bona fides* India doubts your *bona fides*.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: They are wrong.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I say they have every justification. You have delayed beyond every reasonable time-limit.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: No.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Yes, you have. I may tell you you have. You have not made a real, earnest, honest endeavour to enable the people of India to have a proper training in military matters.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: I think we have.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: You come here with one excuse or another, and you tell us that there is this difficulty and that, that there is this to be done and that to be done. Colonel Crawford, I think, represents the true mind of the large body of Englishmen. Has there ever been a proposal which we have suggested which was not rash, except perhaps the deputation in which Colonel Crawford joined? That was not rash, I suppose. When have you Englishmen ever agreed with us and said that any proposal that we make is not rash? You say, "It is rash, be cautious". We have been 150 years under this Government. You have deprived the people of India of arms. What have you done?

(At this stage Mr. President vacated the Chair which was taken by Mr. Deputy President.)

Colonel Crawford says to-day that you have got us against 12 British officers 17 Indian officers. You have got the answer. Here is a testimony of the Honourable Member Captain Ajab Khan. What does he say to you on the floor of this House? Is he an officer or not? He is an officer only in name.

Colonel Crawford: May I explain to the Honourable Member, Sir, that in the British Service, the duties of platoon command are carried out by British officers. I pointed out that is similarly the case in the Indian Army, the higher posts being retained by the British officers and the object was the elimination of the British officers from these higher posts.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: I say this statement does not meet the point at all. The point that we are concerned with—and Colonel Crawford who has certainly more experience of the army than I do ought to know it perfectly well—is this. As it was pointed out to the Commander-in-Chief during the last budget debate, what we want,—and I am sure His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief understands it perfectly well and I am surprised that Colonel Crawford does not appreciate it, though being himself a Colonel he ought to know more than I do—is this. We have got this problem that to-day the officers in the army, both British and Indian, are Englishmen. Only two or three years ago we were given the concession, as somebody would call it, of holding King's Commissions, and you started it by sending 10 boys to Sandhurst. That was the first time in the history of British India that you granted the King's Commission to a few. To-day the entire army, both Indian and British, is officered by Englishmen. We desire that that should be Indianised. That is the issue. Does not Colonel Crawford understand that? What is the good of drawing a red herring across our path and talking about matters which are not relevant? That is the whole question. Although you may be able to satisfy us that perhaps there is a better method or that there is a difficulty in the way of establishing a Sandhurst in India at present, it

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

may be debatable, it may be arguable, but can we possibly discuss that question or that problem on the floor of this House, can we discuss the scheme on the floor of the House? Is it possible? We can only argue. If the Government wish to get rid of that charge, namely, that they are not quite in earnest, if the Government wish to remove that impression—and I say it is there throughout India, the soberest of men think like that—if you want to remove that impression that you are wanting in *bona fides*, I appeal to you to appoint a committee with comprehensive terms of reference to tackle this question. And you may appeal to the War Office if you like or to His Majesty's Government—I know your proposals will be turned down, but I do not want to mince matters and I want to put the issue clearly that if you wish to satisfy public opinion in India on this question—and it is the most vital question, the most fundamental one, it is the foundation of future responsible government—if you wish really to satisfy public opinion here we are willing to work with you, to associate ourselves with you—for Heaven's sake at once have a proper body constituted that will inquire into this question fully and thoroughly and let us have an honest and straight-forward scheme which will assure the people of India that you honestly desire that Indians should take up the defence of their own country within a reasonable time. Whatever that scheme may be,—whether it may require 20 years, or 10 years, or 100 years I am not concerned with that at present, somebody may say 5 years, somebody may say to-morrow, somebody may say 100 years, I am not concerned with that at this moment—I want my military Commander-in-Chief, my military experts, my politicians and my members of the Civil Service and even Colonel Crawford and Sir Campbell Rhodes who might think otherwise and think that we might be rash, so as to ensure that we should not be rash I should like to have them there. Let them sit together as real well-wishers of India and the Empire and frame a scheme and let that scheme be adopted. I am sure, Sir, that will satisfy India and you will then be able to repudiate the charge and I shall then stand up here again, if I am here, and say as emphatically and as fearlessly that you are acquitted of that charge of want of *bona fides*.

The Assembly then adjourned for Lunch till Half Past Two of the Clock.

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

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: (Madras City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I shall be very brief in speaking on this motion. Necessity knows no law. Necessity knows no difficulty, and necessity is also the mother of invention. I am fully alive to the difficulties pointed out by the Honourable Mr. Burdon in the way of establishing a military college like Sandhurst in our country. Sir, we have waited too long in these matters. It is often pointed out that if we want responsible government we cannot have it till we are able to defend ourselves, and if we want facilities for enabling us to defend ourselves we are told that the path is beset with difficulties. So that they are arguing in a vicious circle. There is much truth in the complaint made by the Honourable Mr. Jinnah, at any rate there is the real foundation for the belief in our minds that the Government are not in earnest. I will not say that they are not *bona fide*, but I am sure they are not in earnest in these matters. In 1921 the

atmosphere was quite different. In 1921 when His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief came to this House and said, "I am your humble servant; I am going to carry out your orders and not those of the War Office in England," we were all elated. We were lifted off our feet and we thought really that we had become masters of the situation here. But, Sir, they are mere words. We were in a mood then to co-operate with each other. There was necessity for co-operation both on the part of the Government and on the part of the peoples' representatives here. Unfortunately 1921 has passed and 1925 has come. The Government were reasonable then. We had Mr. Montagu at the head of affairs then. The Government are unreasonable now, that is the real truth of it, the Government at home. And we wish to take full advantage of His Excellency, Lord Rawlinson's sympathies. We do not want to miss the chance; now that His Excellency Lord Rawlinson is here, we want to push on with the scheme, and I am sure that, if it were left to His Excellency, he would be the first to suggest all the remedies for the difficulties which have been pointed out by his lieutenant, the Honourable Mr. Burdon. I am sure Lord Rawlinson will solve those difficulties in no time if he had the mind and if he is permitted. But the question is, if he is permitted? Now, Sir, the people demand that he should be permitted to do that, and we cannot wait, we cannot afford to wait any longer. This is one of those matters in which we should begin at once, whatever the cost. Sir, if for instance you went to the country with a proposal for a direct levy of taxation for this purpose, for the purpose of establishing a military college, assuming our finances do not permit it, I am sure, Sir, the people will return with one voice and say "by all means put on this impost." There will be no uncertain voice in this matter; I can speak with all the authority, with all the knowledge I possess; and speaking in the presence of my countrymen I can assure the House that if really a special tax is put on for this purpose, they would cheerfully meet it. Sir, it is a necessity, as I have said, it is a prime necessity for this country to get on. We cannot afford to wait any longer; and as I said, therefore, this is a matter which must be taken as a thing beyond question. That is, the desirability of establishing a military college must be taken as a proposition about which there can be no dispute. So assuming that as the basis, the next question is, what are we to do in that direction? I quite recognize that there are various questions, complicated questions, to be gone into before you can establish a military college. It cannot be done in a day, and it cannot be done by one mind. You want expert assistance, you want the assistance of politically-minded people, you want the assistance of other people, financial experts also, so that, Sir, this comprehensive scheme is needed for the purpose and that can be evolved only by a competent Committee, and I therefore, Sir, move the amendment which stands in my name, which runs as follows:

"That for the words in the original Resolution 'and the necessary amount be sanctioned to start the preliminary work' the following be substituted:

'and that for that purpose a Committee including non-official Indians be immediately appointed for investigating and reporting upon a comprehensive scheme including the financial commitments involved therein.'

As amended, Sir, the Resolution will run as follows:

"This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that early steps be taken for starting a well equipped Military College in a suitable locality to train Indians for the commissioned ranks in the Indian Army Service and that for that purpose a Committee including non-official Indians be immediately appointed for investigating and reporting upon a comprehensive scheme including the financial commitments involved therein."

[Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar.]

So that the purpose for which the Committee is appointed is confined solely to the purpose of establishing a military college, and for that purpose only the Committee is needed in order to advise upon a proper scheme.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: As to the nature of the building? What sort of a building? What will the Committee do?

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: The Committee will examine what expert service is required and all the various other matters in order to establish a military college, what course of instruction will be needed here, how it is to be staffed, whether the whole instruction should be here or should embrace a further course in Sandhurst and various other matters—I mean it is really impossible to specify all the details which the Committee can go into—and probably also where it is to be located, which will be the central position, and various other matters. The principle is accepted in the Resolution that a military college should be established. What the preliminary training ought to be, what the course of training ought to be, all these are matters of detail—of sufficiently important detail—which will have to be investigated by a Committee. I therefore, Sir, move this amendment. I have mentioned there “including non-official Indians.” I have not specified there that they should be non-official Indian Members of the Legislature. I am sure the Government will take care to include non-official Indian Members of the Indian Legislature when they appoint a committee, although I have not specified it. I did not want to confine the scope of the selection only to Members of the Legislature. There may be other competent non-officials outside the Legislature. I wanted Government to have the opportunity to appoint such competent men. That is why I have made it so wide. I therefore think that the time has come for the Government to take earnest steps in this matter. It will not do for them to say: “We were not quite sure what we were doing in 1921.” Whatever they may have been doing in 1921, whether really they meant all that they said, it does not matter to us. But what does matter to us is what steps you are going to take in order to establish the college.

Pandit Motilal Nehru (Cities of the United Provinces: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, the Resolution before the House is one on which there can be no two opinions so far as the Indian public is concerned. The whole of India—and I am speaking of Indian India—is solidly in favour of the proposition. The fact is there and no amount of reasoning can shut our eyes to it. I have heard to-day a very strong case attempted to be made out by my friend the Honourable Mr. Burdon. I have heard also the very warm appeal made by my friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. I have listened to the cold reasoning of my friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and I have also heard the very powerful indictment of the Government of India by my friend Mr. Jinnah (Hear, hear.) If, Sir, everyone of us, the Indian element in this House, were to be given a chance to say a few words, I have not the least doubt in my mind that they will all echo the same feeling. Now, as for the speech of Colonel Crawford, I was wondering what was the case that my gallant friend was trying to make out. He was probably fighting a shadow. He has no doubt fought many substantial enemies in the past, but to-day I am bound to say that it was nothing but a shadow that he was fighting. He was forgetting that we are not asking that the Indian Army should be officered by Indians all at once.

He was complaining that what Indians want is training and training of a special character which befits the British officer to lead an army. What is it that we are asking for? We are asking just for a training ground, just for an opportunity to bring up our young men in the same manner as English officers are brought up. And how are we to get it? Sir, only the other day as to one proposition which was before the House, namely, the establishment of a Supreme Court, I committed myself to the opinion that the time for that will be when we have responsible government. But there are questions and questions. This is a matter in which we cannot wait for a single moment. We are unfit to defend our country and therefore there is no responsible government. Why are we unfit to defend our country? Because there is no responsible government. It is a vicious circle. Unless the two things go on together and unless we begin to qualify ourselves to defend our country at the earliest possible opportunity, the argument will hold good for ages to come. Not that it is disputed by anybody that the time has not come for us to prepare to defend our country. It is only the method, it is only the procedure, it is only the manner in which all the difference lies. Now, whatever may be said by the Government or their apologists, the fact cannot be burked that it is the Government and the Government alone which is to blame for the present state of things. Why are we not ready? Because you came in our way. You did not permit us to be ready. You disarmed us and then you did not afford sufficient opportunity for the young men of the country to train themselves for the army. Now that it is past high time it is said that there are difficulties in the way. But who has created those difficulties? I have not the least hesitation in saying that they are all of your own making. If you had only begun in time, to-day it would have been possible, after 150 years, to man all the officers of the Indian army by Indians. (*A Voice*: "Then where would the British Empire go!") That is just the difficulty. But surely there are friends like my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, who say that we will be proud to continue the present connection with England for all time to come. I am not of that opinion. Not that I am against keeping up the connection between England and India, but that it should be on very different terms to what obtains at present. There has been a suggestion made by my friend Mr. Jinnah and a formal amendment moved by my friend Mr. Rangachariar.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: May I rise to a point of explanation, Sir. My suggestion is totally different from . . .

Pandit Motilal Nehru: That is what I was going to explain. My friend Mr. Jinnah need not anticipate me. I was just going to say the very thing he stood up to explain. There is a vast difference between the suggestion of Mr. Jinnah and the formal amendment which has been proposed by my friend Mr. Rangachariar and I may at once say that I thoroughly agree with Mr. Jinnah. Resolutions, Sir, are moved in this House. They are either carried or defeated. Even if carried, they occupy no higher place than those which have been defeated because the Government do not usually act upon them. But in this case a formal Resolution has actually been accepted by the Government and yet we find that no definite steps have been taken up to this day. On the contrary, what has happened is that the acceptance of that Resolution has been conveniently forgotten as has been shown by Mr. Jinnah. But what I would submit to the House is this, that the mere carrying of this Resolution will not help to carry us

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

far. As far as I have been able to understand my friend Mr. Burdon, I feel that he at least has an honest and sincere desire to see that definite steps are taken in order to make it a practical proposition and not merely a Resolution which would be passed by this House and then forgotten. I think, if I have been able to understand my friend Mr. Jinnah correctly, his view was not merely that this Resolution should be adopted by this House and accepted by the Government of India, but that the Government should at once proceed to act upon it by taking steps to formulate a scheme with the assistance of some Members of this House, and of expert advice, and I would add, by a visit to the various training colleges, Sandhurst and others if necessary. If the Government will accede to that suggestion and thus put a practical shape to the proposition, I think it would be far better than merely carrying this proposition by a majority of our votes. I do hope, Sir, that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will see his way to accept the principle of the Resolution, and to go further and appoint, or at least allow this House to appoint, a committee which, in collaboration with experts, would draw up a scheme of what is possible in the present circumstances in order to make a beginning. For the rest, I submit, Sir, that the argument on the Government side comes to this: because you get far better training in Sandhurst, therefore it is not advisable to have it here on the ground of expense and other things. If that argument were to hold good and be carried to its logical end the result would be that we would have to shut up all our colleges and universities because undoubtedly the training now given in the English colleges and universities is far superior to what we get here. But it would be absurd to suggest such a thing. We want to make a beginning in our country under the circumstances in which we live. My friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer said that we can have everything here except the atmosphere. I say we can also have the proper atmosphere for a military career. The example of Japan was given. What has Japan done? My friend Sir Hari Singh Gour put a very pertinent question to Colonel Crawford when he was talking of the indispensability of an English training. He asked "What about Japan?" but the gallant Colonel did not give a reply. Of course they did not all receive their training at Sandhurst, nor did they qualify themselves anywhere else in England. There are many nations in the world whose armies are officered by their own nationals and not by Englishmen, or men who have been trained in Sandhurst. The only difference is that in other countries they have their own Government; they evolve their own schemes; they import persons with expert knowledge and do all that is needed. We are helpless and therefore we cannot get on unless this Resolution meets with the acceptance of the Government of India and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief takes the interest for which my friend Mr. Rangachariar has appealed to him. I therefore would suggest, Sir, that the Government will be pleased and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will be good enough to see eye to eye with this House, and the whole country, and give due weight to public opinion on this very essential and vital question. That can only be done by facilitating the training of Indians for a military career in their own country. It may be that under exceptional circumstances and for certain high posts a special training in England may be considered necessary. To that I do not think there can be any objection, but a beginning must be made in the country itself. We must have our young men to look up to an institution where they can look forward to a brilliant military career.

I need not take up the time of the House as to the argument of my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford about martial races not being educated enough and non-martial races being better educated. Sir, the distinction between martial and non-martial races is fast disappearing and as soon as there is an opening in this country for a military career you will find that even the non-martial races will flock to the college in such numbers that you will be surprised. They will be found in every way to be fit for a military career. (*Colonel J. D. Crawford*: "But will they stay?") What reason have you for saying they will not stay. Who are after all the martial races? It is surely not the caste system by which we are to be guided. It is not that a Brahmin is only a priest. You have got your 1st Brahmins. You have got the Baswara Brahmins. (*Mr. K. C. Neogy*: "Even the Bengali Regiment".) Yes, even the Bengali regiment. All the talk about martial and non-martial races is ancient history that will not hold water now.

Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-Official): What Colonel Crawford said was what prevents those classes from going to Sandhurst.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: He did not say that. What I understood Colonel Crawford to mean was that general education was lacking in the martial classes and officers must have a ground-work of general education before they can be given expert and technical education in military affairs. But I say that is not the case. I say that among those who have a grounding of general education you will find martial people and martial races; and that there does not exist any sharp line of cleavage between non-martial and martial races in India.

We may spend the whole of to-day and to-morrow also if we like on this Resolution. There will be any amount of good argument forthcoming from the side of the Indian section of this House and there will be any amount of excuses on the other side. The question has been discussed threadbare in the country. As I have said, you cannot convince us that there are such difficulties in your way that you cannot overcome them. We claim that we have succeeded in convincing you that those difficulties are nothing compared to the advantages which are bound to accrue not only to India but to England as well. For these reasons, Sir, I support this Resolution and I again appeal to His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief to accept it in principle, and not only to accept it in principle but accompany his acceptance by something definite and something substantial in the way of actually framing a scheme which would lead to the establishment of a military college in India in the near future.

Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon (United Provinces: European): Sir, I propose to address myself to a point on which the learned Pandit who last spoke complained that no answer had been given to the contention put forward by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. It was said that if Japan could build up an army such as she did build up in 20 years, and if the Colonies could have their own military colleges, why should not India do the same? Sir, this argument, in my humble opinion, overlooks facts in a way that is very common when analogies are drawn. Japan is, and has been, for centuries a homogeneous nation—one in language, one in religion and one in atmosphere. Colonies offer no analogy whatsoever. They are the Local Governments of the settlers of one race and their descendants.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: What about Canada, France and England?

Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon: Where in Japan or the Colonies is there that congeries of races, castes, creeds and languages which we find in India? It is no good blinking these facts. One has got to face them. That is the only way we can meet the difficulties which arise out of them. In Japan you have a trust between man and man, a patriotic adhesion for national progress which must succeed wherever it is backed up by the necessary courage and character. Now, Sir, in India all the necessary courage and, in many cases, the character are present. But where is that trust between man and man without which there can be no Commonwealth?

Mr. A. Rangaswamy Iyengar: What about the sepoys?

Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon: Forces of disruption and disintegration abound. The country labours under the disease of communal suspicion. All honour to the educated leaders who are now trying, and have been trying for years, to overcome this evil. But until their teaching works down to the millions who constitute the population of India, until a general spirit of working for the common rather than for the communal weal is established, India cannot hope to emulate the achievements of Japan. It cannot hope to have established an Indian national army any more than it can hope for Swaraj. (*A Voice:* "Bravo"; and ironical cheers from the Swarajist benches). What Japan did in 20 years, India, if left to herself as she is now, would not achieve in 200 years. (Ironical cheers from the Swarajist benches.) (*A Voice:* "Thanks to the present condition of India".) But it is just here that the Englishman in India can find his place and help to discharge the trust which he has laid on himself, provided he gets some measure of trust and of genuine co-operation from his Indian fellow-subjects. With British and Indian co-operation, even in the present conditions, there is no reason whatever why, in a reasonably brief space of time, the high, noble and commendable aspirations of my esteemed friend, Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, should not be achieved. (*Voices:* "Do you fix the time?") My friends, Sir, make a mistake, I think,—I say it with all respect to them,—they make a mistake in scoffing at the smallness of the beginning that has been made at Dehra Dun. The largest oak that ever grew started as an acorn. I have personally, in common with other Members, though I went alone, visited the Dehra Dun College, and, owing to the kindness and courtesy of Colonel Houghton, I saw every part of it, including some of the cadets; and I realised that in that College Indian lads were being trained in character and discipline and ideals in a manner which, before that visit, I did not consider possible. The College deserves the admiration and support of every true Indian, and I hope that Government will so far sympathise with the proposal now made as to consider the early enlargement of that institution. May it be remembered one day as the cradle of a united Indian people of high ideals, character and discipline—of a people able to govern themselves and to defend themselves against foreign aggression. I am bound to confess that such accusations as Mr. Jinnah was pleased to hurl against Englishmen in general and the Government in particular do not invite or encourage a sympathetic attitude towards the cause he advocates. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah:* "I don't want sympathy; I want justice.") But we must think only of the cause, and do what we can to save it from its friends. Mr. Jinnah laid a charge

of dishonesty, of want of *bona fides* against Englishmen generally. Let him first be honest to himself. His whole argument rested on a false foundation—"We demand this", "the country, the people want that", and so on. If Mr. Jinnah was able to speak on behalf of a united people, if there existed such a nation as he imagined for the sake of his argument, his contentions would be unanswerable. But he knows, as we know, that he has built up a superstructure which has no foundation. Let us take a practical view of the proposal before the House. Let us assume that an Indian Sandhurst had been started, beginning with an English staff as suggested by Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. I wonder how long it would be before a majority in this House would insist on a complete indianisation of that staff. Then, let us go on until we find ourselves with Indian units commanded by Indian officers. Can my friends honestly and seriously think that communal differences and caste jealousies would then disappear? How long would it be before battalions which were started shoulder to shoulder found themselves face to face in opposite camps? Sir, I am no pessimist. I know of what Indians are capable, even without European leading. I remember with pride—and who can ever forget?—what a small handful of Sikhs did at Wana a few years ago. (*A Voice*: "Guru-kabagh.") But the people of India are handicapped by that constant struggle of class against class, that habit of distrust between man and man with which the country is honeycombed. It is our duty, despite distrust misrepresentation and calumny, to try and promote that unity for which Mahatma Gandhi has prayed and fasted and which we all desire. One step is the training up of character in the youth of the country,—to teach that youth habits of mutual trust and manliness, of belief in motives and purposes which will rise above racial and communal jealousies and suspicions: so that, we may have a building up of a national army side by side, as it were with the nation which it is to serve. I think the amendment of my friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar has much to recommend it. but he narrows down the composition of the committee to non-experts and he unduly limits the scope of the committee's functions.

Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar: How do I do so?

Colonel Sir Henry Stanyon: I think the matter is one for a competent Committee with power to examine the whole subject in its administrative as well as its purely financial aspect, and I recommend that suggestion to the Government.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: Sir, I have listened during this debate to some extremely interesting and in some respects illuminating speeches. The subject of the Resolution has been spread by Honourable Members who have spoken over a very wide field. Many speakers have entered into the intricacies and the details and the general question of the Indianization of the Army as a whole. I do not think that that is really part and parcel of the Resolution as put forward by the proposer and as included in the amendment which has been proposed by Mr. Rangachariar. I do not, therefore, think it necessary for me to deal with that larger and wider question, for there will be other opportunities of dealing with it later on, and I propose to confine myself more to the specific Resolution which has been placed before the House. I have noticed in several speeches, however, a reference both to the system which now prevails in the Dominions and to what has been accomplished by Japan in respect of her military re-organisation. At one time it was my business to study

[H. E. the Commander-in-Chief.]

that organisation in Japan and to see how it had been brought about. The speaker who has just sat down has already, I think, given the House a complete answer to any comparison which is possible, or rather I would say impossible, between this country and Japan . . .

Pandit Shamial Nehru: I hope Your Excellency does not agree with Sir Henry Stanyon on other points.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: . . . and more than that I do not propose to say. I do rather resent the attitude, I might almost say the accusation, that has been made against the Government and to some extent against me personally by Mr. Jinnah.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Sir, may I explain that it was no personal accusation at all? But I do maintain my charge against those who are responsible for the government of this country.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: He insinuated . . .

Mr. M. A. Jinnah: Not personally.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: He insinuated that the Government, since those Resolutions in 1921 and 1923 that have been referred to, have done nothing in this direction. That is wrong and I think I ought to tell the House that this question of an Indian Sandhurst, which of course is very intimately connected as the basis of any plan of Indianization, has been receiving our very closest attention since those Resolutions were passed. If I may take the actual wording of the Resolution, it says:

" . . . early steps be taken for starting a well equipped Military College in a suitable locality to train Indians for the commissioned ranks in the Indian Army Service and the necessary amount be sanctioned to start the preliminary work."

I might almost say that that has been done. Perhaps the House has not heard of an institution, which is in embryo I admit, called the Kitchener College of which the Prince of Wales laid the foundation stone when he came out here and concerning which all the necessary preliminaries have been undertaken and settled with very great care by myself and my assistants—a College the strength of which, the organisation of which, the site of which, and the cost of which have already been agreed to, and which, so far as this Resolution is concerned, fulfils what the proposer claims. Now, this College as a memorial to my distinguished predecessor will cater for the sons of soldiers, officers, non-commissioned officers and men as a fitting memorial to that great Field-Marshal. It will train them for a period of years and it will enable them to obtain commissions in the Indian army but they will not be King's commissions. They will serve in the ranks for a period and rise to commissions which will be either Viceroy's commissions or Dominion commissions as the case may be, and that College, so far as the terms of this Resolution are concerned, will fulfil what the proposer wants. But I know that at the back of his mind this is not what he wishes or what the House intends and therefore I do not pretend that the Kitchener college fulfils the requirements which are at the back of the minds of Honourable Members. They want a college which is going to produce Indians with King's Commissions in this country to officer the Indian army. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah:* "That is what the Resolution says.")

There is nothing about the King's Commission. You read it again. (Mr. M. A. Jinnah: "Commissioned ranks in the Indian Army".) I think one speaker in referring to the King's Commission was a little doubtful as to whether it was really sufficiently important that these officers should be given King's Commissions. Personally, I look upon it as of the highest importance, and one of the main reasons, if not the main reason, why I am reluctant to see an Indian Sandhurst established too soon for I want to pass as many young Indians as possible through the Sandhurst in England, and get them King's Commissions in the Army, so as to form an adequate nucleus of the future Indianised army. If you institute a Sandhurst in this country too soon you will not have a sufficient number of officers who passed through the home Sandhurst to form a satisfactory basis on which to build your Indianised army and it is for that reason that I counsel delay. An amendment has been proposed to this Resolution. That amendment I can almost—I will not say quite—accept. On the paper there is another amendment. Unfortunately, the proposer of that amendment has not put it forward. To me it is preferable to the amendment that has been put forward and I do not know whether I should be in order if I were to take the amendment that has been put forward in the name of Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar and propose it myself. At any rate that amendment is more acceptable to me than the amendment that has been put forward and, if Sir Sivaswamy likes to introduce it, I shall be prepared to accept it. There is one point with reference to the Resolution to which I ought to refer. That is that early steps be taken for starting a well-equipped college. Early steps is a somewhat indefinite term especially when you come to consider the complications and the difficulties of this really serious and important problem. I am quite prepared to accept a committee on the lines that have been proposed or that might have been proposed by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar. Let them set to work at once to examine this problem and to advise us. The Government will submit to them all the evidence that it is possible to get on this subject and a committee somewhat on the lines of a committee that recently sat in connection with the Auxiliary and Territorial Forces (the report of which will shortly be in the hands of Honourable Members) is what I have in mind and is what I am prepared to accept. I feel every sympathy with the views that have been expressed with regard to the creation of this college and I want to help you and I want you to help me to solve this intricate, difficult and important problem.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao (Godavari *cum* Kistna: 'Non-Muhammadan Rural): His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has expressed his general sympathy with the Resolution of my Honourable friend Mr. Venkatapatiraju. I have one or two difficulties in understanding the exact position and I wish to place certain considerations before this House so that the issues may be clarified. His Excellency has expressed his preference to the amendment which stood in the name of my Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyar. The difficulty about that amendment is that if that is adopted, we shall be going back on the position that has been established on the two previous occasions on which this subject came up for consideration in the House. I may perhaps invite His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's attention to the proceedings of this House on the 4th July 1928. The amendment that was proposed on that occasion (and that was accepted by the Government) was that the first favourable opportunity should be taken of

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

representing once more to His Majesty's Government the necessity and the desirability of giving effect as soon as circumstances render it practicable and advisable to do so to the Resolutions 7, 8, 9 and 12 of the Legislative Assembly passed on the 28th March 1921. Honourable Members will see that, so far as this House was concerned, the Resolution that was adopted in July 1923 asserted that representations should be made once more to His Majesty's Government that an Indian Sandhurst should be established. That being so, we are not prepared to deviate from the position that has been taken up on the two previous occasions and that is the difficulty which is felt in regard to my Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy's amendment which would leave this question open again for consideration.

Well, Sir, that is the first point that I should like to bring to His Excellency's notice. In regard to the general question the Commander-in-Chief has really evaded the question of the Indianization of the army as a whole. Sir, this has a great bearing on this question of the establishment of a military college in this country on the lines of Sandhurst. Honourable Members will see that Mr. Burdon's position was that at present only 10 commissions are open to Indians in this country and provision has been made in the College at Sandhurst for the training of this number, and if a Sandhurst is established in this country the number of commissions that are now available are so small the opportunities for training would be so few that the cost of the whole show would be much greater than it would be if the number was larger. That is the position to which I should like attention to be drawn so that the Commander-in-Chief may be in a position to see the bearing, the relevancy of the wider question being brought under consideration. I would like to ask Mr. Burdon and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief if an Indian Sandhurst is to be established in this country what would be the number of men available for training. Unless you decide that larger question of policy and increase the number of cadets the objection that Mr. Burdon has taken will remain. Therefore, Sir, the mere acceptance either of this amendment or of the Resolution as originally proposed would not solve this question, and if only 10 commissions are made available Mr. Burdon's objection will not have been taken away.

Sir, the second point with reference to this question is that it is assumed that provision for satisfactory training of a larger number of Indian cadets would be available in the United Kingdom. Sir, I had something to do with a committee which went round all the Universities in 1922. On that occasion we brought under review the conditions under which Indian students are receiving education at present at the various Universities, and one of the questions that was specifically referred to us was as to what provision could be made in the United Kingdom for the training of Indians in the nautical colleges in that country. We had to go into this question and we found that it was impossible to secure suitable training in the nautical training colleges in the United Kingdom on various grounds. For one thing it was said that the colleges are not open to anybody except subjects of His Majesty born in the United Kingdom. Similarly, the question of facilities for University education was also a subject for our consideration. In regard to University students, the general position was that the Universities in Great Britain expressed the

opinion, and it was so stated by Sir Theodore Morrison, that they could only absorb a certain number of foreign students. I should like to quote his words:

"I beg the committee to realize that no University can absorb more than a limited and rather a small number of foreign students. A University is a corporate body with traditions of a certain characteristic tone. It has a personality of its own and this personality would be destroyed or distorted by the influx of a large number of strangers, and no University will tolerate this transformation."

May I ask His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief whether Sandhurst will tolerate any more Indians than ten? What assurance have His Majesty's Government given him on this score? Is there any assurance that the training institutions in the United Kingdom, Woolwich for instance, would receive any student at all and that Sandhurst would receive more than ten students per annum? On that point, Sir, we have had no assurance whatever; and from this point of view it seems to me, Sir, that the decision which has been reached by the Lytton Committee, namely, that the training and educational facilities should be developed in this country solely from the point of the needs of this country is the soundest view that could have been come to in regard to this matter.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: I might perhaps have had at once, Sir, to save time. When you speak of "assurance" I have nothing in black and white; but I have discussed the question with all authorities both at Sandhurst and with the General Staff at the War Office, and both are prepared to accept more Indians.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: How many, Sir?

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: I did not discuss any actual numbers, but considerably more than go at present.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: When we come to discuss the matter in detail, I feel that difficulties would be urged that more Indians cannot be taken.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: I do not agree to that. I do not think you will find that difficulty. I have discussed the matter with the authorities. They are not at all antagonistic in the way the University authorities are.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: Is the opinion in the University circles in this matter different from the military circles.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: That is quite right; it is quite a different circle. And we know that at present they are favourably disposed towards it. We had better wait and see.

The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra: The circumstances are different.

Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao: Whatever that may be, I think, Sir, that this question of the education of those who wish to have

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

a military career must be considered from the point of view of the requirements of this country, and unless some such steps are taken as is proposed in this Resolution, I do not think, Sir, we shall really be advancing the position any further. Sir, in regard to the scheme of self-government for this country, at the last debate in March last Sir Malcolm Hailey made a great deal of the fact that we are not as yet prepared to take the defence of this country on our shoulders, but when we come forward with proposals for giving us opportunities for the establishment of institutions for training, all kinds of difficulties are pointed out. Therefore, Sir, I think there is a good deal to be said for the consideration of the wider problem which has been raised by my friend, Mr. Jinnah, and which received the support of my Honourable friend, Sir Henry Stanyon. As soon as you make up your mind once for all to see that this question is placed on a sound footing, as my Honourable friend explained—it may be 10 years, or 12 years, or 15 years, or 25 years or 30 years—you will be in a position to see how the necessary requirements for the education of those who wish to have a military career can be placed on a satisfactory footing. Unless some such thing is done, the mere acceptance of this Resolution will not take the case much further than it is now. I do not ever wish to minimise the difficulties of the situation.

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member): Sir, with your permission, I beg to move the following amendment:

That the following be substituted for the original Resolution :

'This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee including Indian Members of the Legislature be immediately appointed to investigate and report :

- (a) whether it is not practicable to establish a military college in India to train Indian officers for the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army;
- (b) if so, how soon should the scheme be initiated and what steps should be taken to carry it out; and
- (c) whether if a military college is established in India it should supersede or be supplemented by Sandhurst and Woolwich so far as the training of Indian officers is concerned.'

An Honourable Member: Will you kindly read the first part again?

The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman: It is in fact an amendment which is already on the paper—Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer's. Sir, I must apologise for stealing my Honourable friend's thunder but as he will not move his amendment, I am moving it. I am very much struck by one note in this debate, Sir, and I think it is a note which I am sure will be very carefully borne in mind in future discussions of constitutional questions, and it is this, that one of the most important things for those who look forward to self-government and self-governing institutions in this country is the provision of an army for India itself. Mr. Jinnah brought that forward very strongly. It has however been suggested by him, and His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief has repudiated the suggestion, that the Government of India are not wholehearted in this matter, that they are playing with the House, that they have no desire to help, that they are really obstructing, and that they are not taking the matter seriously. Sir, it is a very grave charge. It amounts to this that we repeatedly say things which we do not mean. His Excellency has repudiated that, and his real earnestness

is well established by what has already been done. I should deprecate the House catching hold of straws, alleged pledges, when the substance is offered to them, and I suggest that the amendment that I have brought before the House makes a practical step forward. It gives you a Committee to investigate these matters, which you have very greatly at heart, which are fundamental, as I agree, and which must necessarily precede advance in the direction which you have so much at heart. On the technical side of the matter you will not expect me to express an opinion. That has been fully stated by the speakers who are properly advised of the circumstances which are germane to these military institutions. I am not saying whether an Indian Sandhurst is a good thing or not. I am not competent to express an opinion. You have professional advisers on that. But this Committee, I submit, should satisfy Mr. Jinnah and those who have spoken on that side. I do advise the House very earnestly to accept the proposal that I have made. Sir, I move the amendment.

Mr. A. Ranganwami Iyengar (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly: Non-Muhammadan Rural): May I know whether the words "commissioned ranks" again do not introduce, Sir, the difficulty which His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief mentioned, namely, His Majesty's commissions, or commissions in this country?

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: That is what they will consider.

Mr. O. S. Ranga Iyer (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions: Non-Muhammadan Rural): Sir, the amendment that the Honourable the Home Member has moved has, in my opinion, created a new situation. Sir, I am not speaking on behalf of my party, but I am speaking for myself when I say that it has certainly created a new situation, a situation different from the one which was developed by my esteemed friend, Sir Henry Stanyon. The position that he took up was the position which perhaps the *Statesman* of Calcutta took up in the year 1913. I thought, Sir, that the Government would not take up that attitude, and I am glad, Sir, that the position of the Honourable the Home Member is certainly different from the position of Sir Henry Stanyon, and I shall tell you presently how the position is different. Here you are prepared to explore fresh avenues. You are prepared to take practical steps to inquire into the conditions to establish a military college; but, Sir, according to Sir Henry Stanyon there is no kind of analogy between India and the colonies. Fur coats are very good for Canada, but I do not think fur coats are very bad for my constituency. I come, Sir, from Rohilkund, which is a very big constituency, and a much smaller and colder constituency, Kumaon. These two divisions, especially the Kumaon Division, had sent the best of soldiers to the war. I think they are as brave, as heroic, as capable of venturing and sacrificing as any race that may be called martial or as any powerful martial race in any part of the world. The Government know the record of the soldiers of Kumaon. There are also other martial races in India and they have also educated men who could fight. My friend, Colonel Crawford, did not appreciate that fact because he is ill-informed. He does not know that there are several educated men among the martial people in Kumaon. Kumaon is one of the most advanced Divisions in the United Provinces consisting of

[Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer.]

educated people, very brave people, and very hardy people. They live in the Himalayas braving the inclemency of the weather and they have also braved the difficulties of a very difficult war.

Sir Henry Stanyon was telling us: How can we face these facts, facts of communal differences, facts of caste differences, and so on and so forth. We faced them during the war and I shall make a present to Sir Henry Stanyon of the observations of the Montagu-Chelmsford report. What do they say as to how we faced those facts? They say that we faced them remarkably well. I shall quote the words. "The war was not yet over." (They were writing it in the middle of the war.) "It had reached a stage when India put forth all her strength in the struggle." Everybody has recognised that India gave her best in the circumstances which overwhelmed the feelings of Englishmen in England but has not perhaps opened the vision of my Honourable friend from Lucknow. It has been recognised by everybody that India put forth all her strength in the war. And the Report further says:

"The Government of India is anxiously devoting its attention to the best means of putting forth the maximum strength of the country with the co-operation of the Indian people."

I would ask Sir Henry to read the report.

Sir Henry Stanyon was talking of trust and co-operation. Sir, we gave you co-operation during the war. We gave you trust. We did not take advantage of your calamity. We did not say, "Your calamity is our opportunity." What did Mahatma Gandhi do? He, a believer in non-violence, was finding recruits for you. Such were the facts. Is it fair, therefore, on the part of a responsible Member coming to this House and saying, "You must give us trust; you must give us co-operation." We gave you co-operation for many years. You had our entire trust. For the last 150 years you had the entire co-operation of Indians. But how many Indian officers are there in the army to-day? Was it not Lord Hardinge who said: India was bled white, white of British and Indian soldiers during the war? Was it not the time for us to create a revolution if we wanted to create a revolution? Revolutionaries were there in India then, but what did the revolutionaries do? I know, Sir, that revolutionaries preferred to enroll themselves. They went to the war. They gave their best blood, for what, for saving democracy for the world. It was said that the war was fought to make the world safe for democracy. But we know from what Sir Henry Stanyon has said that the war was fought to consolidate English autocracy in India. If that is the position that you take, there can be no kind of union. But fortunately, Sir, the amendment develops a new situation.

Mr. President: If the Honourable Member will address himself to the new situation, it will not be necessary for me to save the debate from irrelevance.

Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer: With due respect to you, Sir, I thought, in view of the observations made by Sir Henry Stanyon, it was necessary to explain the difference between that impossible position and the position that the amendment creates. Confining myself at present to this amendment, I must say there is one fundamental difficulty in the

acceptance of this amendment, which would be very easily removed by the leaders of both sides putting their heads together. The amendment says that a committee should investigate and report :

" (a) whether it is not practicable (I emphasise this) to establish a military college in India to train Indian officers for the non-commissioned ranks of the Indian Army;

(b) if so, how soon should the scheme be initiated and what steps should be taken to carry it out; and

(c) whether if a military college is established in India it should supersede or be supplemented by Sandhurst and Woolwich so far as the training of Indian officers is concerned."

This amendment unfortunately wants only a mere investigation and a report on "whether it is practicable", etc. I want something more practical. Further it does not specify how long the investigation is to take, when the report will be published, and whom and what number the committee is to consist of. I do not see why it should not specify the steps that should be taken for the establishment of a military college. I know the amendment contemplates an inquiry whether Sandhurst should be supplemented or superseded. I think, Sir, that this matter must enlist the most careful consideration of this House, for the Government appear to be prepared to depart from a position from which they have been so unwilling to depart, and when they are breaking new ground, when they are trying to solve a difficult problem, it may not be possible for us to get an amendment to our entire satisfaction. Therefore I want the House carefully to consider the matter and try to come to an understanding if it is really possible.

Sardar Bahadur Captain Hira Singh (Punjab: Nominated Non-Official):

Sir I rise to support the amendment moved by the Honourable the Home Member. Sir, a very complete and a very full inquiry into the whole problem of higher military education is most necessary because it must be remembered that this is a matter of very great importance. We do not want to rush the Government, nor do we want to rush ourselves into hasty and ill-considered schemes, for upon the military scheme which is adopted now will depend the whole future of India. The military experts and we cannot afford to make any mistake. I therefore suggest, Sir, for the consideration of the Government and of this House that a large committee, the larger the better, should be appointed to examine the whole question of the higher military training for which this Resolution has been moved. I go further. The following may be added to the amendment:

"That this inquiry should not be confined to India only. The Committee should visit England, France and the continent and examine the system in force there."

I know nothing will beat Sandhurst because it carries the reputation of generations behind it, and nothing will beat the British cadets who also possess several hundred years' traditions behind them. But we may have by this means all the materials before us on which to make recommendations to the Government of India as to what is best suited to India's needs. Sir, I know that this sort of inquiry will cost a lot of money, but my Honourable friend Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya will no doubt collect and gather the money to meet those expenses.

Pandit Shamlal Nehru: May I inquire, Sir, if the Honourable Member is not satisfied with his present lot?

Sardar Bahadur Captain Hira Singh: Yes, certainly. But this is a matter of great importance and I commend my suggestion to His Excellency and the House for their consideration. With these remarks, Sir, I support the amendment.

Mr. V. J. Patel (Bombay City: Non-Muhammadan Urban): Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment moved by the Honourable the Home Member. As I understand that amendment it means that this Assembly is asked to go back on the position that it had taken up in the years 1921 and 1923. In 1921 this Assembly passed a Resolution recommending the establishment of a military college in India and that Resolution was accepted by Government. Government do not know how to get out of that position now and want the assistance of this Assembly. In 1923 when another Resolution asking Government to urge upon His Majesty's Government the necessity of giving effect to the former Resolution was moved, the Government themselves moved an amendment on somewhat similar lines. This is the amendment which the Government themselves moved:

"That for the words 'urging upon' till the end of the Resolution the following be substituted:

'take the first favourable opportunity of representing once more to His Majesty's Government the necessity and desirability of giving effect as soon as circumstances render it practicable and advisable to do so to those portions of Resolutions Nos. 7, 8, 10 and 11 of the Legislative Assembly passed on the 28th March 1921 which have not yet been carried out.'

Now, Sir, this means that the Government themselves agreed to move His Majesty's Government urging upon them the necessity of giving effect to the Resolution passed in 1921. Government had accepted the Resolution of 1921 and Government had in 1923 by moving this particular amendment themselves accepted the position which the Assembly had recommended in 1921. That being so it is clear that the Government have been committed to the establishment of a military college on the same lines as Sandhurst in India. We do not know whether any action has been taken by Government on the Resolution passed by the Assembly in 1923. My Honourable friend Diwan Bahadur Ramachandra Rao very pertinently asked the Honourable Mr. Burdon to tell this Assembly whether any action has been taken by Government on this Resolution or not. My Honourable friend Mr. Burdon has not yet answered that question. I would once more ask Mr. Burdon if he could say whether any action has been taken on the amendment of Government accepted by this Assembly in 1923 or not. The fact seems to be that the Government now want to get out of the position to which they committed themselves in 1921 and 1923. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief—no, I think it was the Honourable Mr. Burdon who told us it was the fog end of the day when the Resolution was discussed in 1921 and that Government had not sufficient time to consider the implications of the Resolution. My friend Mr. Jinnah says that perhaps it was a mishap on the part of Government that they accepted this Resolution. But in 1923 what was there? Will Mr. Burdon tell me why Government themselves moved the amendment that they would represent to His Majesty's Government the desirability and necessity of establishing a military college in India. We might put down the first Resolution passed in 1921 to inadvertence, but what about the amendment which Government themselves moved in 1923? The reason why I oppose the amendment of the Honourable the Home Member is quite clear. It is this that, if this amendment is carried, it will put us back. The amendment asks us to go back on the Resolutions which this Assembly accepted

in 1921 and in 1923. What does the amendment of my Honourable friend the Home Member say? It says that a committee should be appointed to consider "whether it is not practicable to establish a military college". The practicability of establishing a military college, the necessity of establishing a military college, the desirability of establishing a military college has been accepted twice by this Assembly, and now again we are asked to appoint a Committee to go into the question of considering whether it is practicable to establish a military college or not. That means that we have yet to go into that question; the question remains open. But I say that the question is no longer open. It has been twice decided, and we are now asked to give the Government an opportunity of discussing the question as to whether it is practicable to have a military college or not. As a matter of fact, Sir, my own view is, that the Resolution of my friend Mr. Venkatapatiraju is too moderate. If we had our way, we would at once start half a dozen military colleges in this country, because the argument that we are not prepared for self-defence is always thrust into our faces when we ask for more constitutional rights. And if we had the power to do as we liked, the first thing that we would do would be to establish half a dozen military colleges and secure trained and capable experts from Germany, from America, from Belgium and from other countries to teach our youngmen. This is, however, beside the point. My friend Mr. Raju has asked the Government by his Resolution merely to give effect to the Resolutions to which they themselves were a party in 1921 and 1923. My Honourable friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar is quite right when he said that the Government have become unreasonable. They were reasonable when they accepted the Resolutions in 1921 and 1923, but for obvious reasons they have now become unreasonable and refuse to abide by their own Resolutions.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief was indignant when my friend Mr. Jinnah charged the Government with want of *bona fides*. What does this show? This amendment moved by the Honourable the Home Member clearly proves the want of *bona fides* on the part of Government. And in whom did my friend the Home Member find a supporter to his amendment? He found a supporter in Captain Hira Singh who is always ready to support Government in any matter. Sir, there is no reason to be indignant. The fact is there. Government do not wish to advance a step further. That is the position. They always come out with practical difficulties. Practical difficulties there are always in the world. But where there is a will there is a way. The instance of Japan has been quoted, though my friend Sir Henry Stanyon may not agree with the analogy. Fifty years ago in Japan there were no industries worth the name, there were no railways there, there was no military. But there were the people determined to move on, and there was the Government willing to make the Japanese people a nation. In forty years' time, they did everything. They established their industries, they built their own railways all through, and they have now the best army in the world to-day. That is the position. But here the Government of India do not wish to move on. Once India has an army of its own, then the only excuse of Government to keep their hold on this country disappears. That is the difficulty. If India has got a *nationi*

4 P.M. army ready to defend herself against foreign aggression, her claim to self-government would be unassailable. And if we have our army, then the only course open to you would be to carry out our orders. At present you do what you like because the army is under your control and is not therefore national. We have not got the sanction of an army behind the

[Mr. V. J. Patel.]

words we use in this Assembly. That is the reason why they do not want to make an advance in this direction. There is absolutely no reason why you should be annoyed when you are charged with want of *bona fides*. There is no doubt that you do not want to give effect to your own Resolution. His Excellency told us that he had accepted the original Resolution and not the amendment that was moved in 1921. That may be true but what about 1923? Will His Excellency tell us what was the position in 1923 when the Government themselves moved an amendment agreeing to move His Majesty's Government to consider the necessity and the desirability of establishing a military college in India? Not only did the Government endorse the Resolution of 1921 but they went further. That was the time when you should have stated that it was a mishap that you accepted the Resolution in 1921. On the contrary you were of opinion that the Resolution must be given effect to and you moved an amendment already referred to by me. You agreed that you would move His Majesty's Government to consider the necessity and the desirability of establishing a military college in India. That is the position. Under the circumstances, I strongly oppose the amendment moved by my friend the Honourable the Home Member. I wish he had not moved it. I am glad my friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer did not move that amendment.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya: Sir, I solicit your permission to move another amendment. I move that the words "whether it is not practicable" in (a) of the amendment moved by the Honourable the Home Member should be omitted and the following words substituted in their place: "what steps should be taken". So that (a) will read

"to investigate and report:

(a) what steps should be taken to establish a military college in India to train Indian officers for the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army."

I move that (b) be omitted altogether. Then (c) will become (b):

"(b) whether if a military college is established in India it should supersede or be supplemented by Sandhurst and Woolwich so far as the training of Indian officers is concerned."

I further move that the following clause be added as (c):

"to advise at what rate Indianisation of the Army shall be accelerated for the purpose of attracting educated Indians to a military career."

The reasons for my amendment, Sir, I will state briefly. As the amendment stands, it says the committee should investigate and report whether it is not practicable to establish a military college. So far as I understand English, that implies that in the opinion of the Mover of the amendment it is practicable to establish a military college in India. When you ask a man to say whether he is not ready to do so and so, that means that you indicate your opinion that he is ready. And the words "whether it is not practicable" cannot have any other meaning in the English language, so far as my humble understanding of it goes, than to imply that in the opinion of the Mover of the amendment it is practicable to establish a military college in India to train Indian officers for the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army. What I suggest therefore is the simplifying of the amendment. After implying that it is practicable to establish a military college it goes on to say, "If so, how soon should the scheme be initiated and what steps should be taken to carry it out". I cut this out because I have substituted "What steps should be taken to establish a military

college". That includes the formulation of a scheme and a recommendation as to the time when the scheme should be put into operation. Then I retain (c) changed into (b), and I add (c) and "advise at what rate Indianisation of the Army should be accelerated for the purpose of attracting educated Indians to a military career". It will be no good starting a military college in India unless young Indians can be assured that they will have a satisfactory opening for them after they have received training at such a college. Therefore, the addition of the last clause suggested is necessary. I hope that the Government and the House will agree to accept this amendment. The Government have said that their object is to create facilities for giving the best military education to young Indians. From the remarks of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief it was clear that he was solicitous that the military education that Indians should receive should not be inferior to that imparted at Sandhurst. I therefore hope that he will agree that an assurance to young Indians that there will be more careers open to them in the Army than there are at present is an essential feature of any scheme which is to be successful.

As to the rest of the amendment, we have already heard a great deal about the Resolution that was passed in 1921 and also about the one that was passed in 1923. I do not wish that the matter should be argued in a pettifogging spirit. I wish that the matter should be looked at from a broad point of view, and I will accept His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief's opinion, if he will read the speech he delivered in 1921, and say whether there was a word said by him to indicate that he, or the Government which he represented, did not accept or was opposed to the Resolution of the Assembly which recommended the establishment of a military college in India. I quite agree that His Excellency confined his remarks to the establishment of a college such as the one which has been established at Dehra Dun. His Excellency distinctly referred to that. But there was not a word, Sir, in his speech which indicated that the Government of India, as represented by His Excellency, was opposed to the Resolution for the establishment of a military college in India as early as may be practicable. I would also ask him to say whether it is not the training of Indians for the King's commissions that has been the object of the Assembly throughout all these discussions. It is not the Viceroy's commission, it is not a Dominion commission that we have been asking for. We asked for the King's commissions. We said that it was our right as subjects of His Majesty the King to get those commissions, and it is to provide training for our young men for these commissions that our proposals have been put forward. I hope I carry His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief with me in these two points, namely, that the Government did not oppose the Resolution recommending the establishment of a military college in India, that the Government allowed the vote of the House to be unanimous on that question, and that when His Excellency spoke after the Resolution had been passed, he did not say one word to indicate his dissent from it, and secondly that the Government did not oppose the Resolution which was passed in 1923. I invite attention to the passage which my friend Mr. Patel read only a little while ago. Take the two Resolutions together. Then also remember that before the war we had been pleading for years together, for decades together, even since I joined the Indian National Congress in 1886, for the grant of King's commissions to Indians. That was one of the subjects which constantly came up for discussion and on which we sent up our recommendations year after year to the Government. When the war broke out, Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy, sent a despatch to the Government in England and it is an open secret that he recommended

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

that the King's commissions should be thrown open to Indians in a fairly large measure. Subsequently, Lord Chelmsford's Government sent up a scheme and they too recommended that the King's commissions should be thrown open to Indians. In the Montagu-Chelmsford Report also considerable attention was devoted to the recommendation that the King's commissions should be thrown open to Indians. Therefore, all this time we have been asking that the King's commissions should be thrown open to Indians. We have recommended the establishment of a military college in order that our young men should be qualified for King's commissions. We did not recommend the establishment of such a costly college in order to train Indians merely for the Viceroy's commissions. That being so, in view of the attitude adopted by Government so far, an attitude of non-opposition, to put it at the mildest, to the Resolution of this Assembly, I submit that they should agree to the small change which I have indicated in the amendment put forward by the Honourable the Home Member. I again say that we should look at the question in a large spirit, and I appeal to every Member of the House to say whether the words "whether it is not practicable" do not imply that the Honourable Mover of the amendment wishes to indicate that it is practicable to establish such a college in India now. I therefore urge that we should agree to accept that as a fact and to say that the Committee should investigate and report what steps should be taken to establish a military college in India. And to make it clear that it is the King's commission which is meant and not the Viceroy's commission or Dominion commission. I would insert the words "King's commissions" in order not to leave any room for doubt at a future date. I would read it like this: "to train Indian Officers for King's commissions in the Indian Army." (*A Voice*: "There are the words 'commissioned ranks'.") I would leave the wording as it is if it is understood that "commissioned ranks" means King's Commissions. But if anybody is going to argue that it does not mean King's commissions but something else, then I would clear it up by using the words I have suggested. I think that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief will agree that what we Indians have been urging all these many years is that the King's commissions should be thrown open to Indians, and that therefore that is the point which is now before the House. I hope His Excellency will see his way to accept this amendment. (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "How will you read the present clause (c)?") It will stand as it is. (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar*: "You say 'if a military college . . . Why do you introduce a doubt there?'"). "If" means "when" there. My last clause is "to advise at what rate Indianisation of the Army shall be accelerated for the purpose of attracting educated Indians to a military career." That is my amendment.

Before I resume my seat, Sir, may I, with your permission, remind His Excellency of how the development of the army took place in Japan? It is true we have got here many religions and many races, but His Excellency will remember that Japan built up patriotism in her sons by a deliberate, persistent, long-continued effort in educating them in patriotism and by a regular system of training for the army for national defence which they were taught to regard as a matter of pride; that it was the result of years of persistent education of the Japanese that built up their magnificent patriotism. I believe, Sir, that, though we profess different religions, we people of India are nearly all of one race, and have lived under the influence of a common Government for over 150 years, and if the proper

kind of education is given, if the proper scheme is adopted, we shall show not less patriotism than the Japanese have done. Our misfortune has been that some of the finest things which England had it in her power to give to or withhold from India have been withheld from us. I join with Colonel Crawford in paying a tribute to English public schools. These schools unfortunately have not been established in India. We ask for the establishment of a military college because we believe that comradeship on the grounds of such a college between Indian youths of different creeds and castes will be the best antidote to communal and narrow feelings. I expect, Sir, that if this college is established it will be the means of promoting the purest and the noblest patriotism among Indians of all classes and creeds, and that is the reason why I commend this amendment to the consideration of His Excellency and the other Members of the House.

His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief: The last two speakers have made it perfectly clear to me, and I suppose they think they have also made it clear to the House, that on the occasion upon which I accepted on behalf of Government an amendment and a Resolution both in 1921 and in 1923 I was not quite so well versed in the methods of this House as I am to-day. I therefore propose to go a little more warily now than I did then. I am not going to be caught napping again. Much as I appreciate the amendment proposed by the Honourable Pandit, I am sorry it is quite impossible for me to accept it. In the first alteration that he proposes in paragraph (a) he makes a really material change in the wording of the original amendment and that, I am afraid, is more than I can accept. The addition that he makes to paragraph (c) which will become paragraph (b) in his new amendment of course extends the purview of the committee to a much wider area than I originally intended. I am afraid therefore I can accept neither.

Colonel J. D. Crawford (Bengal: European): I desire to state that I, and my colleagues are prepared to support the amendment brought forward by Government, by the Honourable the Home Member. We do so because we are not, as the Honourable Mr. Jinnah would have us suppose, opposed to this problem. We desire that it should be examined very carefully because it is an important problem and we should endeavour to find what is the best solution of the difficulty. My own feeling lies very much in the fact that what we really want so much, I am now talking from the point of view of the officers of the army, is that our young boys of the age of 9 upwards should have the training which will enable them to benefit by a technical course at a military college. Without the education which is provided by our public schools training at the military college would greatly lack much of what is required and I trust that, if the amendment, as moved by the Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman, is accepted by the House, the scope of the committee would include the question of the training of our youths as well as that of the provision of a military college. It is fairly evident that the desire of the House for the dignity of King's commissions is very great indeed and they are deserving of that dignity. In view of that fact I feel it is somewhat expedient for this House to accept the amendment as put on the paper by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and as moved by Sir Alexander Muddiman. Because if we fail to accept that amendment and endeavour to give too much in the nature of directions to our committee, are not we surely rather stating that we are somewhat nervous of our case? I would also congratulate the Government

[Colonel J. D. Crawford.]

on, in this debate, not having started off the debate by giving a lead as they so often do to the House but allowing the debate to develop and then coming forward with a concrete suggestion. I trust that this House will realize the very substantial concession that has been made in the Government amendment. (*A Voice*: "A going back.") No, Sir, it is not a going back, it is a distinct advance forward. We will be able ourselves to consider the problem from every point of view and to make recommendations fully within the scope of this amendment. I trust therefore that my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru will on this occasion support me and the Government.

Several Honourable Members moved that the question be put.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That the question be now put."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The question is:

"That in the amendment as moved by the Home Member for the words 'whether it is not practicable' the words 'what steps should be taken' be substituted."

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

The Assembly divided:

AYES—59.

Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Almuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
 Gulab Singh Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jajodia, Baboo Runglal.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chalgam Maulvi
 Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.

Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Mutalik, Sardar V. N.
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.
 Nambiyar, Mr. K. K.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Piyare Lal, Lala.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NOES—37.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur Muhammad.	Marr, Mr. A.
Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.	McCallum, Mr. J. L.
Ajab Khan, Captain.	Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra Nath.
Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.	Moir, Mr. T. E.
Ashworth, Mr. E. H.	Muddiman, The Honourable Sir Alexander.
Bhore, Mr. J. W.	Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur Saiyid.
Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.	Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
Bray, Mr. Denys.	Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
Burdon, Mr. E.	Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
Calvert, Mr. H.	Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V. Visvanatha.
Clarke, Sir Geoffrey.	Sim, Mr. G. G.
Clow, Mr. A. G.	Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
Cooke, Mr. H. G.	Sykes, Mr. E. F.
Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.	Tonkinson, Mr. H.
Crawford, Colonel J. D.	Webb, Mr. M.
Fleming, Mr. E. G.	Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
Graham, Mr. L.	Wilson, Mr. R. A.
Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.	
Hudson, Mr. W. F.	
Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.	

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: Further amendment moved :

"To omit clause (b) in the amendment as moved by the Home Member."

The question is that that clause be omitted.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: Further amendment moved :

"To add at the end of the Home Member's amendment as a new clause (c) :

'to advise at what rate Indianisation of the Army shall be accelerated for the purpose of attracting educated Indians to a military career.'

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: Further amendment moved :

"To omit the word 'if' in clause (b) and insert the word 'when'."

The question is that that amendment be made.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The original question was :

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that early steps be taken for starting a well equipped Military College in a suitable locality to train Indians for the commissioned ranks in the Indian Army Service and the necessary amount be sanctioned to start the preliminary work."

Since which an amendment has been moved that the following be substituted for the original Resolution :

"That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee including Indian Members of the Legislature be immediately appointed to investigate and report :

- (a) what steps should be taken to establish a military college in India to train Indian officers for the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army;
- (b) whether, when a military college is established in India, it should supersede or be supplemented by Sandhurst and Woolwich so far as the training of Indian officers is concerned; and
- (c) to advise at what rate Indianisation of the Army shall be accelerated for the purpose of attracting educated Indians to a military career."

[Mr. President.]

The question I have to put is that that amendment be substituted for the original Resolution.

The Assembly divided:

AYES—58.

Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.
 Abul Kasem, Maulvi.
 Acharya, Mr. M. K.
 Ahmed, Mr. K.
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Mr.
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.
 Chaman Lall, Mr.
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.
 Dalal, Sardar B. A.
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.
 Duni Chand, Lala.
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.
 Hans Raj, Lala.
 Ismail Khan, Mr.
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.
 Jajodia, Baboo Runglal.
 Jeelani, Haji S. A. K.
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi
 Muhammad.
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.

Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi
 Sayad.
 Mutalik, Sadar V. N.
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.
 Nehru, Pandit Shamlal.
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.
 Pal, Mr. Bipin Chandra.
 Patel, Mr. V. J.
 Piyare Lal, Lala.
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.
 Ramachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.
 Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.
 Roy, Mr. Bhabendra Chandra.
 Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan
 Bahadur.
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.
 Shams-uz-Zoha, Khan Bahadur M.
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.
 Sinha, Kumar Ganganand.
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.

NOES—37.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur
 Muhammad.
 Abdul Qaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.
 Ajab Khan, Captain.
 Ashworth, Mr. E. H.
 Bhore, Mr. J. W.
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.
 Bray, Mr. Denys.
 Burdon, Mr. E.
 Calvert, Mr. H.
 Clarke, Sir Geoffrey.
 Clow, Mr. A. G.
 Cocke, Mr. H. G.
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.
 Graham, Mr. L.
 Hira Singh, Sardar Bahadur Captain.
 Hudson, Mr. W. F.
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.
 Marr, Mr. A.

McCallum, Mr. J. L.
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra
 Nath.
 Moir, Mr. T. E.
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir
 Alexander.
 Muhammad Ismail, Khan Bahadur
 Saiyid.
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.
 Rhodes, Sir Campbell.
 Rushbrook-Williams, Prof. L. F.
 Sastri, Diwan Bahadur C. V.
 Visvanatha.
 Sim, Mr. G. G.
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.
 Webb, Mr. M.
 Willson, Mr. W. S. J.
 Wilson, Mr. R. A.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: The question is that the following Resolution be adopted, namely :

“ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that a Committee including Indian Members of the Legislature be immediately appointed to investigate and report :

- (a) what steps should be taken to establish a military college in India to train Indian officers for the commissioned ranks of the Indian Army ;
- (b) whether, when a military college is established in India, it should supersede or be supplemented by Sandhurst and Woolwich so far as the training of Indian officers is concerned ; and
- (c) to advise at what rate Indianisation of the Army shall be accelerated for the purpose of attracting educated Indians to a military career.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. President: I have to announce that in view of the fact that nominations for the election to the panel for the Standing Committee on the Department of Industries and Labour is short of the amount required by the regulations, I extend the period of notice for such nominations to 4 o'clock to-morrow, Friday, February 20th, and similarly the period of notice of nominations for the panel of the Committee for the Department of Commerce is extended to the same hour. The nominations for the other two Departments are complete.

The Assembly then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 20th February, 1925.
