

8th September, 1925

THE  
**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES**  
**(Official Report)**

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

**SECOND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, 1925**



SIMLA  
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS  
1925

# CONTENTS.

VOLUME VI, PART II—7th September to 17th September, 1925.

	PAGES.
<b>Monday, 7th September, 1925—</b>	
Member Sworn .. .. .	781
Questions and Answers .. .. .	781-820
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	829-47
Election of Two Members to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways .. .. .	847
Message from the Council of State .. .. .	847
Appointment of the Panel of Chairmen .. .. .	847
Resolution <i>re</i> Recommendations of the Majority Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee— <i>contd.</i> .. .. .	848-909
<b>Tuesday, 8th September, 1925—</b>	
Member Sworn .. .. .	911
Questions and Answers .. .. .	911-17
Message from the Council of State .. .. .	917
Resolution <i>re</i> Recommendations of the Majority Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee—Adopted as amended .. .. .	917-1006
<b>Wednesday, 9th September, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers .. .. .	1007-10
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	1010-13
Elections to the Standing Finance Committee for Railways .. .. .	1013
Procedure relating to the Disposal of Amendments .. .. .	1013-15
The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill—Passed as amended .. .. .	1015-69
<b>Thursday, 10th September, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers .. .. .	1071-73
Bill passed by the Council of State laid on the Table .. .. .	1073
Appointment of the Committee on Public Petitions .. .. .	1073
The Hindu Coparceners Liability Bill—Additions to the Select Committee .. .. .	1073
Resolution <i>re</i> Grant of Protection to the Paper Industry— Debate adjourned .. .. .	1074-1130
<b>Monday, 14th September, 1925—</b>	
Questions and Answers .. .. .	1131-78
Unstarred Questions and Answers .. .. .	1173-93
Message from the Council of State .. .. .	1193-04, 1215

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 8th September, 1925.

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

## MEMBER SWORN :

Mr. Kenneth Gordon Harper, M.L.A. (Legislative Department :  
Nominated Official).

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

### DOCUMENTS SIGNED AT THE FIRST AND SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCES.

738. \***Dr. S. K. Datta** : Will Government place on the table of the House copies of (i) *The Agreement Protocol and Final Act* of the First Opium Conference signed at Geneva on February 11th, 1925. (ii) *The Convention, Protocol, and Final Act* of the Second Opium Conference signed at Geneva on February 19th, 1925 ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : The documents referred to by the Honourable Member are contained in the pamphlet entitled " *International Opium Conventions, 1912—1925* " a copy of which is available in the Library. I am sending a copy to the Honourable Member also. The Government have a limited number of spare copies for supply to other Members of the Legislature who may care to apply to the Secretary, Central Board of Revenue.

### SIGNATURE ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA OF THE CONVENTION PROTOCOL AND FINAL ACT OF THE SECOND OPIUM CONFERENCE.

739. \***Dr. S. K. Datta** : Will Government explain why the representatives of the Indian Government did not sign the *Convention, Protocol and Final Act* of the Second Opium Conference ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : I have not the information required to answer the Honourable Member's question, but I would point out that the *Convention, Protocol and Final Act* have since been signed on behalf of the Government of India.

**Dr. S. K. Datta** : May I ask the Honourable Member when this *Agreement and Convention with their Protocols and Final Acts* were ratified by the Government of India ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : I must have notice of this question, Sir.

### IMPORT OF CHARAS FROM CENTRAL ASIA.

740. \*Dr. S. K. Datta : Will Government state what is the amount of *charas* imported into India annually from Central Asia ? From which countries is it specifically imported ? What are the frontier towns or ports through which this traffic is maintained ? Do the Government of India maintain a *charas* officer and establishment at Leh, in Ladak ? In what other places if any are these officers maintained ?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett : The average annual imports during the 5 years ending 1923-24 amounted to 3,622 maunds. *Charas* is imported only from Central Asia. It is first warehoused at Leh and brought on special permits, through Kulu or Kohala and Rawalpindi, into the Punjab, where it has again to be stored in a Government warehouse. The Punjab Government maintain the warehouse and the establishment at Leh. There is no Indian warehouse establishment for the purpose at any other place outside British India.

Dr. S. K. Datta : Does the Honourable Member say that this *charas* is imported under import certificates ?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett : It is warehoused at Leh and brought in under special permits from there.

### SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS CUSTOMS IN CONNECTION WITH THE USE OF HEMP DRUGS IN INDIA.

741. \*Dr. S. K. Datta : At the Second Opium Conference, did the representatives of the Indian Government make the following statement :

“ The Government of India, however, at the present stage of their examination of the subject point out various serious difficulties of an administrative order in confining the use of hemp drugs to medical and scientific purposes ; for example there are social and religious customs which naturally have to be considered.” ?

Will Government state the precise religious customs to which reference was made ?

The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett : Yes. The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to Chapter IX of the report of the Indian Hemp Drugs Commission, 1893-94, in which the religious customs in question are fully stated. A copy of the Report is in the Library.

### DISSEMINATION OF PROPAGANDA FOR THE DISCOURAGEMENT OF OPIUM SMOKING.

742. \*Dr. S. K. Datta : (a) At the First Opium Conference was a proposal made that Government should use their utmost efforts by instruction in schools and dissemination of suitable literature to discourage opium smoking ?

(b) Did Mr. Campbell, the representative of the Government of India, oppose this proposal ?

(c) Did he use the following words :

“ Experience did not encourage the belief that official propaganda would be successful in the East. On the contrary there were numerous specific instances... showing that the population only consented to take measures to protect themselves against the epidemic when the Government abandoned propaganda and compulsory measures... official propaganda in regard to opium would do more harm than good in India.” ?

(d) Did the Japanese and Chinese delegates state that this was not true as far as their countries were concerned ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** (a), (c) and (d). The replies to the questions are in the affirmative.

(b) The Indian Delegate demurred to the proposal in its obligatory form, but agreed to it on the condition that if a Government considered propaganda in the form proposed undesirable under the conditions existing in its territory, it should not be binding upon it. I may add that the Government of India have no objection in principle to propaganda being undertaken by the responsible Local Governments, within whose sphere such action clearly falls. The Government of India have in fact already addressed the Local Governments on the subject and their replies are awaited.

**Dr. S. K. Datta :** Was the censure of the Government of India conveyed to Mr. Campbell for suggesting that the Government of India had no influence with the Indian people ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** I do not think that is a fair inference from the statement made by Mr. Campbell.

#### APPOINTMENT OF AN OPIUM COMMISSION.

743. \***Dr. S. K. Datta :** In view of the promise made by the Finance Member during the debate on the Opium Demand last March, will Government state what steps have been taken to set up a commission of inquiry on the production, sale and consumption of opium in India ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply to question No. 613 asked by Kumar Ganganand Sinha in this House on the 3rd instant.

#### RECRUITMENT OF THE CLERICAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICES OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL AND THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL, CENTRAL REVENUES, RAISINA.

795. \***Lala Duni Chand :** (a) What are the scales of pay for the clerical establishment of the offices of the Auditor General and Accountant General, Central Revenues, Raisina, and what are the rules for their recruitment ?

(b) Are the Government prepared to issue instructions to the effect that steps may be taken to have the different provinces fairly and equitably represented ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** The information is being collected and a reply will be given in due course.

#### RECRUITMENTS TO THE INCOME-TAX DEPARTMENT, PUNJAB.

796. \***Lala Duni Chand :** (a) Is it a fact that almost all the appointments of Income-tax officers, Assistant Income-tax officers and Inspectors in the Income-tax Department, Punjab, in the year 1925 have been filled by Muslims and that the claims of better qualified Hindus have been disregarded ?

(b) Will the Government please state the qualifications of the Muslim candidates selected in comparison with those of the Hindu candidates rejected this year and those selected in 1924 ?

(c) Is it the intention of the Government to give preference to Muslims over Hindus when educational qualifications are equal or is it their intention to give preference to Muslims even when they do not possess the qualifications possessed by their Hindu rivals ?

(d) Do the Government propose to instruct the Commissioners of Income-tax that only those who possess better qualifications should be recruited irrespective of their religion ?

(e) Have the Government fixed any minimum qualifications for the candidates for the above appointments in the various provinces ?

(f) If not, do the Government propose to consider the advisability of laying down standard qualifications necessary for the appointments and instruct the Commissioners to follow them strictly regardless of the caste and creed of the candidates ?

(g) Do the Government propose to make selections of candidates for these posts for the whole of India by a central examination or through the Public Service Commission to ensure uniformity of practice and treatment in all provinces ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** (a) No appointments of Income-tax Officers, Assistant Income-tax Officers or Inspectors have been made in 1925 from outside the Department. Two fully qualified Muslim Inspectors were promoted to be Assistant Income-tax Officers.

(b) The Government are not prepared to discuss the qualifications of individual officers on the floor of this House, but I can assure the Honourable Member that the two Inspectors who were promoted were fully qualified.

(c) and (d). I have nothing to add to the Honourable Sir Malcolm Hailey's speech of 10th March 1923 which still represents the policy of the Government of India.

(e) and (f). The answer is in the negative.

(g) The question will be considered in due course after the establishment of the Public Services Commission.

#### OPENING OF A SUB-ASSISTANT SURGEON CLASS AT THE LADY HARDINGE MEDICAL COLLEGE, RAISINA.

797. \*Lala Duni Chand : (a) Is it a fact that there is only a senior (Assistant Surgeon) class in the Lady Hardinge Medical College, Raisina, and that there is no Sub-Assistant Surgeon class ?

(b) Are the Government aware that most of the Indian females do not possess sufficient educational qualifications and cannot avail themselves of this long and expensive course ?

(c) Is it a fact that the College was started primarily for Indian females ?

(d) Do the Government propose to start a Sub-Assistant Surgeon class ?

**Mr. J. W. Bhore :** (a) and (b). Yes. As stated in the Articles of Association of the Governing Body the institution exists for the purpose of imparting higher medical education to women. For this purpose special classes, teaching up to the Intermediate standard of the Punjab University have been opened at the College and candidates for higher medical instruction receive their preliminary training in these.

(c) The College was started primarily to prepare Indian women for a University degree in medicine. Government are not aware that there is any demand for making provision for the training of sub-assistant surgeons at the College. Facilities for this exist at Ludhiana, Agra and other places.

(d) The matter is one primarily for the consideration of the Governing Body but Government do not consider that such a course is either desirable or necessary.

**OPENING OF BRANCHES OF THE IMPERIAL BANK OF INDIA AT DISTRICT HEAD QUARTERS.**

798. **\*Lala Duni Chand :** (a) Will the Government please lay on the table a statement showing the progress made during the last two years towards the Indianization of the Imperial Bank of India ?

(b) What rates of pay are generally offered to Indian graduates and undergraduates in the subordinate grades and what are the corresponding rates for Anglo-Indians and are there any rules governing their recruitment ?

(c) How many branches of the Bank have been opened in the Punjab during the last 2 years and how many of them are in such districts in which there is no other Bank ?

(d) Are the Government aware of the existence of a feeling in the Punjab that branches of the Imperial Bank are being opened and have been opened with a view to compete with the indigenous Indian banking enterprise ?

(e) Do the Government propose to instruct the Bank authorities to open its branches preferably in district headquarters where no other banks exist at present ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** (a) and (b). The Government are not in possession of the information required ; but such information as I have seen on this matter in the Press shows that progress has been rapid.

(c) Ten new branches were opened in 1923 and 1924 ; of these one is in a district in which there is no other bank.

(d) If there is such a feeling, I am sure it is ill-founded.

(e) The Government take all relevant circumstances into consideration when scrutinising the list of places at which the Bank propose to open branches ; but obviously the absence of another Bank cannot be made the sole, or the most important criterion.

**LEAVE AND FURLOUGH OF INDIAN OFFICERS OF THE BOMBAY, BARODA AND CENTRAL INDIA RAILWAY.**

799. **\*Pandit Harkaran Nath Miara :** 1. Are the Government aware of the grievance of the Indian officers on the Bombay, Baroda and Central

India Railway in the matter of leave and furlough regulations and is it not a fact :

- (a) that even the subordinates (Europeans and Anglo-Indians) enjoy the same rights as the European officers but the same are denied to the Indian officers ?
- (b) that on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway the Indian officers enjoy the same rights as their European colleagues ?

2. If the reply to the above be in the affirmative, do the Government propose to inquire into the matter and try to remove this differentiation ?

**Mr. G. G. Sim :** The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given to a somewhat similar question asked by Mr. N. M. Joshi on the 2nd July 1923.

#### THE IMPERIAL BANK (LUCKNOW BRANCH) FRAUD CASE.

800. **\*Pandit Harkaran Nath Misra :** (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the judgment in the Imperial Bank (Lucknow branch) fraud case delivered by the Judicial Commissioner, Lucknow, in the beginning of August 1925 and specially the remarks made by the Judicial Commissioner against the then Agent of the said Bank ?

(b) Do the Government propose to take any action against the Agent of the said Bank and, if so, what ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** The Government have not seen the judgment referred to. So far as I understand, this is not a matter which concerns the Governor General in Council, but as I have already said I will make inquiries and consider whether any action by the Government is called for.

#### INDIANIZATION OF THE ORDNANCE SERVICES.

801. **\*Pandit Harkaran Nath Misra :** Will the Government please state :

- (a) What progress, if any, has been made in Indianizing the Ordnance Services ?
- (b) When the number of Indians in the said service will reach the proportion of one-third to the total strength ?
- (c) If any arrangements are being made to give these men any technical and departmental training ?

**Mr. E. Burdon :** The attention of the Honourable Member is invited to the reply given on the 27th August to starred question No. 173.

#### REFUSAL OF PASSPORTS TO ALOKANAND MAHABHARATI, PRESIDENT OF THE ARUNACHAL PEACE MISSION, AND PROFESSOR JADUNATH SINHA.

802. **\*Mr. Gaya Prasad Singh :** (a) Is it a fact that Alokand Mahabharati, President of the Arunachal Peace Mission, and Professor Jadunath Sinha, M.A., P.R.S., whose applications for passports to visit some foreign countries on a religious Mission of World Peace, were refused by the Governments of Bihar and Orissa, and the United Provinces,

respectively, appealed to the Government of India, but their applications were rejected ?

(b) Will the Government be pleased to state the reasons for refusing to grant passports to these gentlemen, and also place on the table the correspondence which may have passed between them and the Local Governments concerned ?

**Mr. H. Tonkinson :** (a) Yes.

(b) I am not prepared to state the reasons for the refusal of passports to these gentlemen or to place on the table any correspondence on the subject.

---

MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

**Secretary of the Assembly :** Sir, the following Message has been received from the Secretary of the Council of State :

“ I am directed to inform you that the Council of State have at their meeting held on the 7th September 1925, agreed without amendments to the following Bills which have been passed by the Legislative Assembly :

1. A Bill further to amend the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908,
2. A Bill further to amend the Religious Endowments Act, 1863,
3. A Bill to amend the law relating to salt and salt-revenue,
4. A Bill to confer certain exemptions on members of legislative bodies constituted under the Government of India Act,
5. A Bill to supplement certain provisions of the Sikh Gurdwaras Act, 1925.”

---

RESOLUTION *RE* RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MAJORITY REPORT OF THE REFORMS INQUIRY COMMITTEE—*contd.*

**Mr. President :** The House will now resume discussion on the Resolution\* of the Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman and the amendment† of Pandit Motilal Nehru.

\* “ This Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do accept the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee and that he do give early consideration to the detailed recommendations therein contained for improvements in the machinery of Government.”

† “ That for the original Resolution the following be substituted :

‘ This Assembly while confirming and reiterating the demand contained in the Resolution passed by it on the 18th February 1924, recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to take immediate steps to move His Majesty’s Government to make a declaration in Parliament embodying the following fundamental changes in the present constitutional machinery and administration of India :

- (a) The Revenues of India and all property vested in or arising or accruing from property or rights vested in His Majesty under the Government of India Act, 1858, or the present Act or received by the Secretary of State in Council under any of the said Acts shall hereafter vest in the Governor General in Council for the purposes of the Government of India.
- (b) The Governor General in Council shall be responsible to the Indian Legislature and subject to such responsibility shall have the power to control the expenditure of the Revenues of India and make such grants and appropriations of any part of those Revenues or of any other property as is at present under the control or disposal of the Secretary of State for India in Council, save and except the following which shall for a fixed term of years remain under the control of the Secretary of State for India :
  - (i) Expenditure on the Military Services up to a fixed limit.

**Masrur Muhammad Vakub** (Rohilkund and Kumaon Divisions : Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, it may be considered rather rash and impudent on my part to participate in the discussion on such an important and epoch-making Resolution. My only excuse to stand before the House to-day is that I belong to a community which occupies a peculiar position in this country. We are not a small minority like the Parsis, Sikhs, Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians, whose rights and claims and whose stake in the country are naturally very small. Although we are in a minority, still our minority is no less than 7 crores of persons, much bigger than the population of some countries in this world. We hold a very important and unique position in the politics of the world, and it is therefore very important that the views of the advanced section in this community should find a place in the proceedings of this debate. I deem it therefore my duty to make a few observations in supporting the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru. Indeed, Sir, it would be foolish on my part to make an effort to conceal the state of ~~the~~ feelings between the two great communities and to belittle gravity of the communal tension. It is in my humble opinion the first and foremost duty of every true Indian to bring about a reconciliation between

(ii) Expenditure classed as political and foreign.

- (iii) The payment of all debts and liabilities hitherto lawfully contracted and incurred by the Secretary of State for India in Council on account of the Government of India.
- (c) The Council of the Secretary of State for India shall be abolished and the position and functions of the Secretary of State for India shall be assimilated to those of the Secretary of State for the self-governing Dominions save as otherwise provided in clause (b).
- (d) The Indian Army shall be nationalised within a reasonably short and definite period of time and Indians shall be admitted for service in all arms of defence and for that purpose, the Governor General and the Commander-in-Chief shall be assisted by a Minister responsible to the Assembly.
- (e) The Central and Provincial Legislatures shall consist entirely of members elected by constituencies formed on as wide a franchise as possible.
- (f) The principle of responsibility to the Legislature shall be introduced in all branches of the administration of the Central Government subject to transitional reservations and residuary powers in the Governor General in respect of the control of Military, Foreign and Political affairs for a fixed term of years :  
 Provided that during the said fixed term the proposals of the Governor General in Council for the appropriation of any revenue or moneys for military or other expenditure classed as 'Defence' shall be submitted to the vote of the Legislature ; but that the Governor General in Council shall have power, notwithstanding the vote of the Assembly, to appropriate up to a fixed maximum any sum he may consider necessary for such expenditure and in the event of a war to authorise such expenditure as may be considered necessary exceeding the maximum so fixed.
- (g) The present system of dyarchy in the Provinces shall be abolished and replaced by unitary and autonomous responsible Governments subject to the general control and residuary powers of the Central Government in inter-provincial and all-India matters.
- (h) The Indian Legislature shall after the expiry of the fixed term of years referred to in clauses (b) and (f) have full powers to make such amendments in the constitution of India from time to time as may appear to it necessary or desirable.

This Assembly further recommends to the Governor General in Council that necessary steps be taken :

- (a) to constitute in consultation with the Legislative Assembly a convention, round table conference or other suitable agency adequately representative of all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests to frame with due regard to the interests of minorities a detailed scheme based on the above principles, after making such inquiry as may be necessary in this behalf ;

the conflicting elements. There can be no doubt that the Muhammadans in India are deeply concerned about the form of the constitution to be framed for the administration of the country after responsible government has been attained. But our anxiety is only about our share to be clearly defined and definitely set apart. The considered opinion of the general body of the Mussalmans is clearly stated in the resolution passed by the All-India Muslim League at its special session held at Lahore in May 1924, which runs as follows :

"Whereas the speedy attainment of Swaraj is one of the declared objects of the All-India Muslim League, and whereas it is now generally felt that the conception of Swaraj should be translated into the realm of concrete politics and become a factor in the daily life of the Indian people, the All-India Muslim League hereby resolves that in any scheme of a constitution for India, that may ultimately be agreed upon and accepted by the people, the following shall constitute its basic and fundamental principles :

- (a) The existing provinces of India shall all be united under a common Government on a federal basis so that each province shall have full and complete provincial autonomy, the functions of the Central Government being confined to such matters only as are of general and common concern.
- (b) Any territorial redistribution that might at any time become necessary, shall not in any way affect the Muslim majority of population in the Punjab, Bengal and the North West Frontier Province.
- (c) Full religious liberty, that is, liberty of belief, worship, observances, propaganda, association and education shall be guaranteed to all communities.
- (d) The idea of joint electorates with a specified number of seats being unacceptable to Indian Muslims, on the ground of its being a fruitful source of discord and disunion and also as being wholly inadequate to achieve the object of effective representation of various communal groups, the representation of the latter shall continue to be by means of separate electorates as at present, provided that it shall be open to any community at any time to abandon its separate electorates in favour of joint electorates.
- (e) No Bill or Resolution or any part thereof affecting any community, which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the elected body concerned, shall be passed in any Legislature or in any other elected body, if three-fourths of the members of that community in that particular body oppose such Bill or Resolution or part thereof.

That in the opinion of the All-India Muslim League, the Reforms granted by the Government of India Act, 1919, are wholly unsatisfactory and altogether inadequate to meet the requirements of the country and that the virtual absence of any responsibility of the Executive to the elected representatives of the people in the Legislature has really rendered them futile and unworkable : the League therefore urges that immediate steps be taken to establish Swaraj, that is full responsible Government having regard to the provisions of the previous resolution and this, in the opinion of the League, can only be done by a complete overhauling of the Government of India Act, 1919, and not merely by an inquiry with a view to discover defects in the working of the Act and to rectify imperfections under its rule-making power."

The complete overhauling cannot be done by such a Committee as was appointed by the Government of India and whose report we are now discussing. We are not opposed to having Swaraj or responsible Government : what we are opposed to is the Raj of a single community. As regards Swaraj in its real and true sense, which means Government by all the communities and the people of this country, the Mussalmans certainly are as anxious and earnest as any other community inhabiting this vast Peninsula. Like the other communities we also consider the present state of administration as highly unsatisfactory and unbearable and we are quite in agreement with the demand that the question of policy and principles of the system of Government under which India

- (b) to place the said scheme for approval before the Legislative Assembly and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute."

[Maulvi Muhammad Yakub.]

ought to be governed in future must immediately be settled and we must be entitled definitely to know the number of stages and the period of each stage after which the present system of Government will be radically altered and based upon right principles and policy in the accomplishment of our cherished goal. Freedom is the birth-right of every nation in the world and no nation can recognise and appreciate the blessings of freedom more than the Mussalmans whose religion is based on the principles of freedom and the equality of the human race, which knows no depressed classes and no untouchables. Almost all the educated and patriotic Mussalmans are fully of opinion that the Government of India Act, 1919, is wholly incapable of leading us to the path of responsible Government and no action taken under the Act or the rules thereunder can rectify the fundamental administrative imperfections. I am quite in agreement with the opinion expressed by the non-official members of the Reforms Inquiry Committee contained in the minority report when they say :

“ We do not think that our suggested amendments, if effected, will afford valuable training towards responsible government, or will provide any solution of the difficulties which we have discussed in our Chapter on Political Conditions.”

This is the last paragraph of their report which has already been quoted by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru and I therefore need not repeat it here. No doubt the authors of the minority report are entitled to our gratitude for their courageous attitude and honest expression of views ; and if this House to-day is not in a position to accept their Report as it stands, it is not because of our disagreement with their views but because by the terms of reference in the matter of remedial proposals their scope was much limited and therefore they could not go to the full length of our national demands. The amendment proposed by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru is only an amplification of their opinion quoted above which also fully represents the views of a very large majority of the people of this country. Sir, I do not claim that the whole of our electorate is yet fully in a position to realise the importance of responsible government. But, Sir, this is no reason why our country should remain in a state of perpetual subjugation. In England itself Parliamentary Government existed some hundred years before even the rich and middle classes of the people had any voice or vote in it. It is futile to say that we must wait till all the people are ready. The British people did not so wait for their Parliament. We are not allowed to be fit for over 150 years. We can never be fit till we are actually made to undertake the work and the responsibility. When China in the East and Persia in the West of Asia are awakening and Japan has already awakened and both of them were under despotic rule, can the free citizens of the British Indian Empire continue subject to despotism for ever ? It is no use telling us that a good beginning cannot be made as yet in India. I assert that not only has the time fully arrived but had arrived long ago to make this beginning. The only thing needed is the willingness of the Government to fulfil the Royal pledges of 1857, 1887, 1898, 1906 and 1917 and there cannot and shall not be any hesitation in carrying out the amended Resolution now under discussion. With these remarks, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the amended Resolution proposed by the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar** (Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity for intervening in this debate. I rise to support the amendment of the leader of the Party to which I have the proud privilege to belong. During the short space of time, however, that is at my disposal under the rules, I do not think I can do justice to that all-important amendment and to its provisions categorically. What is it that we want ? We want that the revenues of India shall vest in the Government of India. No true Government anywhere on the face of this earth can exist without the command of the power of the purse. The power of the purse, Sir, is the key-note of the whole situation. Unfortunately, under the present regime, that power has been solely reserved to the bureaucracy, the Executive and the autocracy. What is that we want next ? We want that the Governor General in Council shall be responsible to the Indian Legislature. You cannot have democracy and bureaucracy running side by side. The two things are divorced from one another. They cannot be wedded together. We want officials of this country to be the servants of the people as they ought to be and not their masters as they at present continue to be. We want the abolition of the Council of the Secretary of State and his being placed on a par with the Secretary of State for the Dominions. Under the present arrangement, Sir, India's centre of gravity is in London. We want to get rid of this most unnatural arrangement. Then, Sir, we want that the Army in India shall be Indianised in a short period. We do not want again to move in the same vicious circle of no army, no full Dominion status ; no full Dominion status, no army. I will not attempt here, Sir, to reply to the various arguments that are usually advanced against the rapid Indianization of the Army. They have so often been shown by many a Member of this House as nothing more than sham excuses to keep us out of our own. Sir, then we want fully representative Legislatures based on a wide franchise. I would sooner be elected by 10,000 people than by 1,000 people, because then I would feel more satisfied as having been returned by a large electorate and would feel much stronger in my place. Then, Sir, we want the various Governments of the country to be responsible to the Legislatures. It is no good your merely enfranchising the people. If you want to constitute an electorate, it will not do if you merely enfranchise the people. The one thing that you must do is to make the vote valuable. If a man is asked to vote and as a result of that vote nothing happens, nothing that he can see, nothing that he can appreciate, nothing that he can reward or punish by the maintenance or the transference of his vote, you cannot train an electorate. Therefore, the first necessary step in the training of an electorate is to give it power through its representatives. As a result of a vote, if a person is elected and he cannot only criticise but get things done and be held responsible for the things that he does, then the man who wants to turn him out will soon make it his business to undertake the task of training the electorate to realise the importance of the vote. You must create men who will be responsible to their electorates, who will be competent and who will have the power to carry out their demands.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** : That will take some time.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar** : No, it will not take any time. And it is only then, when such a state of affairs comes into existence, that we can do

[Mr. M. V. Abhyankar.]

something worth doing in these Legislatures, something better than merely fiercely and impotently criticising those that are in power to-day, those who are the masters of the situation to-day.

Then, Sir, the present Government of India Act was considered by some amongst us as the great gift of the British people to India. But even those who were once charmed with this gift horse have now been thoroughly disillusioned after having looked into its mouth.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** (Rajshahi Division : Muhammadan Rural) : Where were you then ?

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar** : I am coming to you Mr. Kabeer-ud-Din Ahmed presently. (Laughter.)

To-day I see very few on the side of the present constitution except those that are attached by golden hooks and they indeed inquire nothing more about any question, but what are the commands of the day ? And those who oppose this amendment demanding freedom for the people of India, like my friend Mr. Kabeer-ud-Din Ahmed, I will freely admit, have more cogent reason, because it is they from whom our bondage arises.

Then, Sir, the speech of the Honourable the Commerce Member, as he delivered it yesterday, I think did him great honour and very great honour indeed, because he has upheld the traditions of the group to which he belongs. Whoever heard of political reform coming out of bureaucracy and particularly an alien bureaucracy ? His devotion to the people of this country, his devotion to the masses of this country, is, I should say, something rather remarkable ; but, unfortunately, Sir, devotion has often been the common veil of pernicious designs, and his speech yesterday reminded me of the wag in the play who follows an honest gentleman with " God bless and preserve your honour's worship " while he is slyly picking his pocket ! The Honourable the Commerce Member yesterday repeated the old falsehood of the theory of Britain's trust of India. He repeated and repeated it more than once. He said that the British were the trustees and until their trust was fulfilled,—and not one day before that,—they would not depart from this country. I am sorry the Honourable the Commerce Member is not present here. I should have liked to have asked the Honourable Member who created this trust. Did God one fine night whisper it into his ears and hand it over to him ? It is not a trust, it is a huge fraud, a gigantic fraud. He said that the new generation does not know what it means for a man's life to be saved or a woman's honour to be saved. These are his words. Are we safe under the British bureaucracy and under the present Government in our own house ? We are shot down like dogs as we have been in Jallianwalabagh. Even the best amongst us, that gentleman over there, the leader of our Party whom to-day you call your Honourable friend, was his liberty safe in his own country ? None of us can escape the kind attentions of our paternal Government when it means to bestow them upon us.

Then, Sir, the Honourable the Home Member said that India was such a vast country, India was populated with so many millions of people, that it would not be possible for a democratic government to survive in this country.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** (Home Member) : I said nothing of the sort, Sir.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar** : I beg the Honourable Member's pardon. It was the Commerce Member who said it.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** (Finance Member) : I may say on behalf of the Commerce Member that he said nothing of the sort.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar** : He did say so. I have just read a copy of his speech. He gave us the analogy of the South American States and he said that India was such a big country, populated with so many people, that it was not possible for any democratic government to thrive in this country.

**Mr. H. Tonkinson** (Home Department : Nominated Official) : May I say, Sir, that the Honourable the Commerce Member did not say it was not possible.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar** : He said it was a new experiment. That means exactly the same thing. When you say it is an experiment, you say at least that it has not been possible. Then, Sir, I would tell him that the history of the world is not finished yet. Many chapters are yet to be added to it and we may be able to add, by the grace of God, one more glorious chapter to it. The whole of India will stand as one man in a democratic government and then her power would be such that they would not be able to meet it. Then, Sir, the Honourable Commerce Member said that Indians were divided, that there was no unanimity in India, and unless we got that, it would not be possible for self-government to be established here. This is an old hackneyed argument. I should like to make him a present here of a passage giving the conditions that prevailed in his own country, when they were fit and quite fit for self-government. (*An Honourable Member* : "Are you talking of England or Scotland?") I am talking of England. Lord Dunraven in "Legacy of Past Years" says :

"The Penal Code came into existence under William immediately after the Revolution, and was extended under Anne and the first two Georges. It affected all human action and endeavour in every form of life. Catholics were prohibited from sitting in Parliament, and were deprived of the franchise. They were excluded from the Army, Navy, the Magistracy, the Bar, the Bench. They could not sit on Grand Juries or Vestries, or act as sheriffs or solicitors. The possession of arms was forbidden to them. They could not be freemen of any corporate body, and were allowed to carry on trade only on payment of various impositions. They could not buy land nor receive it as a gift from Protestants; nor hold life annuities or mortgages or leases for more than thirty-one years, or any lease if the profit exceed one-third of the rent. Catholics were deprived of the liberty to leave property in land by will. Their estates were divided among all their sons unless the eldest became a Protestant, in which case the whole estate devolved upon him. Any Protestant who informed upon a Catholic for purchasing land became the proprietor of the estate. No Catholic was allowed to possess a horse of greater value than £5, and any Protestant could take the horse for that sum. A Protestant woman landowner was, if she married a Catholic, deprived of her property; mixed marriages celebrated by a Catholic priest were declared null. A wife or child professing Protestantism was at once taken from under the Catholic husband or father's control, and the Chancellor made an assignment of income to them. Catholic children under age at the time of the Catholic father's death were placed under the guardianship of Protestants. Catholics were excluded from seats of learning. They could not keep schools or teach or act as guardians of children."

This was the condition, Sir, of your own country when you thought that you were quite fit for self-government and were having it.

**Mr. President :** Order, order, the Honourable Member's time is up.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar :** I will not then quote other passages, Sir, since my time is up. Indians have been led in the past to believe that the sole aim of the British rule in India was their welfare. This theory which was nothing more than a mask to hide the true character of British rule, has now been completely torn asunder. Dreamy and contemplative India cannot be deluded any more. Even the most Moderate of Moderates among us, as could be seen from the speeches of Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and Mr. Rangachariar, has lost all his faith in the British people. At last he has found out that they are not gods, which he once believed them to be, and that they will not voluntarily forego the gains of power from considerations of mere justice. The Moderates no longer indulge, as was said by my Honourable friend Mr. Rangachariar yesterday, in the phrase "British justice." If, and the "if" is a very big one.....

**Mr. President :** Order, order. I cannot allow the Honourable Member to go on. Already I have given him two minutes more.

**Mr. M. V. Abhyankar :** I will finish in one minute, Sir. If, and the "if" is a very big one, there is such a thing as British justice, I would like to know from this House if the Irish people and the white people of Kenya had no faith in it. I can assure this House that they had plenty of it. Only whenever they wanted to appeal to the sense of justice of the British people, they also appealed to some other sense, so that two or more senses quite awake to the situation, and acting together, might result in some little justice. That is the way in the British Empire their own people have of getting things done, and that is the way they proceed to their business.

One last sentence, Sir, and I have done. We have a system of Government in India to-day which is treason to God's law, because under it the noble, free, virile, fearless, which is the red blood of a nation has become torpid and nothing can compensate us for so terrible a wrong. Wounded self-respect, complete deterioration in the manhood of the nation, economic evils of vast magnitude inseparable from foreign domination have become intolerable. The galling chains of subjection can no longer be endured by us, and we have made up our minds, I should tell the Honourable the Home Member in the end, to break those chains in spite of him and his Government. This is a critical juncture in the relations between England and India; we have now reached a stage when it is necessary for our rulers, to take advice in time before it is too late and take a bold step to bring about a rapprochement, to conciliate the people of this country, and prevent any further alienation between the two countries, and unless this is done, who can foretell what is in the womb of futurity? We on our side can only trust in God and seek from Him further light on the subject.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao** (Godavari *cum* Kistna : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, several instructive and interesting speeches have been made both yesterday and to-day in regard to the general political situation in this country and to the issues that arise on the report which is associated with the name of my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman. Sir, in the concluding observations made by my

Honourable friend he expressed some amount of satisfaction that, before the end of his official career in this country, he would be able to put the recommendations associated with his name and those of the majority of his Committee into.....

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** No, Sir, I never said that ; I said I hoped I might be able to do some small thing to improve the administrative machinery.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao :** Sir, both my Honourable friend and my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes referred to their long, and if I may say so, their distinguished services to this country, and if at the end of their careers in India they can only back up what I may call the very insignificant proposals which are embodied in the majority report, I am really sorry for them. Sir, the Government of India is now practically in the hands of a governing class. The governing class have decided the destiny of this country on all previous occasions, and Sir, the new Councils have been in existence for the last five years, and looking at the fact that the growth of public opinion is also a deciding factor in these matters, I at any rate expected that, whatever the merits of the proposals of the majority committee might be, my Honourable friend would take into consideration the general public opinion in regard to this question. Sir, almost every one of the witnesses before that Committee urged that dyarchy is a failure, that the inherent defects of the existing machinery are such that it is impossible to rely upon it as machinery of administration in the provinces, and that the principle of responsibility should also be introduced in the Central Government. Amongst those who have urged this view are the *ex*-Ministers in the provinces, and looking at the composition of the Committee, one of its Members, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, was connected with the Government of India at one time, and the latest addition to the Government of India, Sir Fazl-i-Hussain, has urged the transfer of all subjects in the provinces and also responsibility in the Central Government. So much, Sir, for the evidence. As regards the way in which these proposals were generally received in the country, there is not one single responsible public association or body or responsible organ of the Press which endorsed the proposals of the majority. In these circumstances, Sir, it is certainly most surprising that my Honourable friend should have the hardihood to get up in this House and ask us to accept the proposals embodied in the report of the majority.

Sir, having said this much, I may also point out that my Honourable friend himself was aware that one of his proposals would be endorsed by Indian public opinion, and the minority have also said the same thing. At page 186 they say :

“ The Majority Committee say in their Report that no recommendations within the terms of reference would satisfy Indian public opinion. We desire to express our complete agreement with this opinion, though we do not agree with some of the members of the majority, who hold that there is a section of Indian politicians which will recognise that a constitutional advance has been effected if more subjects are transferred, particularly when the list of recommended transfers referred to above is borne in mind.”

Therefore it is clear that both the majority and the minority are of opinion that nothing done within the terms of reference will meet with the approval of Indian public opinion, and yet the Honourable Member, conscious of the fact that nothing done within the terms of reference will meet with general approval asks us to endorse his recommendations.

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao:]

Sir, apart from these general observations, my Honourable friend has skillfully avoided making any reference to any of the recommendations of the majority of the Committee. That is another argument in support of the view that he did not think it worth his while that he should elaborate and justify those recommendations in this Assembly. I do not wish to weary the House with the details, but if you look at the details, you will see that a pious observation or recommendation that the Meston Committee's Award should be revised, or that the Members of the Executive Council should not be in charge of any of the spending departments, or that the Devolution Rules should provide for Financial Advisers, or that the separation of accounts from audit should be given effect to, these and other recommendations in regard to the provinces will not carry us any further than we are at present. In regard to the Meston Settlement, the recommendation is qualified with those familiar words that the revision should take place "as soon as a favourable opportunity occurs." These words are familiar to us in connection with other pledges which have been made in regard to one of the burning questions of the day....

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** Does the Honourable Member want that revision earlier ?

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao :** I am merely discussing the views of the majority. My own views are well known, and my Honourable friend knows what I feel on the subject.

**Mr. H. Tonkinson :** What did the minority say on the same point ?

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao :** Even if the majority and the minority may agree, that does not mean it is a sound recommendation.

**Mr. K. Ahmed :** What is the use of quoting those whom you do not approve ?

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao :** My Honourable friend has a licence in this House which no other Member enjoys and I do not think it is necessary for me....

**Mr. President :** I would ask the Honourable Member to ignore Mr. Ahmed's interruptions.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao :** Sir, so much for my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman. My friend Sir Charles Innes made some observations about the size of India as a reason for the view that responsible government is unsuited for India or very difficult to introduce. I do not know, Sir, whether at any future time India will become smaller than it is now. Does my Honourable friend suggest that on account of the size of India there should be two Central Governments in this country ? It is impossible to understand the relevance of the size of India in a consideration of this question. There are Provinces and provincial administrations and if necessary the question of the redistribution of provincial areas may be taken up and decided. Then my Honourable friend referred to the social structure of India and also to what he called the want of fundamental unity in this country. This argument has often been brought forward. On the occasion when Lord Cross's Act was under discussion the same arguments were used. The communal differences, caste differences, religious differences, these and others which exist in this great continent have been trotted out. There was again evidence of this when

the Act of 1909 was under discussion. Then on the occasion when the Parliamentary Joint Committee investigated the matter all these differences and communal difficulties also came up for consideration ; and in 1924 when the Resolution about Dominion status was under discussion the same views were expressed. Nevertheless every time the Government of India, or rather His Majesty's Government, has taken a definite step forward. The Preamble to the Government of India Act says that the goal of His Majesty's Government is the establishment of responsible government in the country. Therefore, Sir, I really do not understand why the same argument which has been urged on so many different occasions when a definite step forward has been taken should again be used on the present occasion to prevent a further step in this same direction being taken. So much for these differences and difficulties. Perhaps in this connection I cannot do better than invite the attention of Honourable Members to what Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, the late Prime Minister, said in regard to this question during the debate on the budget estimates in the House of Commons on Colonel Wedgewood's motion :

“ Having said that, I should like to make our position clear upon another point, which is very germane to that. We are constantly being told that India is not a nation, that there are so many hundred tongues and dialects, so many religions, so many sects, so many castes always coming up again and again. All I am concerned with is this, that I will defy anybody to turn to me a page or a section in the history of India, where the life of India was running at the full, where in peace or in war, turn to me one single section of those religious philosophies that are really the basis of the life of the Hindu, and point out to me anything where there is not underlying all the assumption, the aim of Indian life was unity within the peninsula. It has been the aim of everyone, of every conqueror, to unify that peninsula. It has been the aim of every statesman. The Hindu, who utters his religious prayers at the Ganges, the whole conception of the Indian mind is unity, and the fact of a common habitation in the peninsula has gone far to remove, at any rate amongst the sections that are creating our political problems—I say that amongst those people the difference between Hindu and Muhammadan is steadily being bridged over, and the leaders of both sections are constantly in the same category.”

Sir, this is the view which my Honourable friends opposite should take and they should not urge the same arguments and the same differences which have been referred to on previous occasions.

Sir, I do not wish to take up the few minutes at my disposal with any further observations in regard to either of my Honourable friends opposite. I only wish to refer to one aspect of the scheme which has been embodied in the amendment of my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru, and that is the aspect to which my Honourable friend Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar made some reference yesterday. Our point is that the whole scheme of the Government of India Act, 1919, is unsatisfactory. We say that unless the revenues of India are vested in the Government of India and are administered under a responsible legislature, there cannot be any responsibility in financial administration and no other change except this will meet the requirements of the situation. Sir, when the Act of 1858 was enacted, there were at that time both the Board of Control and the Court of Directors, and the Council of the Government of India was really a reproduction of the Board of Control and the Court of Directors. Even at that time, Sir, many people accustomed to the free institutions of Great Britain had great difficulty in reconciling themselves to the creation of a Council at the India Office. A good many of the Members who took part in the debate on the India Bill in 1858 deprecated the creation of a bureaucracy at the India Office. They said that the mismanagement of colonial affairs which was then present in the minds of the people was

[Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao.]

due entirely to the bureaucracy at the Colonial Office ; and in his famous report on the affairs of British North America Lord Durham complained that owing to repeated changes in the political chiefs at the Colonial Office the real management of the Colonies fell into the hands of the permanent officials, and this was felt by the Colonies as a great grievance ; and a group of British reformers at that time who were working with Lord Durham held exactly the same views.

**Mr. President :** It is a very unpleasant thing for the President to have to remind Honourable Members of the time limit, but I hope the Honourable Member will bring his remarks to a close.

**Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao :** Well, Sir, I only wish to point out, if you will give me one minute, that the abolition of the India Office was advocated also by the Crewe Committee. They said :

" We reiterate however our opinion that the present is the most opportune time, both for political and constitutional reasons, for marking the inception of the Reforms by a definite and unmistakable change in the Home Administration of India."

They suggested that the India Council should be purely an advisory body and that the statutory functions of that body should be abolished. If I had the time I would have shown that all the clauses of this amendment have been discussed by Indian public opinion during the last 40 years. The abolition of the India Office was referred to in the first Indian National Congress. It was agreed to in 1916. It was urged before the Joint Parliamentary Committee ; and if my Honourable friend, Sir Alexander Muddiman who is generally acquainted with the political literature of this country, would take the trouble he will see that this amendment represents the general consensus of opinion in India. We are perfectly certain that the conditions imposed by the Secretary of State in his speech have been fulfilled in regard to the amendment which is now before the House.

**Mr. Chaman Lall (West Punjab : Non-Muhammadan) :** Sir, it is with the greatest diffidence that I rise to-day to take part in this debate. I am convinced that the atmosphere which surrounds the proceedings of this House on this question is surcharged with unreality. There, on the one side, you have the Treasury Benches convinced of their might, of their great power. There, on the other side, you have the representatives of the people of India convinced of the righteousness of their cause. On that side, Sir, you have nothing but brute force. On this side, we have nothing but the Will of the people. You happen to be convinced at the present moment that the Will of the people is not strong enough to assert itself, and it is because of that that you here in this House, Lord Birkenhead in the House of Lords and His Excellency the Viceroy in opening this Session, take up the attitude that there is nothing doing as far as the demand for political freedom is concerned. You may be right or you may be wrong ; events and the future will justify you or justify us. But let me at the outset give

12 Noon.

you this warning : do not depend too much upon the brute force that you command now. That force, that power, that strength is a double-edged sword. You may use it to put us down now, but in the end it will result in nothing less than the destruction of the present system of government. You are challenging constitutional struggle in India to-day. You are trying, you are doing your worst, to destroy that constitutional struggle. No man, Sir— and I address these words in all earnestness—no man in India knows what the end of this may be. We are faced to-day, not with

the issue which the Honourable the Commerce Member presented to us, but with the issue which the Honourable the Home Member refused to face. The issue is very simple. Last year, when we the Swarajists came into the Assembly, we came with the determination either to mend the Assembly or to end it; and as a beginning we presented you with our demand—a very modest and moderate demand. You were at the moment under the tutelage, the Government of India were under the tutelage of a party which was supposed to represent the cause of righteousness as far as India was concerned—the Labour Party; and under the pressure of the Labour Party you were compelled, let me remind you, to set going your committee known as the Muddiman Committee. But with it you gave an undertaking to this House that if in the examination of the constitution of India defects were discovered which would make it impossible for the constitution to work properly, then the matter would be left open. What I want to draw the attention of the House to is this, that the overwhelming evidence which you took in that committee proves that the working of this constitution has become impossible. You, Sir, have not faced that issue. That issue is perfectly clear. The people of India say to you “We cannot work this constitution; there is no popular will behind it; there is no popular sanction behind it; the constitution itself has been proved by evidence to be unworkable.” Yet you will persist because you know that you have brute force on your side in telling us that we must continue to work this constitution, that we must continue to co-operate with you in working this reforms scheme. What is it that you mean by co-operation? Co-operation with what? With a scheme which every witness, every Minister who gave evidence, barring one, and gave willing co-operation to you for three years, has said to be unworkable, a scheme which it is impossible to regard as one which would lead to the success of the reforms? And yet, Lord Birkenhead, after a very painful period of intellectual parturition, comes out with the statement that he expects the people of India to co-operate before he could do anything for the people. What is it that you are demanding of us? A one-sided bargain: you say “Give up your fight; give up your non-co-operation outside the Councils and inside: come to us like beggars; eat humble pie, and then, and then only, in the might of the British Empire, in the wisdom of the British Empire, we may consider at some future date your claims.” That, Sir, is a one-sided bargain that you are asking of us to make. There is no man from the leader of my Party, from the leader of the Independents in this House downwards, no politically-minded intelligent man in the country, who is prepared to accept such an ignominious and humiliating position for himself or for his country. Lord Birkenhead said—and let me remind those who may still have doubts as to the meaning that His Lordship wished to convey to his audience—he said:

“Conformably with the principles laid down in the Preamble one constitution or another might at one time or another be attempted. Experience, educating us, or informing our critics in India might induce us to make an amendment here or an advance or a variation there. But the whole message as we understand it of our situation in India with all it involves, in the storied past, in the critical present and in the incalculable future is to be read in that Preamble.”

He says that India must be tied to the apron strings of the British Empire until it pleases the rulers of the British Empire to take notice of us.

His Excellency Lord Reading supplemented that and said:

“My Government and I”—and this is absolutely definite—“after most carefully weighing their views have reached the conclusion that the moment for an inquiry has not yet arrived.”

[Mr. Chaman Lall.]

That, Sir, is the situation to-day, the constitutional position. As far as the political situation is concerned, everybody knows that a constant and ceaseless struggle has been waged against British Imperialism in India. It has been waged by every political party in India, in different ways no doubt, by the non-co-operators, by the Swarajists and by the Moderates. Is there any man in his senses in India to-day who believes that that fight is going to come to an end? We may not have the sanction behind us at the present moment. But there is no man who believes that the time will not come, and very shortly come, when we shall have the sanction behind us. We do not intend, Sir, at least the Swarajists do not intend to commit political *hari kari*; we are not going to efface ourselves by merely listening to these sweet words which mean nothing. Your policy is a policy of do-nothing; your policy is a policy of repression; your policy is a policy of tyranny undiluted, because you know that you have the power of your sword. Our policy is a policy of suffering; our policy is one of organisation; we shall go to our people; we shall educate our people; we shall organise our people and will make it impossible for this Government to sit upon the high pedestal upon which it is sitting at the present moment. Just as Humpty Dumpty, as the old maxim says, sat upon a wall, so the British Government are sitting upon the wall. But remember the time will come when Humpty Dumpty must have a fall, and neither the King's men nor any power on God's earth will be able to set you up again.

I heard the Honourable the Commerce Member say: "We are the trustees of the people of India." Trustees of India—are you the Lord's appointed and the Lord's appointed? Who appointed you trustees of India? Robbers and thieves, that is what the British people in India have been. They have not been trustees of India. You have broken every pledge that you gave us, broken it to the ear of the peoples of the world; you have treated with contempt. . . .

**Mr. President** : Order, order. The Chair must discourage this practice of constantly and repeatedly addressing the Treasury Benches instead of the Chair.

**Mr. Chaman Lall** : Sir, I was addressing you and through you the Treasury Bench. I can find no fitter medium through which I could convey my impressions and my thoughts to the Treasury Bench than through you. Here are statements that show how the British Government in India have treated their trusteeship. Here is the view of His Grace the Duke of Argyll :

"We have not fulfilled our duty or the promises and engagements which we have made with the people of India."

That is a very high authority who says that you have not fulfilled your promises, that you have been promise-breakers to the people of India. Here is another authority which says :

"The English rulers stand sentinel at the front door of India challenging the whole world that they do and shall protect India against all comers, and themselves carry away by a backdoor the very treasure they stand sentinel to protect."

Trustees ! Trustees of a treasure which they are protecting for their own good. Sir, let me remind you of what Major Baring said. He said that "the extreme poverty of the mass of the people" of India was a fact. Sir George Campbell, reiterating that, said that "the bulk of the people are paupers". Mr. Robertson, who was Agricultural Reporter to the

Government of Madras, said, speaking of the agricultural labourer in Madras, that

“ His condition is a disgrace to any country calling itself civilised. In the best of season, the gross income of himself and his family does not exceed 3*d.* per day throughout the year and in a bad season their circumstances are most deplorable. I have seen something of Ireland, in which the condition of affairs bears some resemblance to those of this country but the condition of the agricultural population of Ireland is vastly superior to the condition of the similar classes in this country.”

Here is Lord Lawrence, once Viceroy of India, saying “ that the mass of the people were so miserably poor that they had barely the means of subsistence.” Here is Sir William Hunter telling us this. He is the best defender of British Administration in India. He says “ that 40,000,000 of the people of British India go through life on insufficient food.”

That is your trusteeship. You are welcome to your trusteeship.

**Mr. President :** Order, order.

**Mr. Chaman Lall :** I did not catch the interruption.

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member must address his remarks to the Chair and not to the Treasury Benches so repeatedly.

**Mr. Chaman Lall :** I want a definite reply from the Honourable the Home Member when he gets up to speak. I want him to enlighten the House as to how he has fulfilled his trusteeship to the people of India. Statements have been made in the House of Commons that in India the trusteeship of the British people in India is so construed as to mean that no support, no sustenance is to be given to the poor people of this country, that the masses are to be ignored and that the masses are never to be taken into consideration. Here in this House you have 20 representatives of the vested interests in India. Have you one representative of the masses and yet you call yourselves the trustees of the Indian people. Never have I known such a hypocrisy of trusteeship. In the House of Commons, it was stated that out of a thousand children born in 1922, 667 died within a year of their birth. What was the trustee doing then? Sleeping a sound sleep ?

“ When I consider life (Reforms) is all but a cheat,  
Yet fooled with hope and men favour the deceit,  
Trust on and to-morrow will repay,  
But to-morrow is falsier than the previous day.”

This is the condition of British Government in India. Politically, constitutionally and socially this administration is a bankrupt administration. As I have said on another occasion it has no sanction behind it but the sanction of brute force. No doubt you hold the sword in your hand. The time will come when the people of India may be driven not to actual violence but to something worse than actual violence and you may repent that day when that situation arises. I do not want that situation to arise. Let me be clear about it. My leader does not want that situation to arise. He has held before you the hand of friendship. If you turn that gesture down, it will certainly be a day which the British Government and the Government of India and the whole British Empire will repent. I do not approve of violence. We are pledged to non-violence. It is the British Government in India that hold the brief for violence, which always dangle their sword before us. We ask you to remember that in presenting this case, Pandit Motilal Nehru has done so in a meek, mild and humble fashion. It is the first occasion when the Swaraj Party as a party

[Mr. Chaman Lall.]

has come out and accepted the programme not only of Independents in this House but actually of the National Liberal Federation. It is to show the British Government in India that we as a party stand united with all parties in India and the difference between us and the Moderates and other parties in India is this, that when the time comes for the sanction to be enforced we shall be there to enforce it. The National Liberal Federation and the Moderates at the present moment say exactly what we are saying.

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member has already exceeded his time limit.

**Mr. Chaman Lall :** I have no intention to continue, but I will just say one parting word and that last parting word is this—that in my opinion, in the opinion of my Party and in the opinion of the leader of my Party, we and the British Government are at the parting of the ways now. The struggle is bound to continue; if this hand of friendship which is held out to the British Government is not accepted. In one hand the British Government hold the sceptre which is the symbol of tyranny and on the other hand they hold the sceptre which is the symbol of friendship. We ask you to hold out to us the hand of friendship, because we are offering you our friendship. You want our co-operation. We are willing to co-operate only on the condition that you accept the principles underlying that co-operation. We cannot place our life and our liberty in the hands of the British Government, of Lord Birkenhead or Lord Reading or any system of Government that may be in existence here or in England. We want a definite announcement on the part of the authorities that they are prepared to accept the principles that are laid down in the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru. If that is conceded, if that is accepted, I see no difficulty whatsoever in a reconciliation being arrived at, but if it is not, take it from me that we shall go to the country and raise up a storm against you—a storm that you shall never be able to meet with any sort of gesture except the gesture of defeat writ large upon your face.

**Mr. President :** Before Sir Basil Blackett speaks, I may explain that the Chair does not object to a Member occasionally addressing the Treasury Benches. That may well be construed as addressing the Treasury Benches through the Chair. But when a Member addresses the Treasury Benches repeatedly and all the time he is speaking without any regard to the existence of the Chair, the Chair must intervene and take exception to such conduct.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** I have no desire to ignore the Chair. Indeed the present occupancy of the Chair is one of my strongest arguments in answer to the rather pessimistic claims that are put forward by some of the more vociferous speakers on behalf of the other Benches that there has been no progress and that the reforms are worth nothing and that the Government do nothing but sit still. (*An Honourable Member :* "That is in spite of you.") I do not rise for the purpose of making a long speech and I shall do my best to keep within the time limit. One or two challenges have been thrown out to the Finance Member in the course of the debate which I feel it is perhaps desirable that I shall not entirely ignore. Let me begin with my Honourable friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar. He quoted Sir Alfred Mond's rather pessimistic

remarks about the working of the reforms. They were based on Sir Alfred Mond's experiences of the budget debates of March 1924. Sir Alfred Mond, the Welsh statesman, was nearly as pessimistic as the Madras statesman, who has a special aptitude for pessimism (*Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar* : "Robust.") Robust pessimism. But I think that those who look back to the debates of February and March 1924 and contrast those debates with the debates of to-day and with what has happened in the meanwhile will realise that there has been a very great change.

Even my Honourable friend who has just spoken, and who has such a magnificent gift of eloquence and so little to say—(Laughter) has learnt quite considerable lessons since February 1924, and Mr. Abhyankar also has come on quite considerably ; they have both retained their old style, but there is very much more substance in what they have to tell us. They have learnt a good deal by co-operation, for I think that the real lesson of the last 18 months is that there has been a very great deal of co-operation. (Hear, hear.) There was co-operation in passing the Steel Protection Act, there was co-operation in effecting the separation of the railway from the general finances, there was co-operation in connection with the last Budget, and I believe that the historians of the second Assembly will eventually say that it had as good a record as the first in the matter of co-operation. So I refuse to be pessimistic.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar** (Tanjore *cum* Trichinopoly : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : It depends on what you are going to do.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : Several speakers have referred to that passage in the amendment which deals with the transfer of control of the purse from the Secretary of State in Council and the British Parliament to the Governor General in Council and the Indian Parliament. Now Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar spoke as if there was no kind of control of the purse in India, as if the Secretary of State in Council were the absolute, autocratic master in this respect. Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar has been sitting for the last month on the Public Accounts Committee, and I take this opportunity of saying that he has been an extraordinarily valuable colleague. He has I think in connection with the Public Accounts Committee obtained very many proofs that the reforms have transferred a very potent weapon to this Assembly, for control over Government finance, even in the non-voted portions.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar** : May I say one word of explanation, Sir. What I said was not that this Assembly had not any statutory powers under the present Government of India Act ; what I said was that despite those powers which have been conferred on the Assemblies in India, the Secretary of State in Council to-day possesses the power of overriding the whole Budget of the Government of India under some other rules or provisions.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : My answer would be that he cannot quote a single case in which that has been done, and that any arbitrary attempt to exercise that power would immediately bring its own retribution.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar** : But, Sir, the law is there and there were instances in the past.....

**Mr. President :** Order, order. Sir Basil Blackett.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett :** Sir, I have only a quarter of an hour, and I will do my best to keep within it, but I cannot if I am continually interrupted. Therefore, I say that whatever the technical explanation of the position may be, there has been a tremendous advance and a tremendous advance is going on all the time. I have not got the figures, but I am sure that figures comparing the numbers of Indians in high responsible positions in the Government of India five years ago and to-day would show very remarkable results.

Let me now come to Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas. He was anxious to prove that it was necessary in the interests of the commerce of India that there should be a Government responsible to the people. He quoted several instances. Now I do not want to go into those particular instances just now. We shall have a discussion on the cotton excise duty before very long apparently, and the other subjects are not strictly germane, if one gets deep into them, to the discussion now going on. But I should like to ask my Honourable friend, Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha, or my friend, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, whether they are quite sure that a Government responsible to this Assembly would have done what Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas apparently wishes, and guided our currency and exchange policy entirely according to the views of the particular section of Bombay. I have a much better opinion of the Indian capacity for self-government than that. I am quite sure that if there had been a ministry responsible to a Parliament, that ministry would have endeavoured to conduct its currency and exchange policy very much on the lines that this Government have conducted it for the interests of the people as a whole. If then Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas is really right in the complaint that he makes against this Government that it has not done exactly what a particular section of Bombay has wanted in various matters, that surely is a strong argument, a much stronger argument in Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas's mouth than it ought to be, for a ministry representing something more than this Assembly at present represents : for if Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas is right that a ministry appointed by this Assembly would have neglected the interests of India as a whole to the extent that he desired, then Sir Charles Innes must be right in saying that a Government such as now exists is required which represents the people of India somewhat more widely. I do not agree with that argument in this case because I do not believe that Sir Purshotamdas Thakurdas was right in saying that the present Government have neglected the interests of India in the matter of commerce, or that a Government responsible to this Assembly would have been so unwise as to adopt entirely the views represented by the Bombay Merchants' Chamber and Bureau. I have a great affection for that Chamber—(Hear, hear)—for I know whenever I visit Bombay that I shall have a lively discussion and shall meet some live friends there. But I do claim that the Government of India have the right and have successfully exercised the right of representing wider interests than those which are sometimes pressed with great vigour by that particular body.

The amendment before us to-day is rather a difficult one to understand. I am waiting with great interest to hear how Mr. Jinnah will explain how it is in accordance with the views of the minority report on the Reforms Inquiry Committee. Of course it has one great virtue : it

is open to a Swarajist interpretation, to an Independent interpretation, and to a Moderate interpretation, and as far as I can make out the three interpretations are not the same. (*An Honourable Member* : "They are incompatible.")

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** (Bombay City : Muhammadan Urban) : It is a crowning achievement.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : They are entirely incompatible and will thereby salve the conscience of a large number of people holding entirely different views when they vote for the same Resolution and mean entirely different things. (*Several Honourable Members* : "No, no.") But let me try and put this amendment in the form in which I imagine it really is meant to go. I do not pretend that it says so. (*An Honourable Member* : "Would you like it to say so?") But it has I think a least common denominator. It begins by saying,—“ We do not object to most of the detailed recommendations in the majority report, but we do not think that they are of great importance. We do object to the principle of the majority report, that is, we do not agree that it is worth while making a further effort to work the existing constitution and tinker with it (*An Honourable Member* : "Quite right.") Our view is that the constitution is faulty—and here I have to interpret a little—and we ought immediately to appoint a statutory commission or a Royal Commission or some other suitable agency for I think the words "other suitable agency" in the amendment are meant to hint at a Royal Commission to reconsider the constitution. (*Mr. M. A. Jinnah* : "A bad constitution.") There is no need to insert additional epithets. Then it goes on to say : "The idea of the new constitution we have in mind is something on the lines laid down in the clauses of the amendment and we should like the statutory commission, when appointed, to consider that line as being the most hopeful line of advance. We should even be willing to insert a provision for a veto here and there and other things suitable in a transitional stage." That is how I interpret the amendment, as Mr. Jinnah perhaps would put it. I do say that that is not the amendment as it is down on the paper. If that had been the form of the amendment and if this Assembly had come forward and said : "Of course this cannot be done all at once, and for the rest of the life of this Assembly and for the beginning of the next, we will co-operate to the best of our ability", then instead of being, as I see it, in form an entire rejection of the invitation from the British Government and from Lord Birkenhead and from His Excellency the Viceroy to co-operate, it would have been a material contribution to discussion.

**Mr. A. Rngaswami Iyengar** : Will you frame an amendment and propose it ?

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : I am not good enough at drafting amendments. That seems to be the particular gift of the Whip of the Swarajist Party and others. I do not wish to exceed my time limit or to go further into the matter than that ; it does seem to me that there is really a great opportunity before us at the present time. It is not so very long before in any circumstance the statutory commission must be appointed. There are an immense number of details in the working out of a new constitution which require study before that statutory commission comes. This amendment—this is another striking point about it as I understand it—states quite definitely that we are

[Sir Basil Blackett.]

satisfied that constitution on western lines is what India wants. (*An Honourable Member* : "No.") That is what the amendment says. I do not know of course what anybody who votes for it may want. The amendment says that the future constitution of India must be on western models. Now, it has often been said that the present constitution is an experiment. It is an experiment to my mind not nearly so much on the question of the capacity of Indians for self-government, as in the possibility of adapting to the conditions of a very great Continent in the East the ideas and methods of western responsible democratic government.

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar** : This is a hybrid affair.

**The Honourable Sir Basil Blackett** : It may indeed be said that the amendment is hybrid, but, as I understand it, the united wisdom of the three parties in the House comes forward and says we want a constitution on the western model and this is our general idea of it.

There are details in this constitution that I should like to deal with. It suggests that provincial autonomy should be immediately granted. I think "provincial autonomy" is a nice phrase that hides two quite different thoughts. There is the question of making the Provincial Governments absolutely responsible to the provincial Legislatures in the provincial sphere. There is the quite separate question of what powers should be granted to the Provincial Governments. Provincial autonomy is a subject which has taxed the wisdom of the framers of all constitutions, federal constitutions, in the world. It has been well said that the constitution of the United States of America all but broke down over the question of State rights when it was being framed; one of the most disastrous civil wars was fought on the question of State rights and the question is entirely unsolved to-day. That is..... (*An Honourable Member* : "Slavery" *Another Honourable Member* : "And yet they go on.") The question of slavery was the immediate occasion, but it was quite incidental according to the views of American historians and the real cause was the question of State rights. The question of provincial autonomy is one of the subjects on which we might seriously think in the interval before it is possible to take the next step. There are many other subjects of the same sort; one of them is Mr. Rangaswami Iyengar's own subject, the question of the financial relations of provinces to the Central Government and of the Central Government to Parliament. However, I see, Mr. President, that I shall shortly be putting myself under your ban if I continue. I will therefore content myself with making one more appeal to the House. Let them think again about this offer of co-operation. If they really mean an offer to co-operate by this rather catholic (though catholic is perhaps dangerous adjective to use to-day) amendment, let them think whether they cannot frame it or at any rate explain it in a form that will not be what it is at present, a direct rejection of the offer of the Secretary of State to consider any constitution that may have had behind it wide support of Indian opinion and a direct rejection of the Preamble of the Government of India Act, which says that the manner of any advance must be determined by the British Parliament.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : I am very doubtful whether this debate will be at all fruitful in the end. Sir, I feel at this moment that the atmos-

phere is very gloomy and the political horizon is certainly very dark. But in the first instance, let us try and understand what is the question before the House to-day. Sir, the history of this question is a very old and long one, but I do not propose to go into that history beyond 1919. In 1919, when the Government of India Act of 1919 was passed, I think the Government know perfectly well, that there was a large body of people who were not satisfied with the Act of 1919, but, nevertheless they said that they would try to work it for what it is worth. The Government knew that perfectly well and Lord Birkenhead could not be so badly informed—although he has not referred to it in his speech—and I am sure that in those conversations which he had with Lord Reading in England he must have been fully apprised of those factors and situation. Not only that, but they are mentioned in the Muddiman Committee's Report, which, I believe, His Lordship Lord Birkenhead must have read. The reasons why the non-co-operation movement started, and found its existence and was carried on were the extraordinary events which moved the blood of every man, woman and child in this country. (Hear, hear.) Sir, the Punjab question no longer exists: Jallianwala Bagh we cannot forgive; but we are willing to forget. The Treaty of Sevres is gone; the Khilafat question does not exist in that acute form. But, Sir, the question of Swaraj remains. Now let us recall the recent history of this question in 1921, what did this Assembly, composed of men who came here to co-operate with the Government at the risk of obloquy and odium of public opinion, do in 1921?

In 1921 a Resolution was moved and the Government practically accepted that Resolution. That Resolution ran as follows:

“That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he should convey to the Secretary of State for India the view of this Assembly that the progress made by India on the path of responsible government warrants re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1929.”

Well, Sir, to that we got a reply from His Majesty's Government and there were three objections raised. The first reason was that the progress was possible under the existing constitution. This House will mark the words that the progress was possible under the existing constitution. The second reason was that the merits and capabilities of the electorate had not been tested by time and experience. And the third reason was that the new constitutional machinery had still to be tested in its working as a whole. To that the answer was given by this Assembly by a large vote on a Resolution in February 1924, which was accepted. That Resolution, as amended by the amendment of my friend Pandit Motilal Nehru, was accepted by every section, almost without exception, on this side of the House. The House will remember that at that time I for one made it quite clear that the round table conference was merely an agency. What we wanted was that steps should be taken to establish responsible Government in India. It was not a question of a round table conference or a square table conference, about which we make bones. It was not a question that we were going to get responsible government now here at this moment. The question raised by the House was that the Government of India Act was unworkable and that the time had come when this Act should be revised and reviewed. Sir, to that question the answer was—I am not going into details—that the Reforms Inquiry Committee was constituted under the aegis of the Labour Government. The terms of reference of that Reforms Inquiry Committee were unfortunate; they are well known to all the Members of this House. Sir, it was asserted that progress of a

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

substantial character was possible within the policy and the structure of this Act. We joined issue. Then we were told : " Very well, that is your position. At any rate, we want to make an inquiry. And, if our inquiry shows that substantial progress was not possible within the structure and the scope of this Act, then the question of revising or reviewing the constitution is a separate issue which will be considered hereafter." Remember that was a clear and a definite term of reference to the Muddiman Committee, namely, that, if our inquiry showed it, we were to say that substantial progress was not possible within the Act and the constitution should be revised. Well, Sir, here I refer to the speech of Colonel Crawford, who went to the length of saying in this House and on the floor of this House with all the responsibility that he carries that the impartiality of the minority was damaged at the very outset of the inquiry. Sir, I am sure if the gallant Member had tried to understand the constitutional aspect and if he had read those observations which he quoted in order to establish the proposition that the impartiality of the minority was damaged, he would have been the last person to have made such a reckless allegation. What are the observations upon which he relied ? The observations on which he relied are to be found on page 132 of the Muddiman Report. I shall quote those observations and I appeal to Colonel Crawford again to read those observations carefully, and I also appeal to him that he should withdraw the suggestion which he made against the minority. (Hear, hear.) Sir, what did we say ? We said :

" We beg to point out that, having regard to terms of reference, we felt at the very commencement of our work that although it was open to us to traverse a large ground so far as the inquiry was concerned, yet in the matter of remedial proposals our scope was very much limited by the language used in clause (2) of the terms of reference."

Now, is that not a fact ? Is that not true ? Does Colonel Crawford now realise what we meant ? Although the terms of reference gave us the power to inquire into the defects and the difficulties inherent in the Government of India Act from A to Z, yet we were precluded from examining those defects and recommending the remedies ? That is what we meant.

**Colonel J. D. Crawford** (Bengal : European) : On a point of explanation, Sir. In view of what the Honourable Mr. Jinnah has said, I desire to withdraw—(Applause)—any charges of partiality that I may have made against the distinguished members of the minority report. My intention was really to emphasise the fact that in my opinion the members of the minority had given undue attention to the political aspects overshadowing altogether the administrative aspects of the problem, and I felt that it was the administrative aspect and not the political aspect with which the man in the street and those engaged in trade and commerce were mainly concerned.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : I am not going to quarrel with the point of view of Colonel Crawford at the moment. I grant that there are differences of opinion. But that is not what I am going to deal with at this moment.

Sir, now I shall proceed further. Now, what is the question before this House ? The question upon which I again want the House to rivet its attention is this. Is this constitution to be revised, to be reviewed at an early date, or are we going to wait until 1929 ? That is the real issue and that is the question which we have got to consider. Now, Sir, we maintain

and there can be no doubt—even Lord Birkenhead and the Honourable the Home Member cannot gain say it—that the inherent defects of dyarchy make any real progress towards responsible government impossible within the structure and the policy of the Act. What does Lord Birkenhead say on this point :

“What then is it possible for me to say at this stage of the future? The wisdom of Parliament declared that after a period of ten years the Montagu-Chelmsford constitution should be revised by a Royal Commission. It will undoubtedly require such revision, and it cannot be too plainly stated that everything will necessarily be thrown into the melting pot. Dyarchy itself is very obviously not a sacred principle. It must be decided by results. The conception was always doctrinaire and artificial. A great measure of success may justify it where a smaller would not.”

And then he quotes at the end of his speech a passage which is a well known passage and which has been quoted over and over again as a true and accepted estimate of dyarchy.

And he says that he had no quarrel with that description and estimate of dyarchy.

I will repeat that passage for I feel it would bear repetition :

“The Governor in Council in words quoted by the noble lord who moved has, it is true, placed it on record that in his opinion the dyarchy is a cumbrous, complex, confused system having no logical basis rooted in compromise and defensible only as a transitional expedient, my lords, I have said enough to make it plain that whatever other controversies may separate the noble lord and myself this will neither be one of the most better nor the most protracted.”

Now, Sir, if so far I am right and we are right that dyarchy cannot possibly, having regard to its inherent defects, enable us to make any progress within the structure and policy of the Act—and we go further and say that if you make any amendments within the scope and structure of the Act, it does not meet the needs of the country, and certainly, I say it most emphatically, it does not satisfy a single section of the political minded people of this country—then what is the answer? The answer is, trot out all the arguments which in my judgment amount to nothing else but scandalising the Indian people. The first argument is that we are not a nation, therefore we must wait till 1929. Then I suppose suddenly we shall become a nation. Sir, the argument was advanced in 1919 when Mr. Montagu, the late Secretary of State for India, for whom I had the profoundest respect, said on the floor of the House of Commons :

“That pronouncement was made in order to achieve what I believe is the only logical, the only possible, the only acceptable meaning of Empire and Democracy, namely, an opportunity to all nations flying the Imperial flag to control their own destinies. (*An Honourable Member*: “Nations.”) I will come to nations in a moment. I will beg no question. The Honourable Member raises the question of nations. Whether it be a nation or not, we have promised to India the progressive realisation of responsible government. We have promised to India and given to India a representation like that of the Dominions on our Imperial Conference. India is to be an original member of the League of Nations. Therefore, I say, whatever difficulties there may be in your path, your Imperial task”——

for which, Sir, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes is not ready :

——“to overcome those difficulties and to help India on the path of nationality, however much you may recognise”——

And I propose to ask the House to consider them :

——“the difficulties which lie in the path.”

Sir, India is not a nation, we are told. We were a people when the Great War was going on and an appeal was made to India for blood and money. We were a people when we were asked to be a signatory to the Peace Treaty in France. We are a nation when we become a member of the League of

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

Nations to which we make a substantial contribution. We are a nation or a people for the purpose of sending our representative to the Imperial Conference. We are your partners, but we are not a nation. We are not a people nor a nation when we ask you for a substantial advance towards the establishment of responsible government and parliamentary institutions in our own country.

Then, Sir, we are told—and I say again it has reached the point of scandal—what are our electorates, look at them. Then we are told, “Look at your education”, “look at your position with regard to the defence of your country.” Lord Birkenhead has done the greatest injustice in that statement of his in the House of Lords. We are told that we cannot give ten boys for the vacancies allocated to India for the King’s Commission. I repudiate that as an entire falsehood. I can give you ten thousand if you want. You have closed that door to the Army to the people of India. You only opened that door under the stress of war in 1918 and allowed an Indian to be in a position to take the King’s Commission, and now you turn round and say, “But nobody in India suggests that we can dispense with the British troops.” You have placed a garrison, you have kept the sons of the soil out for a hundred years or more, and you now tell us we are not able to take up the defence of the country. Sir, it is well known, the Government know it, and if they don’t know it, then I say they are not fit to govern. Lord Birkenhead may have indulged in pomposity but he has shown—I speak with the greatest respect, for after all he is Secretary of State for India—utter ignorance in the one-sided picture he has painted for the House of Lords, which is a slander of India’s fair name.

Now, Sir, the next charge is education and here I come to my Honourable friend, Mr. Coeke. He has taken a very businesslike view. He did not pretend that he was capable of understanding constitutions and he pointed out what strikes the ordinary man. I am not going to exaggerate on the floor of this House, although I hold very strong views that there are difficulties, undoubtedly there are difficulties. A man who says there are no difficulties is not speaking the truth, but do not in the name of heaven scandalise us. We say that there are difficulties, but meet them and let us solve them as comrades together. That is what we want.

I do not want really to take up more time, but I want to deal with the next point, what is the answer of Lord Birkenhead, His Excellency the Viceroy and the Honourable the Home Member. They all say there is one condition. The minority report means that we want a Royal Commission, but says the Honourable the Home Member, there is a clear condition before the Royal Commission can be announced. Before Government do that there is one clear condition. He did not add the word “precise” which Lord Birkenhead did, but I will add both “precise and clear”, and the condition is that responsible leaders must co-operate. I again here ask the Government, I ask Lord Birkenhead, I ask Lord Reading, what is your answer to those men who have co-operated with you? None. Your answer to me as one who has not non-co-operated with you is this.

Will you bring a section of the politically minded people, who happen to be the largest political party, will you bring them down on their knees? Will you bring Pandit Motilal Nehru to bow down to the throne at Viceregal Lodge, and

say " Sir, I am humble, I crawl before you, and will you now be graciously pleased to give me a Royal Commission ? Is that what you want ? What has Pandit Motilal Nehru been doing in this Assembly ? Has he not been co-operating with you ? What more do you want ? I want to know what more you want, and may I know what evidence, what proof, documentary or oral, do you want me to produce or adduce that the responsible leaders are willing to co-operate with you ? Have you no eyes, have you no ears, have you no brains ? (*An Honourable Member* : " No hear ".) Sir, so much for co-operation.

Now I come to the next point. I think if Sir Basil Blackett had confined himself to the financial aspect of this question we would have done much better, instead of interpreting a constitutional document and trying to give some meaning to it. Well, Sir, I will not say anything more. I say that document is clear: it speaks for itself. But if Lord Birkenhead and His Excellency the Viceroy, and even the Honourable the Home Member, had stopped at this, that as soon as the responsible leaders show evidence of co-operation and show that they are willing to work this constitution for what it is worth, we shall certainly appoint a committee at an early date, if they had stopped at that, I could understand it. But what do we find ? The pomposity and pedantry of Lord Birkenhead does not stop there and it is repeated here. He says further :

" It has always seemed to me that a very simple answer may be made to such a contention. We do not claim in Great Britain that we alone in the world are able to frame constitutions, though we are not altogether disconcerted with our humble constructive efforts which we have made in this field of human ingenuity."

I certainly admit, Sir, that dyarchy was a human ingenuity. Then he goes on :

" But if our critics in India are of opinion that their greater knowledge of Indian conditions qualifies them to succeed where they tell us that we have failed, let them produce a constitution which carries behind it a fair measure of general agreement among the people of India."

Here we are peoples of India :

" Such a contribution to our problems "

They are their problems, not ours :

" to our problems would nowhere be resented. It would, on the contrary, be most carefully examined by the Government of India, by myself, and I am sure by a Commission, whenever that body may be assembled."

Lord Birkenhead therefore says, well give us an idea of your constitution. Now I turn again to my friend the Honourable the Finance Member, and I say that, if he will be kind enough to read that amendment, he will see that that amendment lays down the definite lines on which the constitution should be amended. Am I wrong in saying on the floor of this House, as an answer to Lord Birkenhead, that these are the fundamental changes that I want to be embodied in this constitution ? Am I wrong in that ? You may say that my proposals are wrong ; you may say my proposals are defective: you may point out to me where I am wrong, and certainly I for one make it clear that I am open to conviction.....

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** (Commerce Member): Will the Honourable Member explain whether he accepts what Pandit Motilal Nehru said yesterday, that not a comma of this amendment must be altered ?

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah**: I am used to the mischievous attitude of the Honourable the Commerce Member, and he will not draw me into his parlour. I have known the spider too long and the fly is not going to be caught. Now I shall proceed, untrammelled by any mischief. I say this amendment is an answer to Lord Birkenhead.

Well now, Sir, let me come back to my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes. What did he say? He said the Preamble can go to the winds; that does not matter.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: What I said was that Preambles could be altered.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah**: Yes, therefore they can go to the winds. Well, surely they are not sacred; they can be altered as we like.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: Not as you like.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah**: You and I. Anyhow, Sir, I have been in the legal profession for a long time and I always thought that no Preamble was sacred, no Statute was sacred, no provision of a Statute was sacred. As a matter of fact let me tell Sir Charles Innes, if he does not know it, that the Preamble has always to recite the evil it is intended to cure; the Preamble merely states the object with which the legislation is undertaken and nothing else.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: Thank you.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah**: But really to me, Sir, this is a futile controversy, an utterly futile controversy. The question really is this. Take your section 84-A, to which the Honourable the Home Member referred. Well, what will the Royal Commission, when it is appointed, do? It will examine the question, and supposing the Royal Commission came to the conclusion, on an examination of the question, that all that we are saying in our amendment can be done, having regard to the growth of public opinion, having regard to the efficiency of the electorates, having regard to the educational condition of this country. And let me tell you that more people are educated in this country to-day, if you rely on percentages, than there were in England when you had a Parliament there first—and having regard to all the circumstances of the case, supposing they thought that the people of India were competent and fit and that the proposals embodied in this amendment should be carried out, would you object to it?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes**: Not at all, but the decision would rest with His Majesty's Government. That is what the Honourable Pandit will not admit.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah**: Now I come to the decision. Let me tell you, if I may address the Honourable the Commerce Member, let me tell you something in your history. I dare say hard-worked officials like Sir Charles Innes sometimes forget history. Now let us get back to history. He talked about the manner, the measure and the time, and said His Majesty's Government is going to be the final arbiter of that. That was his contention. Now let me ask the Government and particularly the Honourable the Commerce Member who was the arbiter in the harbour of Boston? Not His Majesty's Government. You have that instance in history.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : That is hardly an instance from the history of peaceful constitutional reform !

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : They also wanted constitutional reforms there. My Honourable friend the Home Member will allow me to proceed a little. Who was the arbiter when unasked you gave self-government to South Africa ?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** : His Majesty's Government.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : Who was the arbiter when you gave self-government to Canada ?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** : His Majesty's Government.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : And what about the revolution which preceded His Majesty's Government's decision ?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** : The revolution was before that.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : And so His Majesty's Government made up their minds to give self-government. Do you want that here ?

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** : Do you ?

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : If you want it, you shall have it. Who was the arbiter in Ireland ? His Majesty's Government ? (*An Honourable Member* : " De Valera ! ") The gentlemen who carry on the Government of India with all their sense of responsibility utterly lack imagination.

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** : They have too much.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : They may be earnest administrators but what can you expect from that ? My Honourable friend said " I have spent 27 years in hard work " ; I grant it ; conscientious work, I grant it ; good work according to his lights ; I grant it. But, Sir, he has been brought up in that atmosphere where it is impossible for him to get out of it. Those very 27 years that he has spent disqualify him from examining the constitutional question. What does he say ? First he talked about the British claim. Claim, to what ? Trusteeship. Sir Charles, it is an old exploded theory and I assure you, you stand on no moral ground if you talk of your trusteeship. Sir Charles says " we are not only the trustees of the intelligentsia or any one section of the people but of the entire people of India. " Well, Sir, the less we talk about it, the better. It is no use to anybody. Sir Charles sees nothing but cliffs and abysses or precipices ; he is so frightened that he will tumble down.....

**The Honourable Sir Charles Innes** : That you will tumble down.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : Then he says to us : " We have not known chaos and anarchy for a century ; we have not known "—I think he said " the horror of chaos and anarchy for a century. " I grant it, that is a good argument, as far as it goes ; but what have we seen ? (*An Honourable Member* : " The horrors of plague and poverty ! ") We have not seen the horrors of chaos and anarchy, but what have we seen, I ask again ? Sir, the horror of being a disarmed people ; we have seen the horror of being kept out of that ring of monopoly in the administration and the Government of our own country. We have watched, and we

[Mr. M. A. Jinnah.]

have experienced the horror of helplessness in the defence of our own country for a hundred years. We have seen the horror of keeping a large body of people in darkness, denying them even elementary education. No country in the world that claims to be a civilised country would tolerate that. After a hundred years' rule, can you compare your education policy with any civilised country? We have seen those horrors and we say that these horrors are much worse than anarchy and chaos. We want to free ourselves from these horrors; and there is one way and one way alone for India to free herself from these horrors, and that is to replace that irresponsible bureaucracy by a Cabinet responsible to the Legislature of the representatives of the people. And we want you, we want you honestly as men to come forward and help us. I know the difficulties. We know the difficulties there are.

Now, Sir, I have done. I say in conclusion that you have got two alternatives placed before you. There is a minority report, which I say has made out a case to the hilt for a revision of the constitution and they recommend certain reforms and examination by a Royal Commission or some other body. Here again I may say that Lord Birkenhead has run away from the point in his speech and has evaded the real issue when he says :

“ The obligations of the Government must be admitted to the experienced men who contributed so much labour and produced so competent a report.”

For this reference, standing on the floor of this House, may I express my gratitude to His Lordship. Then he proceeds :

“ We do not anticipate, for reasons which I have already made plain, that we shall be able, as the noble Lord desires, to accept the report of the minority at this stage. The problem of provincial autonomy has not indeed been adequately thought out by those who are to-day pressing it so strongly upon our attention. Provincial autonomy contemplates a complete transfer to all the provinces of law and order and it would render necessary far-reaching changes in the central Government of India which I have never yet seen closely analysed and very rarely even cursorily examined.”

Who prevented this course who is responsible for it? Sir, when can they be closely examined? The Reforms Inquiry Committee's terms of reference deliberately precluded us from closely examining them. We say so. In the concluding part of our report,—the minority report,—we say further :

“ In conclusion to our mind the proper question to ask is not whether any alternative transitional system can be devised, but whether the constitution should not be put on a permanent basis with provision for automatic progress in the future so as to secure stability in the Government and willing co-operation of the people. We can only express the hope that a serious attempt may be made at an early date to solve the question. Whether this attempt should be made by the appointment of a Royal Commission with freer terms of reference and a larger scope of inquiry than ours or by any other agency is a question which we earnestly commend to the notice of Government.”

Sir, therefore, to sum up the situation within the next two minutes or three minutes, that are at my disposal I submit to this House that the question stands thus :

First, are Government prepared to appoint a Royal Commission at an early date to examine the entire constitution? I see the Honourable the Home Member remains absolutely quiet.....

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** Sir, I shall reply to the Honourable Member in considerable detail later on.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : Second, do you honestly, sincerely desire us to submit to you the fundamental principles upon which a constitution ought to be built? Lord Birkenhead in his speech has said that he would earnestly consider proposals. There is the amendment. Consider it.

Sir, one word more. Let me tell you this. India to-day is in a very critical condition. Believe me I do not say this as words of menace or threat. But let me tell you, India is determined to win her freedom. The manner and the measure and the time, either you determine in a reasonable spirit or else she will determine for herself.

**Seth Govind Das** (Central Provinces : Landholders) : Sir, I rise to oppose the motion of the Honourable the Home Member and support the amendment of my Honourable leader, Pandit Motilal Nehru. Sir, I represent the landholders of the Central Provinces, a class of people who are generally abused both by the Government and by the public. I may remind you, Sir, at the very outset that the landholders of my province at least have always served the nation to the best of their ability, even when such service meant a temporary set-back to their own interests. The landholders have now come to realise that their interests are not opposed to the interests of the rest of the nation. A contented tenantry, a prosperous agricultural population and a thriving trading community is the very basis of the prosperity of the landholders in this country. The landholders, no less than the commercial or professional communities, desire wholeheartedly that their country should advance all along the line of progress, in social, economic and political matters. They have been accused in the past, Sir, of supporting the Government blindly, and to-day one of them is before you, prepared to repudiate such a charge. We are no less patriotic than the other communities in this country, and therefore, Sir, I wholeheartedly support the amendment of my leader, Pandit Motilal Nehru, on my behalf and on behalf of my fellow-landholders.

The reasons for supporting this amendment are two-fold—first, on general principles and second on the merits of the question itself. Now, with reference to the general principle, I may say, Sir, that constitutions cannot be superimposed on a people—they have to be made by the people themselves to suit their national genius, culture and traditions. If this principle of self-determination is to be accepted as applicable to the Indian people, then the only constitution worth the name that can really work is the constitution that will have to be made by the Indian people themselves, assembled in a constitutional convention. That has been the practice wherever constitutions have been made in recent times. The people of Ireland, Australia and Africa and of the new countries of Europe like Poland, have all adopted this practice of framing their own constitutions, in a constitutional convention expressly summoned for the purpose. I ask, therefore, Sir, why should India alone be treated differently? Are the tenets of democracy and self-determination applicable only to countries situated in a particular latitude? I may venture to assert that India will never be content even with the best of constitutions, if it is not framed by herself in accordance with her traditions and her special experience. If that be so, the majority report of the Muddiman Committee will be a stumbling block in the realisation of India's aspirations.

[Seth Govind Das.]

Now, Sir, the Central Government in India is a despotic body, subordinate and responsible only to a distant Secretary of State who has frequently to think much more of the Government, Parliament and people of his own country than of Indians who are unknown to him and cannot reach him. Every one knows, Sir, that such a question as the drainage system of a city like Liverpool or Manchester takes more time and energy of Parliament than the affairs of the three hundred million people of India. A debate on Indian affairs in Parliament attracts not more than a handful of retired Anglo-Indians who then ventilate their grievances, real or imaginary, of the steel-frame services. Lord Curzon's recent book on "British Government in India" gives many instances of the reality of the Secretary of State's control over the Governor-General of India. We all know how this control was exerted on questions like the excise and fiscal policies and the problem of Indians overseas, and the question of the Imperial Services when they affected British interests as opposed to Indian interests. If the Government of India were made responsible to this House, and freed from the control of the Secretary of State, then I venture to say, Sir, that Indian interests would be adequately protected, as has been the case in the self-governing Dominions.

The issue, Sir, is a transference of power from the British Parliament to the Indian Legislature. What does this transference of power mean? It means that the superintendence, direction and control of revenues and the administration of British India should vest, not in the Secretary of State for India in Council or acting singly, but in the Governor General in Council responsible to the Indian Legislature.

Now, coming to the question of dyarchy, Sir, I may mention that much has already been said by my Honourable friend, Mr. Shanmukham Chetty and others. It is, therefore, needless for me to discuss this aspect of the question in detail. I may, however, add that it has been an absolute failure in my own province, namely, the Central Provinces and Berar. It seems to me, Sir, that the chief reasons why dyarchy has failed everywhere is, because the constitutional relations between the Governor and His ministers, as defined in the Act and explained in the instrument of instructions, are extremely unsatisfactory to the weaker of the two parties. The Ministers in our dyarchical form of Government are like step-children in a joint family. They have been looked upon both by their non-official and official colleagues with suspicion, by the former because the powers of Ministers are so limited and the control of Governors is so great.

To sum up, Sir, I may say that both Lord Birkenhead and Lord Reading stated that any scheme produced by Indians would be considered by them or by the statutory commission when it is appointed. There is a scheme now before the House proposed by my Honourable friend, the leader of the Swaraj Party, Pandit Motilal Nehru, and accepted by nearly all the elected Indian Members of this House, including Hindus, Moslems, Christians, Landholders and Labourites, and the bulk of Indians outside this House. If the British Government want to ascertain that this is the case, they may do so by a referendum or ordering fresh general elections in the country with this programme.

and policy as the chief plank of the election campaign. The Honourable the Home Member has said yesterday that unless we co-operate with the Government they are not prepared to grant any reforms. Just now my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah said that Pandit Motilal Nehru and we were co-operating. I say, Sir, that we are not co-operating and we will not co-operate until some change of heart is shown on the part of the Government. Why are there non-co-operators or Swarajists in this country? Are they not the offspring of the policy of repression of the Honourable the Home Member himself, and of his predecessors? If there had been no Rowlatt Act, no Punjab horrors followed by the failure of the Government to impose suitable punishment upon the offenders, there would never have been the non-co-operation movement. A policy of timely reform, unaccompanied by repression, will change our hearts and make every one including even Mahatma Gandhi a co-operator and a loyal subject of the Empire. It is for England to choose whether she wants a peaceful, prosperous and contented India or another Ireland perpetually seething with discontent and disloyalty. In this connection she will do well to recall the words of one of her greatest statesmen, the late Mr. Gladstone :

“ I hold that the capital agent in determining finally the question whether our power in India is or is not to continue, will be the will of the 240 millions of people who inhabit India. The question who shall have supreme rule in India is, by the laws of right, an Indian question; and those laws of right are from day to day growing into laws of fact. Our title to be there depends upon the first condition, that our being there is profitable to the Indian nation; and on a second condition that we can make them see and understand it to be profitable.”

Now, I ask, Sir, what is the condition to-day? Have the British people made Indians feel that their rule is beneficial to India? I will frankly say that they have not been able to prove this successfully to Indians up to this time. Now, Sir, it is in their hands to do it. If they will extend their hand, if they will accept the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru, they will prove this, and then Indians will have faith in them. I trust they will accept the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru and give us the reforms we ask for unanimously without any further delay. With these words, Sir, I support the amendment of my leader, Pandit Motilal Nehru.

**Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar** (Madras ceded districts and Chittoor : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Time after time, almost incessantly for half a century, the demand for full self-government has been made. However heterogeneous this country may be in language, colour or creed, still, Sir, I can confidently assert that India is politically a nation and as a united nation demands that form of Government which has been put forth in specific terms by Pandit Motilal Nehru in his amendment. Sir, I must frankly confess that a good deal of eloquence has been wasted both yesterday and to-day in repeating the same point over and over again in beating a dead snake. How was this demand received by the Government Benches yesterday? So far as I could catch the Honourable the Commerce Member yesterday, he took it partly with flippancy and partly with provocation. He has been speaking to us as though he has been sitting in judgment here over an elocution competition when he began to describe the speeches of the various persons. Is this the seriousness which the Government are prepared to attach to the

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

serious and earnest statement made by the leader of a most prominent and powerful party in this country? It has been insinuated by the Honourable the Home Member and made plainer still by Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer that much of the obstruction to progress has been due to the non-co-operation movement but I am glad that Mr. Chintamani in his recent speech in Bombay has made it much plainer, much more straightforward. He said in his speech that the complicated circumstances which followed, which had nothing to do with the scheme of reforms embodied in the Government of India Act of 1919, suggested to Mr. Gandhi's apt mind, schooled in South Africa, the non-co-operation movement, the very failure of which, after having wrought much public mischief produced the Swaraj Party whose policy is volatile and when consistent is barren and harmful. Another small extract I will quote from his speech. He said that it was his unfortunate conviction that the Swaraj Party's principles, policies and methods would not succeed any more than the undefiled Gandhism of the two earlier years in accelerating progress to Swaraj. I consider these two statements as a piece of gross ingratitude on the part of an ex-Minister. If he had only carefully studied the surroundings, he should have known that whatever success these Ministers pretended to have achieved was due to the non-co-operation movement outside the Legislature. In fact, a leading and prominent Member of the first Assembly actually wrote to the newspapers that whatever hearing they had from the Government Benches in the first year of the reformed Assembly was all due to the vigorous non-co-operation outside. We all know with what friendly feelings that steel-frame of India, the Heaven-born service, received the reforms when they were promulgated by the Montford scheme and yet what is it that we find when that scheme was put into effect. There was a kind of co-operation, a manner of co-operation, which was certainly due to the non-co-operation movement outside. Why go so far? I have got here Mr. Chintamani's own evidence which will indicate what I have said. He said before this committee that his official relations with the permanent services were not on the whole good. They were good in the beginning but during the latter part of his tenure of appointment as a Minister, they were not good. Mr. Chintamani admits that in the early part of his regime as Minister his relationship with the public services was good but in the later years it was not good. Now what is this to be attributed to. Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer raised this question yesterday but he answered it differently and wrongly. I will give the correct answer to it. In the first year of his regime it was the non-co-operation movement that was working outside. The Treasury Benches of the various Governments thought that they must co-operate with those who came into the Councils in order to prove that the reforms were a success but the moment the leader of the non-co-operation movement was incarcerated what was the result? There was a slight setback to the non-co-operation movement and there was a tendency on the part of the public services to treat with contempt the Ministers themselves. That, Sir, is the real answer and if Mr. Chintamani tries to allocate the responsibility for the failure or otherwise of these reforms to the non-co-operation movement I can confidently say that he is wrong.

Now, Sir, I am not inclined to proceed on the very same lines on which the previous speakers have proceeded because it is likely to create the impression in the Honourable the Home Member that there has been absolutely no criticism of his report, that the Assembly wanted a Moon which he was not able to give but otherwise the Assembly had nothing to say against the work that he has turned out on the Muddiman Committee. Therefore, I desire to put some questions to the Honourable the Home Member. I see he is absent for the time being but is represented by Mr. Tonkinson. He is the accredited representative of the majority and we have a right to ask him what he has done even within the limited terms of reference of the Committee. I admit that the terms were limited. I admit, Sir, that the terms of reference were narrow, but all the same, did he do all that he could possibly have done if he really had a *bona fide* intention to meet the desires of the people in this country. He was convinced, Sir, as we find from his own statement in the Report, that a considerable volume of Indian opinion recognised that the transfer of more subjects would effect a constitutional advance. If that, Sir, is the conviction he was driven to by the evidence that was placed before him, I ask him what is it that he has done in order to satisfy that section of the public at least, if he had that *bona fide* intention? Sir, he has miserably failed even to do that, and he has escaped to-day without any criticism because all the attention of the House has been directed to constitutional questions and constitutional questions only. Sir, I ask you what is the recommendation that he has made. First, take the foremost subject, the question of enlarging the group of transferred subjects if not altogether the establishment of provincial autonomy. No doubt I am aware that they brushed aside the demand for provincial autonomy on the ground, the technical ground, that those who pleaded for provincial autonomy did not understand the fullest implications of that term—not the vertical and the horizontal lines. I may now ask him plainly, if he was not prepared to give provincial autonomy what has he done to satisfy at least that small section of the Indian public which will be satisfied with a little more advance? As regards the transfer of more subjects, Sir, he has given Fisheries, Law Reports, Boilers, and Gas. He knew that there were boilers in the country already, and he wanted the Treasury Benches to infuse a little more gas. (Laughter.) Are these the subjects to be handed over to the Ministers? Is that the way in which you want to bring your Ministers into closer touch with the people? Is it not a fact that in order that the Ministers' Departments should be a success, you must bring them into closer touch with the people? And I must mention prominently one subject which he had no reason to withhold from the Ministry any longer, and that is the subject of Land Revenue. So far at any rate as my Presidency is concerned, it must be taken as the most important subject: and what is the answer that the majority report has to give in regard to the transfer of Land Revenue to the Ministers? They say:

“ We consider that this subject is the basis of the administration, and further that as the agency is the same both for it and for law and order, this subject should only be transferred if law and order is transferred.”

Sir, this presupposes that law and order cannot be entrusted to Ministers. Secondly it says that the subject of land revenue must be

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

only in the hands of those who wield law and order. I consider, Sir, both these propositions to be faulty and illogical. Sir, with reference to industrial matters likewise, I should like to ask my Honourable friend whether he is not aware that this is a Department where the Ministers are likely to know the condition and the feelings of the people better than those who sit on the executive side—and that subjects like factories, the welfare of labour, the settlement of labour disputes, etc., should all be transferred to the Ministers. What is the answer that is given on this point in the majority report? They say that these are all subjects for which the Central Government must also have their control, while there must be uniform legislation for the whole of India, and as such, they must pass wholly to the reserved side over which the Central Government have got the control. Assuming, Sir, for the sake of argument that uniform legislation may be necessary in certain matters, does it mean that a law which has been framed by the Central Legislature cannot be administered by the Ministers? Sir, I find no logic in it.

Then, Sir, there are points which I regret to find have been ignored by both the majority and the minority reports. If the majority of the members of the Committee had carefully studied the memorandum which was appended to the terms of reference, they would have found that the Government of India themselves formulated in that memorandum a certain amount of scope for further reforms which would satisfy at least a section of the Indian public. Let me take, Sir, the Governors' Executive Councils and the Governor General's Executive Council. It is open to His Excellency the Governor to add three Members from among the elected Members of the local Legislative Council to the Governor's Executive Council, because the qualification of service that is necessary is only with regard to one of the Members. Similarly, with reference to the Governor General's Executive Council, a rule can be made under section 36 (5) that three Members out of the six Members can be chosen from among the elected Members of the Legislature and made Members of the Executive Council. I would not consider it much of a constitutional advance, but it was open to the authors of the majority report, if it wanted its report to be accepted by the Members of this Assembly, in connection with which point the Honourable the Home Member has preached us a long sermon asking for co-operation, to make some such suggestions. I do not consider that is particularly important from my point of view. But at the same time that would have satisfied a section of the public as an eye-wash. If they had tackled this point about the Governor General's Executive Council, they would have at least conferred on Members of the Governor General's Council so appointed from among the elected Members of the Legislature both a legal, a theoretical, responsibility to the British Parliament and also a moral responsibility to the people of India, who elected them. As for the term "responsibility to the British Parliament", that has always appeared misleading to me. I fail to see the distinction between "responsibility to the British Parliament" and "responsibility to the people of India". Is not the British Parliament responsible to the people of India on your own theory of trust? And if you are responsible to the British Parliament, and the British Parliament is

responsible to the people of India, I consider that you also, through the Executive, are responsible to the people of this country : and as a gradual step towards the reformation of your Council I thought the report might have recommended the addition of Members to the Executive Council also from among the elected Members of the Legislature. That, as the memorandum of the Government of India appended to the reference clearly shows is quite possible under the rules.

Now, Sir, with reference to the borrowing powers of Local Governments, you are not prepared to relax the rule for the simple reason that the Central Government and the Local Governments must often go and tap the same money market. Is that a ground, Sir, that you should enforce rule 3 of the Local Governments' borrowing rules—that the local Government's needs must not come in conflict with the Central Government's needs and that the former must be subordinated to the latter for the simple reason that there would then be a conflict in the rates of interest ? I will not detail the various ways in which they could have made recommendations which would have satisfied some section of the public at any rate. Even with regard to the classification of subjects, it seems to me that out of the central subjects the cotton excise duty, income-tax, salt, civil law, commerce, trading companies, might all very well be transferred to the provincial subjects, and, if the Government choose, if the Secretary of State and the British Parliament like it, they might be transferred to Ministers also. These are all subjects about which there may be varying conditions in the different provinces, and there is absolutely no need why they should always be retained under the control of the Central Government. Sir, the argument that is advanced is curious—namely, that the Central Government must exist, and that the Central Legislature must exist,—that in order to give sufficient work to the Members of the Legislature when they come to Simla and Delhi, such subjects must be retained in the hands of the Central Government. Is that the ground upon which you are going to do it ? Can you not take away these subjects also as provincial subjects and still retain the dignity of this Assembly and the dignity of the Central Government ? If it is a question of the allocation of revenues, then I submit, Sir, that even if the Local Governments collect the revenues.....

**Mr. President :** Order, order. The Honourable Member has exceeded his time.

**Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar :** I shall take only one minute, Sir. I am not going to say anything more about this. But let me conclude by saying that there was much that could have been done by this Committee and which they have not done : and therefore let not the Honourable the Home Member go home with the impression that this Assembly is satisfied with this Report.

There is only one matter which I wish to mention and that is with reference to the amendment proposed by Pandit Motilal Nehru, in which I want to make a mental reservation. When I vote with him fully and entirely, I have to make a mental reservation with reference to the three exceptions in clause (b). Sir, I am not for that exception. On the 8th February 1924 when I spoke about it, I said full responsible government carries with it also the control of the Army. Unfortunately, Sir, to-day I have not got in this Assembly that strong voice to support

[Mr. C. Duraiswami Aiyangar.]

me in the strongest terms, that voice being simply engaged now in saying "Order, order." But, Sir, I must reproduce that voice by reading a small passage which will emphatically put my case on that point. It is this :

"Great stress has been laid by my friend the Honourable the Home Member on the question of defence. Yes, there is that question. Some of my friends do feel nervous about it. Speaking for myself and speaking as representing the Congress, I say here that we have fully considered the question and we find no difficulty whatsoever. Let us have immediate self-government. Let us have immediate responsible government. What is there in the army? Who controls the army at present? Does my friend who sits opposite to me?... Does my friend the Honourable Sir Narasimha Sarma take no part in the deliberations of the Cabinet which controls the Indian army at present? Does not the Honourable Sir Muhammad Shafi take any part? Does not my friend the Honourable Mr. Chatterjee take any part? It is the civilians forming the Cabinet that control the Indian army. No one else. His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is one of the Members of that Cabinet. But after all, the general policy is being dictated by the whole Cabinet and that Cabinet, instead of being responsible to the Parliament, we say, should be responsible to the people of India."

Sir, I satisfy myself with quoting that passage. Only one word more about the original Resolution. The Honourable the Home Member wants us to accept the principles of the majority report. Are there any principles in it? Are there any? I do not want to say that it is unprincipled, but, Sir, are there any principles in his Resolution, except two, perhaps continuous obstruction and non-co-operation. You want to continually obstruct the progress of reforms in this country, the progress of responsible government. You do not want to co-operate with the people and the leaders of this country. Therefore if any principles can be taken out of that Resolution of the Honourable the Home Member, it is only two principles, obstruction and non-co-operation. Sir, I oppose that Resolution and support entirely the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru.

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

---

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

---

**Dr. S. K. Datta** (Nominated : Indian Christians) : Sir, I am a member of a minority community. I do not dare to assert that I am a representative of minority communities, but being a member of a minority community I have, at least the opportunity of understanding and appreciating their demands and their desires. Sir, there are two types of minority communities in India. There is the "qualitative" type and there is the "quantitative" type. My friends representing the European population of this country, are representatives, it seems to me, of a "quantitative" minority, but I do not think any one of us will say that they are the representatives of a "qualitative" minority. The weight attached to their opinions in this House is so great that they may as well be a majority community. On the other hand, you have the case of the Indian Christians. There are 3 millions of them in British India who are both "qualitatively," and "quantitatively" minorities. The total Christian community in British India—I am not talking about the Indian States where there is a very substantial number of Indian Christians,—consisting of Indian Christians, Europeans and Anglo-

Indians is 3,300,000. I have the honour to represent the 3 millions of them here. The other 300,000 are represented by various Members who sit in different parts of this House. I, therefore, hold that we are both "qualitatively" and "quantitatively" a minority.

Now, Sir, these communities demand representation. I will not say actual physical representation within this House, but they desire to be able to express themselves on every matter that concerns not only themselves but the welfare of the nation. Now, in what way can they obtain that representation? The majority report makes three recommendations with regard to these minorities. The first recommendation and the most concrete proposal is with regard to European constituencies. They tell us that the residential qualification for candidates to the Legislatures should be abolished and that the European should be a member-at-large of India generally. Furthermore, they say that even a prolonged absence from India is a matter which he ought to be able to cure quite easily. They go on to add that the European can go out of India, can stay away for months from India, can come back and still have a domicile in this country which gives him certain privileges. If I have read that section of the majority report aright it would mean that a European could be a Member of the House of Commons in England and at the same time a Member of this Assembly in this country. I do not see that anything can prevent him from doing that. What are the two other recommendations? Generally speaking, they say that factory labour should be represented in this House and the provincial Legislatures. Local Governments are going to be asked how they can do it. I need not deal with that point. My friend Mr. Joshi, I trust, will do so at a later stage of this discussion. Then they come to the depressed classes. How are these classes to be represented in this House? Again the matter goes back to the Local Governments. How will it emerge from there? Probably we will be told that it is one of the most difficult things for this community to be represented.

Now, Sir, I hold that the majority report—and, if I may put it, even the minority report—have not given consideration to the question how these unrepresented classes are to be brought within the orbit of influence of the new democratic institutions which have come to be built in this country. We desire to emphasize that this question is fundamental in any demand for further progress. In the second place, in what way are we going to meet the needs of these unrepresented classes? Has the question of education been considered as a basis of franchise. No recommendations have been made that the franchise for the classes should be on the basis of education. Take my community which consists of 3 million people, of whom 300,000 are in school. You say: "You have no money and therefore cannot be represented in this House or the provincial Legislatures." Whatever little money we had we have spent it on education. We have spent it on the education of our children and we ask that that fact at least should be recognised. We maintain that the communities that are trying to come up should obtain representation in this House as well as the provincial Legislatures on the basis of what they have accomplished.

Now, Sir, with regard to the protection of minorities. We have continually been told in this House that the present system is going to protect minorities. I do not believe it for one moment, and I will tell you why. Whenever there is a majority and a minority which circum-

[Dr. S. K. Datta.]

stances bring together, they must come to an understanding as to future progress. If you have a third party, which is the protector of the minority, you will find that trouble will arise. It has always arisen in every part of the world. It was Russia who championed the cause of the Armenians and what happened? The Armenians looked beyond the frontiers of Turkey into Russia. England also championed the cause of the Armenians. Political conditions are such and the events are of such a nature that invariably the situation arises when the protector is compelled to sacrifice something to secure his own position and it is always the minority that is sacrificed. Therefore, the best thing for the minority is to come to an understanding with the majority and not trust to a third party. Well, Sir, let me take up the case in this country. Government have said that they are the protectors of minorities. Under the old system it was true that they could assert their authority. But to-day what happens? Between the clash of the major communities the minorities—the smaller minorities—have to go to the wall. There is no other alternative for them. Take the experience of the last few years. Only in one province was a Christian Minister appointed. And what province was that? It was Bihar and Orissa which was at that time governed by Lord Sinha, who was himself an Indian. I hold that normally it would be impossible for a European Governor to go out of his way and appoint an Indian Christian to high office. And why? Because the European Governor will always have it at the back of his mind whether the particular move is going to pay or not. He will have no regard for justice. An Indian Christian was appointed a Minister under the regime of a man who was an Indian who understood the situation and who was determined to see that justice was done. I believe, therefore, that it is a dangerous thing for minorities to be protected by an outside body. We have to come to an understanding ourselves with the majority.

**Mr. K. Ahmed :** And if you do not come to an understanding?

**Dr. S. K. Datta :** Now, Sir, I would confine my remarks to my particular community and I would not make any further statements with regard to other communities.

The roots of the Christian community lie in two very widely different communities in India. First the depressed classes or the community of the agricultural labourer. One of the roots of that community lies there, the other lies in the aborigines of this country. What is the movement? The movement is an uplift movement among these great communities who lie at the bottom of Indian society who look forward to bettering their own condition. That is what the significance of the movement is, and I therefore couple in my demand for the future the demand that those two communities should not be forgotten, the agricultural labourer on the one hand and the aborigines on the other. I have had experience of some of these communities. I was in the Chota Nagpur Division in 1919, and in that Division there were 200,000 Christians consisting largely of aborigines, and the great Christian Missions, both Catholic and Protestant, had for their education something like 400 schools. An enormous number of these aborigines go to these schools. I say there is the basis for going forward in the political education of these

people and making it possible for them to be represented, to bring their needs and demands to the door of the nation's consideration.

Now with regard to the larger problems which we have been debating in this House. In the first place, Sir, I can only speak as an individual. I cannot do otherwise, but there are those of us who believe that the future of the nation, the needs of the nation are always greater than the needs and demands of single communities. We who represent the minorities have always to take this into consideration. How far this is going to help us to contribute to the larger and bigger life of India I do not know, but there is no other criterion of action for a community. Every other criterion is false. That is one thing which I should like to place before this House. In the second place I believe that those of us who are minority communities must come to some understanding with those of the majority. We come to co-operate with them and ask that opportunities be given to us to co-operate with them, and we are willing to do so. In the third place, I do not believe that the present system will satisfy the needs and demands of these minorities, particularly the minority to which I belong. And I will tell you why it is not going to do it. Naturally every minority, to use a common expression, is looking to see on which side the cat is going to jump, what is the future going to be, on which side do our interests lie? It is impossible under such conditions to do any constructive work. We desire to go forward and we do trust that opportunity will be given us to go forward. In the next place we have put money and time into the education of our people. We believe they ought to have a larger life, and therefore we want all barriers to be lowered, so that our people may take their place in the larger life of the nation. In the next place we have not merely educated our people. We have done something else. Ecclesiastically we have taught them the exercise of the vote. In hundreds of church councils thousands of people, ignorant in many ways, have been asked to exercise the franchise within these ecclesiastical courts. I am glad to see my friends, the Sikhs, are also going to exercise the vote in their ecclesiastical courts. The capacity for the exercise of this privilege is a tremendous asset in the future of the nation; and that experience is one of the things we desire be given to the nation.

Now, Sir, lastly, we come to the problem which has always been before us, namely, this problem of dyarchy. In some ways I have been a convert to the idea of dyarchy. The author and founder of the system of dyarchy I count among my personal friends. I heard him talk of dyarchy with the fire and inspiration that only comes to one in the realm of religion, and I was caught by the inspiration of that fire. As I look round one wonders at the fruits of dyarchy. You must judge it by those fruits. I am not a politician but the defectiveness of dyarchy is one of the things brought home to one as one watches the affairs of this nation. Dyarchy, Sir, is an experiment very old in Anglo-Indian history. It is not an experiment of to-day. In 1765 Lord Clive embarked on what was one of the greatest experiments in dyarchy. The Muhammadan political thinkers divided the functions of Government into the *dewani* or the collection of revenue, and the *nizamat* or the administration. What did Lord Clive do? In 1765 the East India Company said they would take over the *dewani*, or the collection of revenue of Bengal and Bihar and Orissa.

**Mr. President :** Order, order. The Honourable Member must bring his remarks to a close.

**Dr. S. K. Datta :** What happened next. The administration or the *nizamat* was left in the hands of the Nawabs of Murshidabad. Sir William Hunter tells us in his history of the breakdown of the administration because of division of the two sides of government. I trust that we shall go forward because under the present system I believe that the whole of the administration is threatened and there will be a breakdown of the administration. I therefore will support the amendment which has been moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman (Home Member) :** Sir, I propose to address myself directly to the amendment now before the House which has been moved by my Honourable friend, Pandit Motilal Nehru. Before I examine, as I hope I shall examine in some detail, the terms of that amendment, I will permit myself a few general observations on matters which appear to me to arise on its perusal.

In the first place, unless I am entirely mistaken, I see in that amendment an attempt to bring very different schools of thought within the scope of its terms. That is one very interesting reflection. (An Honourable Member here interrupted, but the interruption was inaudible at the Reporter's table.) I did not hear my Honourable friend, but as I was saying it seemed to me that an attempt was made to bring together within its terms very different schools of thought. The second observation of a general character which I should like to make on this amendment—I think it has been lightly touched upon by my Honourable friend the Finance Member when he was speaking this morning on this amendment,—is that if this amendment is intended, as I understood from the statements that have been made from various parts of the House, as a considered proposal from the persons who made it, for the future constitutional development, then I gather from its terms that those persons speaking with such authority as they have, have come to the conclusion that they envisage the future constitution of India as based entirely on Western ideas and Western conventions ; that they have adopted the idea of Western representative government ; that they propose to advance on that path, and on that path alone. I have found no trace of anything that is to be introduced from any constitution other than a Western constitution in this amendment. Now, Sir, if this amendment had only been moved for that purpose, that would dissipate doubts on one point on which we have never been clear. We are therefore, I gather, to understand that all parties, at any rate in this House, who subscribe to the amendment, consider that it is not their creed to discard in any way the foundations on which those institutions have been based throughout the world, and that briefly is on the constitution of the English Parliament, and of the English Dominions under that Parliament. Am I to understand that that is in effect the intention of those who frame this amendment ? The point has so far never been clear to me or to others I believe. I remember my Honourable friend, the late Mr. Montagu, shortly before his death, was discussing this question with me. He said ; “ I have brought forward in my reforms a scheme entirely based on Western representative institutions. I am not prepared to say that it will be the wish of India to proceed on those lines, but I have at any rate given the opportunity to the people of India to indicate their views in that direction.” Am I to assume that this amendment finally rivets down the direction of the future progress of India so far as this matter is concerned in the minds of those who are responsible for it ? If this is so, at any rate it has cleared the ground in one respect. If there is no

desire to go back to any development of indigenous institutions or of Oriental conceptions of Government and we are asked to proceed on democratic lines to the counting of heads by the rule of the ballot box, then we know at any rate where we are.

Now, Sir, I have considered this amendment with the attention that it deserved, not only because of the reputation of the Mover, but also from the general evidence in support of it that has come from many parts of the House. What are the actual terms of the amendment? It involves, as I read it, three distinct stages. The first is that Parliament is to be asked to make a declaration dealing with certain points which are specified in the amendment. Now these points involve, and I do not doubt that this is intended, whatever the reservations, whatever the restrictions may be, a demand for full dominion self-government. That seems to me the only possible construction I can put upon it. That is to say we are now to go to the English Parliament and ask them to make a declaration which I presume would at any rate have to be supported by the assent of Parliament, that complete dominion self-government, subject to the very minor restrictions of a temporary character, which are contained in the Resolution, should be granted. After that there is to be another step. Those who have moved and supported the amendment recognise apparently that the legislative bodies, as at present constituted, are not sufficiently representative to deal with a problem of that magnitude....

**Mr. A. Rangaswami Iyengar :** They have no mandate.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** I am told they have no mandate. At any rate it is recognised that the legislative bodies as now constituted are not constituted to deal with the problems which are referred to, and I may say somewhat lightly referred to, as details, and which are to be referred to a convention or a round table conference which is adequately to represent all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests. They are to deal with the details of the scheme, and they are to do so with due deference to the interests of minorities—and here I must pause to comment that in the declaration that Parliament is to make there is nothing referring to minorities—they are to frame a detailed scheme, after making such inquiry as may be desirable. Thereafter, from that large and representative body, for if it was to be constituted in the manner laid down in the amendment it would be a very large body, from that large and *ex hypothesi* representative body, the matter is to be again referred back to this House, not to the Indian Legislature even, but to this House. This House is then to approve of it, and then the scheme as approved by this House is to be submitted to Parliament to be embodied in a Statute. That, Sir, is the scheme as I have been able to discover it, of the amendment.

Now the first observation I would make on this is that it involves the repeal of the Government of India Act as it exists at present.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah :** No, amendment.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** Repeal and re-enactment. My Honourable friend interrupts me and says it does not involve repeal.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah :** Certainly not; it can be done by an amendment.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** It does involve at any rate, and that was a point I was going to develop, the virtual repeal of

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

section 84A of the Government of India Act, for, unless I have misunderstood my Honourable friends opposite, they have now changed their ground, and those who signed the minority report of the Committee consider that great constitutional advances may be made in India without any necessity for the authoritative inquiry which they themselves recommended. If I can gather anything from this amendment, it is that it proposes that His Majesty's Government should take this final step, without inquiry, that which I venture to think no person could consider would be possible under the Government of India Act as it now exists without the statutory commission which is laid down in section 84A of the Government of India Act. Then, Sir, there seems to be some difference of opinion on the point, and I should like to have cleared up the question whether these remarkable demands—I say remarkable in this sense that they must be admitted to be an extraordinary change in the existing constitution of the Government of India—whether these remarkable demands, which are specified in clauses (a) to (h) are handed to us as an ultimatum. I confess I should myself have read them as such, but my Honourable friend spoke of them as an "offer." I will accept his words. When he makes that offer, does he make that offer in the sense that these are the only terms which can be offered, that they are, as my Honourable friend Sir Charles Innes said, to be accepted or refused without alteration of a comma, dot or semi-colon? That is a point of some interest to me. If I am correct in assuming that I have correctly stated the proposition and that you do intend to discard the idea of any statutory commission before a great constitutional advance is made, and you do intend to present these demands without alteration and without change, then I should like to ask one further question. This, Sir, is said to be an offer. I assume the language is used with due consideration. If so, Sir, and the offer was accepted, what contract would result? What is the contract that would result if the Government accepted this offer?

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : Frame the constitution accordingly.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : *Do ut des*. We give this ; what do we get in return ?

**Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer** : Co-operation.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : Co-operation. (*An Honourable Member* : " Full co-operation ! ") Well, Sir, it is just as well that we should know what the offer is supposed to lead to.

Now, Sir, I pass to another point. In the course of the debate the word " self-determination " has occurred not frequently but occasionally and it is, I think, an idea that lies at the back of many of the speeches that have been made. Now I suppose, if I understand it rightly, self-determination in an individual means the right to live his own life. Self-determination in a nation I suppose means the right to settle its own form of government. Now, Sir, which of us can live our own lives independent of outside influence? I have not heard of anyone, I have not heard of any nation. Phrases of this kind need accurate examination. They need checking. They may contain, and they do contain, a great truth, but they cannot solve any constitutional position, they cannot be used as an answer to practical criticism. Now Sir, what is the actual practical position? That is what I always try, if I can, to bring before the House. It is admitted—I do not desire to reiterate it—that constitutionally any advance can only come from the English

Parliament. It can come in no other way except in a way that I do not propose to contemplate. And in this connection I recognise with pleasure that Members generally speaking have refrained from using language that might be, at any rate in some quarters, regarded as threats. But constitutional advance must come through Parliament and with the goodwill of Parliament. It cannot come otherwise. Therefore why, when we discuss matters of this nature, do we use words that are calculated to prejudice the claims of India before that Parliament? Why do we say, "We will not take this from Parliament"? Why do we say "We do not want boons" from people who *ex hypothesi* have to give them to you if you are to get them? That, Sir, is a difficulty that I think is very real. I heard this morning in one part of the House a charge made that the English had been robbers and thieves. Sir, is that the sort of charge that will help the cause of India in Parliament?

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar** : That was rhetoric.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : It may have been rhetoric, but I deprecate the use of such rhetoric. English people are very plain people, very apt to take words used at their proper meaning : and they do no good to any cause. One speaker, I forget who it was, said that the Government, not this but I gathered almost any Government was like "Humpty Dumpty," to be thrown down. Sir, I will remind him of the nursery rhyme :

*" Humpti Dumpti baitha par chath  
Humpti Dumpti gir gia phat  
Raja ki pultan Rani ke ghore  
Humpti Dumpti kahin nahin jore."*

If you throw down all Government you may find it rather difficult to pick up the pieces and make a new Government. Now I am quite willing to believe that this amendment has been put forward in perfect good faith. If I was a man of a suspicious nature I should be inclined to think that there might be a more Machiavellian aim in it. But I am not and I will take the offer as made in good faith although we have annexed to it impossible conditions.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : No, no.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : My Honourable friend says "No." My Honourable friend's position is to be one of very greatest difficulties in dealing with this amendment. My Honourable friend has said in the minority report that what he wanted was an authoritative inquiry and he apparently at that time recognised the fact that from the practical point of view it would be perfectly impossible to ask Parliament to accept any large proposals except as the result of the investigations of the highest tribunal in the British Empire, a Royal Commission.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : Sir, may I rise to a point of personal explanation. At that time I was not aware that Lord Birkenhead on behalf of the British nation would disclaim a monopoly in the art of framing constitutions and invite us to submit our proposals.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : I think Lord Birkenhead's remarks were quite clear. You will see that that was exactly the point I endeavoured to develop in the earlier part of my speech. What

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

Lord Birkenhead was talking about was the development of a constitution not on the well-known English basis.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : No. Anything we think proper. Provided it received general support in the country.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : But a constitution which would give more free scope to that imagination which is so characteristic of India. His actual words were :

“ It has been the habit of spokesmen of Swarajist thought to declare in anticipation that no constitution framed in the West can either be suitable or acceptable to the peoples of India.”

and I think that bears out my contention as to his point.

Now, Sir, nothing has struck me more in the course of the discussion that has taken place than the fact that till Mr. Jinnah addressed the House I never heard any mention of the word “ electorate ”. Mr. Jinnah used it, but I never heard it used in any other speech.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru** : It is in the Resolution.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : I agree with my Honourable friend it is in the Resolution, but I never heard any one use it.

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah** : I used it.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : I have just said so. Now, Sir, when we are asked to take a step forward constitutionally one would have thought that the Assembly would surely regard the electorate as of great importance. I quite admit that the House is probably getting very tired of hearing the replies that are given from the Government Benches where we point out difficulties, and I agree with Mr. Jinnah that it is our business as far as we can to remove those difficulties and to remove them with your assistance and not to regard them as so many fences that are laid down barring for ever further progress. I am not one of those who hold that at all, but it is not the faintest use not facing facts, and one of the great difficulties—and all of you who have really thought on this matter recognise it as clearly as I do—is the question of the electorate. The evidence recorded in the course of the inquiry of which I was the unfortunate Chairman is very clear on this point. It is idle to say when we use the word “ electorate ” we are scandalising not the court but the opposite Benches. Sir, I have never scandalised any court in my life and I trust I never shall. By pointing out these difficulties I suggest it is not scandalising the court ; I must point out that one of the greatest difficulties in the way of the progress of India is the backward state of the electorate.

Now, Sir, you ask for a large thing. You are regardless of the smaller matters. My Honourable friend returned with thanks—I think those were the words he used—any small recommendations of the majority report. Sir, is it not well sometimes to take what is offered, not necessarily—I should be foolish to suggest that—in a spirit of thankfulness but at any rate to take it ? Is it not wise sometimes, when asking for large concessions, to show that small humble offerings are not unworthy of consideration ? Is it not wise, Sir, to regard this problem from a practical point of view ? If to-morrow I were authorised to stand in my place in this House and say “ We will accept this : we will go to Parliament ”, what reasons could I give, what reasons could the Government of India give ? What could they say ?

**Mr. M. A. Jinnah :** Quote my speech.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** I have no doubt that would be very interesting : but I was considering an argument which would be likely to be effective. Could any of the arguments suggested be valid ? Could we point to the history of these new institutions since their commencement and say, " Now the time has come when without inquiry, without going through the procedure without which no great reform as far as I know in connection with India has ever been carried out, we recommend these great steps to be taken " ?

Sir, you have heard the speeches of the Secretary of State ; you have learnt the terms on which he made his offer—and it was an offer he made. He made it clear that acceleration of political progress was a matter of co-operation. He made it clear that to refuse to work what you have got is not in itself a claim for further progress,—it is indeed likely to obstruct further progress. He laid down the position that the Government at home were not unsympathetic—that they did recognise that to stick to dates is not necessary, wise or desirable. He gave what my Honourable friend, if he was not speaking ironically, described as a very generous offer. Sir, I say, do not close the door by making the position more difficult. Do not give us an ultimatum under the guise of an offer. Do not say " We will grant you the fee of Blackacre if you empty the sea ". Do not suggest terms of that kind. It is neither wise nor, I suggest, likely to be effective. I earnestly hope that you will believe me when I say that we are not merely giving you a blank answer to what I recognise is an attempt to put down on paper what we have never seen on paper before—the united amendment of both parties.

There is one other matter, Sir, and that is this. We were charged in one of the speeches with doing nothing in connection with the examination of provincial autonomy. I think it was my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah who quoted from the Secretary of State's speech and said quite correctly that it was useless to charge the Reforms Committee with not making an investigation into the possibilities of provincial autonomy, because they were not within the scope of the Report. I agree in those observations, and I agree also that an investigation of that kind could hardly be made by a committee of that nature or by any committee ; and in this connection I may tell the House that the Government of India have recently availed themselves of the opportunity of the late occupant of your Chair, Sir, still being in India. They have invited Sir Frederick Whyte, and he has accepted the invitation, to investigate and report to us on the relations between the Central and Local Governments in other parts of the world, with special reference to conditions in India. In that and other directions, Sir, much research work must and ought to be done. My Honourable friend, Sir Basil Blackett, also proposes, I understand, to have the problem investigated more particularly from the financial point of view. In my judgment that is the way in which we can prepare, what I referred to in my first speech, the necessary evidence which is to be laid before and must be considered by the Royal Commission whenever that Commission may be appointed.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru :** May I interpose just for a minute, Sir ? The Honourable the Home Member has put certain questions. I do not know if you will give me an opportunity to answer them now or at a

[Pandit Motilal Nehru.]

later stage of the debate. He has expressed his inability to understand some of the clauses of my amendment and he has put certain questions in connection with them. I do not know if it is permissible to me to answer those questions and if so at what stage of the debate.

**Mr. President :** I do not know whether the Honourable the Home Member desires the Honourable Pandit to answer his queries. If he does, the Chair would permit the Honourable Pandit to speak at this stage.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** I put the questions as one does in a speech, and I assume that they will be answered in the course of debate by some one on behalf of the Honourable Member.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru :** If my Honourable friend does not want me to answer his questions, I am satisfied.

**Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta** (Bombay Northern Division : Non-Muhamadan Rural) : Sir, I rise to support the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru ; it would show a sign of returning wisdom on the part of Government if they too accept the amendment. We have been told that what Government are yearning for is co-operation. Here is an opportunity for them to get it. Their attitude towards this amendment will be an acid test whether their protestations that they are anxious to secure the co-operation of this House and of the country are genuine. If they accept it, then it is a clear indication that they were genuine ; if they do not accept it, then they will well deserve the title which Lord Olivier gave, that Englishmen are the champion hypocrites of the world ; Sir, the very fundamental condition of co-operation to-day is wanting. Who can co-operate ? People who are on equal terms, who can offer honourable help to each other. On what terms are Government demanding our co-operation at present ? They carry a bludgeon in one hand, a sword in another and a pistol in their pocket and armed with these weapons of vetoing, certification and brute force they give us a challenge and say, " These are our weapons, we shall use them. We shall use them whenever necessary and we demand your co-operation on these terms". Sir, it requires no moment's thinking to say that no honourable man with a sense of self-respect can agree to co-operate in working a system like this which would only mean co-operation in the continuous enslavement of the country ; it is clear from the speech of Pandit Motilal Nehru that the co-operation which this House and this country are willing to give is co-operation only on the terms of reciprocity and not co-operation of a one-sided kind.

Then, Sir, what is wrong with this amendment that you cannot willingly accept it. It does not affect the British connection with India. It does not affect the sovereignty of Parliament. It maintains the continuance and the permanence of British rule, and consistently with that permanence we demand the fullest freedom. On these terms you are getting our fullest co-operation but the only answer that we have so far got is a blank negation.

Then there is this further thing about this amendment--it contemplates the elevation of the Government of India themselves. To-day the Government of India are insignificant in England. They are impotent abroad. They are tyrannical only at home. That is the correct descrip-

tion of the Government of India. Lord Curzon described it as a subordinate branch of the British administration six thousand miles away, and as regards the impotence of the Government of India to save Indians from humiliation and injustice in the Dominions and Colonies it is so notorious that even they are themselves ashamed of it. Pandit Motilal Nehru's amendment proposes to remove the thralldom to the Secretary of State in which the Government of India find themselves to-day. Sir, the Government of India cannot create an appointment of more than Rs. 500, without the previous sanction of the Secretary of State (*An Honourable Member* : "No.") or it may be a similar amount. In the Bombay Corporation, we can make an appointment not only of Rs. 500 but of any amount. Here is a subordinate body which makes an appointment which the Government of India cannot make without consulting the Secretary of State. The Acworth Committee gave an instance of how the Government of India were slaves to the leading strings of the Secretary of State. In railway administration the Government of India were guided by a set of rules—115 pages of text, 25 pages of index under 400 heads—rules delegating to the Government of India powers which really belong to the Secretary of State—rules which the Government in turn could delegate to the Railway Board. This is the condition of the Government of India, and if they accept this amendment they will become for the first time a really independent Government so far as the internal affairs of the country are concerned. To-day they are a subordinate and a very secondary sovereign body. But it seems, Sir, that we are not going to get even that co-operation in elevating the Government of India themselves, which this amendment desires.

Sir, I must now come to this Muddiman Committee report. The Home Member is a gentleman, clear-headed and sincere, and from all his speeches we can find that he has a genuine desire to come to terms with us. But what is it that this Committee does? I am reminded of a poem by Lord Tennyson, the late Poet Laureate, entitled *Maud*. His critics described it as "mad" or "mud." With great regard to the personality of the Home Member, the Committee which is distinguished by his name was surely a muddy committee. The Committee had evidence from Ministers, Executive Councillors and men whom they delighted to honour. These people told the Committee that it was impossible to work dyarchy and yet the only change that they recommended is the transfer of such trivial things as Gas. This is the limit of their generosity. Sir, keep this gas to yourself. Give us some freedom, some breeze of freedom and not mere gas. The Government of India are to-day working as a bureau; and the speech of Sir Charles Innes was the clearest indication that bureaucrats are unfit to be statesmen. Like experts, they are good as advisers but very bad when they are masters of the situation. Sir Charles Innes' speech was a further indication that bureaucrats like *pardanashin* women have no access to the free air of nature. They live behind closed doors. They do not care to know opinion from outside and they are so self-opinionated that they will not accept advice given by others. Instead of greater freedom we had the other day from Lord Birkenhead a most fire-eating speech. He rattled the sword. He told us that we were slaves who had been conquered with the sharp edge of the sword. The speech which His Excellency the Viceroy delivered on the opening day of this Session merely covered the iron hand with a velvet glove and the pronouncement of Sir Charles Innes yesterday leaves no

[Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta.]

manner of doubt that you are not prepared to take one forward step until it pleases you ; that is the quarrel which this House and this country have with you and we are driven back to the Preamble of the Government of India Act. Sir, that Preamble is the most arrogant expression of power that one could come across. It is a declaration of the divine right of the British nation to govern this country which this country denies ; this divine right cannot subsist in any country in this 20th century. I do not know what the fate of this amendment will be when it is carried, as I am sure it will be carried. All appearances are that the Government will sit tight over it and as usual while professing the greatest solicitude they will do nothing (*An Honourable Member* : " It goes without saying. ") If it goes without saying, it also goes without saying what those who support this amendment will do. They know what to do. Behind this amendment, there stands the combined strength of Indian opinion which will compel Government sooner or later, sooner than later, to accept the demands behind this amendment. Otherwise there is no doubt that the position in India will soon develop into one of extreme seriousness.

**Mr. K. Ahmed** : No.

**Mr. Jamnadas Mehta** : Mr. Kabeer-ud-Din Ahmed will have no share in that ; but people who come here as representatives of thousands of voters are not going to sit idle when their most considered advice is flouted. When they feel that their representations do not meet with the response which they deserve, the only course left open to them is to go back to their own electorate and demand a further mandate in the matter. The matter cannot be allowed to rest here. It shall not be allowed to lie here, and unless within a reasonable time a fair response is forthcoming on the part of Government I think with the greatest reluctance on our part we will be compelled to resort to some sort of direct action. Sir, the position is anomalous ; when we reason, we are not listened to. We have given reasons for the demands embodied in the amendment. You turn a deaf ear. When we warn you that unless you comply with our reasoned request we must take some direct action, you complain of a threat. Now, you cannot argue both ways. You will not listen to reason, and when nothing but direct action is open to us, you call it a " threat ". What are we to do ? If you do not want direct action, it is your duty to listen to fair and reasonable representations of the leaders of parties in this House. If you do not, then, Sir, nothing is left to honourable men but to go to the country and demand its mandate in this matter. Charles Dickens mentions in one of his novels the story of an experimental philosopher, who wanted to know on how little a horse could live. The philosopher went on day after day reducing the hay which he was giving to the horse,—first one sheaf, then something less and less until it came to merely one piece of straw a day. The philosopher was glorying in the prospects of success of the experiment. " Here I have made an experiment. I shall to-morrow declare to an astonished world that a horse can live on nothing a day. " To his great amazement and confusion, the horse died. (Laughter.) The experimental philosopher was a fool ; he should have known that a horse cannot live on nothing a day. Similarly, the patience of the people of this country cannot be taxed *ad infinitum*. We must have something tangible ;

4 P.M.

if you cannot give us that, then the patience of the people of this country is sure to be exhausted ; and they must naturally resort to the only honourable course left to them, namely, to seek the suffrages of their electors in any further action that they may desire.

Sir, there is only one word more, and I will then take my seat, and that is this. Sir, Lord Birkenhead and His Excellency the Viceroy have told us again and again that if only co-operation is forthcoming, then they will sooner or later get us a Royal Commission ; some such promise is held out. As I said at the start, Sir, this amendment is the offer of co-operation on the most honourable terms, guaranteeing the permanence of the British connection, releasing the Government from the thralldom of Whitehall. It is for you to decide whether you will take it or reject it, and thereafter it will not be open to you to say that there was no intention of co-operation on the part of the people of this country. Our difficulty is that if we are divided, then the Government say, " You are not agreed ". Here however is an agreed amendment, but then the Finance Member was anxious to point to....

**Mr. President :** Order, order. The Honourable Member's time is up.

**Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta :** I will not take very long, Sir. I will only say this that you cannot breathe hot and cold about the same matter. If we unite, you call it a marriage of convenience. If we differ, you say that....

*An Honourable Member :* May I point out, Sir, that the Honourable Member is not addressing the Chair ?

**Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta :** I am addressing you, Sir,—I was simply finishing my sentence, and if you will permit me, I will....

**Mr. President :** Order, order. The Honourable Member's time is up.

**Mr. Jamnadas M. Mehta :** I shall only say this, Sir,....

**Mr. President :** Order, order. Will you kindly resume your seat.

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju** (Ganjam cum Vizagapatam : Non-Muhamadan Rural) : Sir, what is the significance of the various speeches made here to-day and yesterday ? The only significance which must not be forgotten by the Government is " mistrust of the British intentions " and nothing less. Why should it be that among all sections of non-officials there should be such mistrust ? Because it is plain that their conduct in the past as well as in the present evokes mistrust and nothing else. The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman has referred to self-determination. He says, most people do not understand its significance. But may I be permitted, Sir, to point out to Sir Alexander Muddiman that it is a very difficult word, after 1918, for the British nation to digest. I may mention that when President Wilson said that there should be self-determination for the weaker nations and that all should join in putting down the militarism of Germany, then the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, stated, " We are prepared to grant self-determination to the weaker nations ". But may I remind the Honourable Members that in the very article which was originally drafted by President Wilson on this of self-determination,

[Mr. B Venkatapatiraju.]

in the original article 3 as drafted by President Wilson there occurred the - words :

“ Such territorial readjustment if any as may in future become necessary by reason of changes in present racial conditions and aspirations, of present social and political relations pursuant to the principle of self-determination may be effected if agreeable to those people ”,

—that is to the subject races—

“ and the contracting Powers accept without reservation the principle that the peace of the world is superior in importance to every question of political control or boundary.”

That was the article which President Wilson announced to the world. The difficulty was that opposition came strongly from no other quarter but from the British Empire. Even the British Dominions did not oppose it, but the British Empire stated : “ How can we get on with India, if you give self-determination ? ” And therefore, most unwillingly, President Wilson had to drop it, and for it other phraseology was substituted, the result being that when this came to be discussed in both the Upper and the Lower Houses in America, you find people saying, in effect : “ How can we let the British nation have their own way in keeping their subject races in such a miserable condition after making high promises that they would give them self-determination ? They have rejected even President Wilson’s advice ”, and that is the reason that they have not joined the League of Nations.

Sir, in one of the quotations of Pandit Motilal Nehru he referred to the maxim “ whatever is best administered is best ” of the 18th century which Lord Crewe stated that he would adopt when he was discussing the subject of the South African Union. Now I say, why everyone on this side of the House says that we want a change in the administration is because it has not come up to our expectations, it has not given us any satisfaction, and therefore we say that we want to change the system of administration. The Government were all along unpopular, but at the present moment they are much more unpopular than they were ever before. I do not complain that this is due to anything particularly done now, but it is an inherited sin, for as early as 1858 when J. S. Mill wrote the apologia of the East India Company in a memorandum presented to Parliament after the Mutiny when surrendering the Indian Empire, he stated that the East Indian Company—just as Sir Charles Innes and Sir Alexander Muddiman are claiming for this Government now—had established a Government :

“ not only one of the purest in intention but one of the most beneficent in action ever known among mankind, and that it had been one of the most rapidly improving Governments in the world.”

But he adds :

“ Nevertheless it was their hard destiny to make unloved an Empire.”

Not only then, Sir, but also later, it was clearly admitted by Lord George Hamilton as Secretary of State for India :

“ The Indian Government was not popular and would never be popular ”

because they never cared to know the aspirations of the people, to meet them and how best to satisfy them. They are indifferent and that is the reason why they are unpopular even at the present moment. Perhaps some of the gentlemen on the Treasury Benches think that they glory in

their unpopularity because the other day they said they want men for the committees who are unpopular, because they have the strength of conviction behind them. What my friends Sir Alexander Muddiman and Sir Charles Innes complained of is that we should have treated the Government with better respect and not have imputed motives to them. I say so far as Indians are concerned, they do not generally impute motives; they are more charitable. What they do say is that they will judge the Governmental action by its effects alone. What is it that was said of them, not by an Indian, but by an American of importance, Thomas Villard, in his work "Conflict of policies in Asia"? This quotation would also afford a reply to Mr. Cocks. He says:

"British policy in India...the deep political purpose of an alien Government is not revealed by the material improvements it makes or those that occur under its administration of a country; railways, roads, imposing public buildings, factories and other betterments conduce and in modern times are essential to profitable economic development as also are peace and public order."

He adds:

"Betterment of this character cannot be attributed altogether to a purpose of the Government to improve the condition of its inhabitants. The guiding motive may be profitable economic exploitation and a policy of political and intellectual repression to move side by side."

This is what a disinterested observer of British policy in India has stated. He is not an Indian. But even as late as 1923, Mrs. Egan, who was a great friend of Mr. Montagu, after visiting India has written to say that the real British policy is to perpetuate British domination without caring for the people's interests. This is what she says:

"To be firm in the imposition of a benevolent despotism and to keep the natives in their place have been from the British point of view the fundamental requirements of the British position."

That is exactly the reason, Sir, why we ask for fundamental changes in our amendment. Sir Alexander Muddiman complains that we add this as an ultimatum. But we say that after the speech of His Excellency the Viceroy if the question is referred to any Committee appointed by the British nation the verdict will go against them, and therefore to fortify ourselves we will say whatever you may do, whatever you may not do, we want these things if you want satisfaction on our side and expect hearty and cheerful co-operation from us. Give us responsible Government. We do not want to put up any longer with bureaucratic rule which is not responsible either to us or to any others practically. But I may state if the Government are in a mood to understand the real position and to come to terms, of course all parties will be prepared to discuss the question with them. But so long as the British nation depends upon the advice of the Treasury Benches for guidance, I am sure we will not get anything, because a certificate was given to them by more than one member of Parliament in discussing the Government of India Bill that no reform proposals can ever emanate from the Civil Service and they further added that it would be an evil day for them if any changes are made, because they take it a misfortune to themselves if any privileges are granted to the people, and therefore we cannot expect any better recommendation from them. Consequently we appeal to the British nation to judge the matter for themselves, because they are lovers of freedom always.

I will only take a few minutes more. I will just mention one other point. It has already been mentioned, but sufficient importance is not

[Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju.]

given to the statement made by Lord Birkenhead with reference to the Indianisation of the Army. We know that the Government have appointed the Sandhurst Committee, but Lord Birkenhead wants us to understand that there are certain limitations. This is what he stated :

“ An essential in India's advance towards responsible government is to Indian minds the possession of a national army.”

I controvert that proposition. It is a statement made by Sir William Vincent in this House. “ How can we get responsible government without an army ” is a statement made by members of Parliament, to which Mr. Montagu replied :

“ Do not deny to India self-government because she cannot take her proper share in her own defence and then deny to her people the opportunity of learning to defend themselves.”

British statesmen and European officials in India are stating that we cannot expect self-government so long as we rely on British arms for support. Lord Birkenhead further states that we are in the region of an experiment and of a very delicate and dangerous experiment. For whom ? I fail to see. It cannot be for us. The method which has been adopted is that of the complete but gradual Indianisation as an experiment of 8 units. And he admits it is both slow and limited in scope. The process must indeed necessarily be slow : he says the length of time that ordinarily takes the British officer to reach the command of his regiment is 25 years. Now I ask if 8 units take 25 years for complete Indianisation, knowing as we do that there are 146 units, it will take more than even 250 years to Indianise the army. It will take nearly three centuries. Lord Birkenhead adds that they had difficulty in finding enough Indian cadets up to the Sandhurst standard to provide subalterns even for these 8 units, to which my leader, Mr. Jinnah, has already replied. Not only can we provide 10 or 16 cadets, but any number if properly arranged. Lord Birkenhead significantly referred to the fact that the Government of India have recently appointed a Committee under the presidency of the Chief of the General Staff to examine the whole question of training for the army. They may recommend the creation of an Indian Sandhurst. If they do so, the British Government will consider their recommendation “ with every desire to make the experiment of Indianization a success *within its limits.*” If the words “ within its limits ” have any meaning, they mean with reference to the Indianization of the 8 units.

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member will bring his remarks to a close.

**Mr. B. Venkatapatiraju :**

“ But until it has been shown to be a success within those limits, it is not our purpose to go beyond them.”

He says he is not prepared to go beyond that. It is really surprising in view of this statement what would be the result of the Sandhurst Committee, and therefore we say from all sides that the suspicious conduct of the Government engenders distrust in every section in this House.

**Lala Duni Chand** (Ambala Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, I rise to support the amendment of my Honourable leader Pandit Motilal

Nehru. I want to say a word as to why I do not propose the amendment that stands in my name. As the amendment of Pandit Motilal Nehru has been adopted as the main amendment, all subordinate amendments, like mine, must give way to it. Another and greater reason is that as the whole debate has centred round the issue of a national demand as made in the amendment and as united India is going to tell the people of England, and for the matter of that the whole world, what the minimum demands of united India are, it will be rather out of tune for me to move my amendment. The amendment of my distinguished leader is couched in the most moderate and statesmanlike language and contains a demand which falls much short of the demand for Swarajya. It is an honourable, patriotic and conciliating reply to the invitation extended by Lords Birkenhead and Reading to the responsible leaders of Indian political opinion to co-operate with the Government. A number of the younger members of the Swarajya Party and even the middle aged members like myself do not feel enthusiastic over the national demand made in the amendment, and it is only considerations of loyalty to and implicit faith in our great leader and our sense of gratitude to the memory of the great departed leader Shriji Chittaranjan Das who extended an olive branch of peace to the British Government shortly before his death, that has reconciled the Party to the proposed amendment. Even if this most reasonable demand is not responded to, both parties will be entitled to revert to their respective positions, the Government to the pursuit of the policy of repression and suppression of all legitimate aspirations of the people of this country and the Swarajya Party to the only business left to itself of creating a situation in the country that will make it difficult for the Government not to concede the birthright of the people of this country.

As to the terms of peace that have been offered by the Government in the form of the recommendations of the Reforms Inquiry Committee Report they are nothing short of an insult to the people of India. There can be no denying the fact that the long-suffering people of India, by reason of the operation of the laws of nature, were driven to the necessity of waging truly a war though of a non-violent character against the present system of Government. No Government howsoever mighty can afford to treat it as a mere childish freak or an abnormal ebullition of human passions. The outburst was the inevitable result of the state of serfdom and subjection that had been created in this country during the last hundred and fifty years of alien though professedly benevolent rule. Though seemingly you have succeeded in suppressing the forces of non-co-operation, at heart the people of this country are still non-co-operators. Even assuming that we are vanquished foes, which we deny we are, I put the question to you: Are these terms worthy of being offered even to vanquished foes? The recommendations like the transfer of fisheries and excise in Assam and of forests in certain Provinces, of provincial law reports, stores and stationery and so forth as proposed in the Inquiry Committee Report, will not satisfy anybody. An offer of this kind is nothing short of a cruel joke cruelly indulged in at the expense of the people of India. When the most reasonable and reasonably balanced men like the authors of the minority report refuse to agree with the majority, the Government should pause and ponder over the situation. The keynote of the speeches of the two statesmen, Lords Birkenhead and Reading, is that unless and until responsible leaders of Indian political opinion resume co-operation and undertake to work out the unworkable reforms, they

[Lala Duni, Chand.]

will refuse to listen to them. The words of the Secretary of State as reproduced by Lord Reading are as follows :

“ We desire and request good-will, nor shall we be niggardly bargainers if we meet with that generous friendship which is ever near and dear to our hearts.”

Sweet words like these cannot satisfy India. An ounce of practice is better than a pound of theory, an example is always better than precept. India is prepared to meet you halfway. Let there be a genuine desire on the part of the English nation to respond to the aspiration of the people of India. Co-operation implies the idea of mutuality of obligations. If England is anxious to secure the good-will and co-operation of 300 millions of the people of India and their friendship as an asset of some value, 40 millions of the people of England should come forward, with an offer of a substantial measure of freedom. If the reforms were declared by the self-respecting and patriotic section of Indian people as inadequate, disappointing and unsatisfactory in 1919, how can it be fairly and reasonably expected that in 1925 the people of India, who have been through the ordeal of fire of repression and persecution, can be false to themselves and proclaim to the world that the reforms are satisfactory and adequate ? The Government are probably encouraged in their attitude of supreme indifference towards the national demand by the fact that the non-co-operation movement has spent its force and the Hindus and the Muhammadans are breaking each other's heads. I may warn the Government that it should not allow itself to be lulled into a false sense of security. The Hindus and the Muhammadans cannot continue to fight eternally in order to keep the foreign bureaucracy installed in its position of authority and power. I am quite sure that the qualities of good sense and patriotism among Hindus and Muhammadans are not altogether wanting and are bound to reassert themselves in the near future against the forces of communal tension and religious feud. It is true that the visible activity of non-co-operation is suspended but non-co-operation is driven deeper into the very bones of the men and women of India. In my opinion the present time is most favourable and most opportune for an honourable settlement. If the Government do not avail themselves of this time they may have to rue the day. There was a time when His Excellency Lord Reading found himself perplexed and did not know what to do and how to meet the onrush of non-co-operation. There was also a time when His Excellency Lord Reading was prepared to invite Mahatma Gandhi to a round table conference with a declaration that the four-anna franchise men of the Congress would have representation in proportion to their importance and neither party would claim any victory; but Mahatma Gandhi would have a round table conference on his own terms. In certain influential though rash quarters severance from the British Empire was openly preached. Even the date for the declaration of the establishment of a republic in this country was fixed. I am reminding the Government of these things simply in order to show the depth and intensity of the feelings of the people of this country against the present system of the Government. It is not long ago that you could find very few friends in this country and you looked upon the few friends that you had as enemies in disguise. The whole aspect is now changed, the fury of the non-co-operation movement has subsided. The most uncompromising non-co-operators are inclined to co-operate with you on reasonable and honourable terms. Swarajya within the British Empire has been

declared by all reasonable leaders as the early if not immediate objective of India. The late Mr. C. R. Das extended to you the hand of fellowship and dispelled your fears with regard to the cult of violence. The great and statesmanlike leader of the Swarajya Party has not missed a single opportunity since he entered the Assembly to extend the olive branch of peace and the grasp of the hand of fellowship. It is due to him that the most restless souls are being moulded into a body of peace-makers. He and the illustrious dead, Mr. C. R. Das, have ample proof of constructive statesmanship in order to demonstrate their fitness ; they have ever run risks of taxing too much the adherence of their followers. Mahatma Gandhi, who is still the leader of leaders, has preached the gospel of love towards you in return for the sentence of 6 years' imprisonment passed upon him. What has been your policy in contrast to this ? Sir William Vincent was prepared to give greater consideration to the demand of an ordinary Member of the Assembly like Rai Bahadur Mazumdar in 1921 than Sir Malcolm Hailey was prepared to treat the joint demand of stalwart leaders like Messrs. Nehru and Jinnah in 1924 or Sir Alexander Muddiman is prepared to treat them in 1925.

**Mr. President :** Order, order. Will the Honourable Member adjust his remarks to the time limit ? He has nearly reached the time limit.

**Lala Duni Chand :** I will not exceed my time limit. Have I exceeded it, Sir ? I have got good reasons to believe that in 1921 you were prepared to concede provincial autonomy to buy peace. You should not allow yourself I say again to be lulled into a false sense of security. If there was enough patriotic material in India in 1921 to start a movement of non-co-operation, the quantity of that material has infinitely increased since then. If a Rowlatt Bill or Jhallianwala Bagh could rouse the inert mass into a volcanic outburst, there is no knowing whether a little match applied to the gunpowder magazine of the too much taxed patriotism of India may not create a worse situation. The British tiger should not think that the Indian lion has fallen to rise no more. The wounds caused without any attempt to apply the healing balm are bound to increase the fury and the ferocity of the wounded lion.

I have made it clear as best I could that the present time is best suited for settlement. Lord Birkenhead wanted a constitution which should have a fair amount of support of different sections of the Indian people behind it. Messrs. Nehru and Jinnah have already given you a very fair and definite idea of the constitution in the form of the amendment, the framing of which, I believe, did not take them more than a few hours. Distinguished leaders like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and others representing different schools of political thought, are virtually parties to it. What further proof need Lord Birkenhead or Lord Reading require of the fair measure of support behind it ? Certainly they do not require the storm of 1921 as a proof of the required support. The calm and considered support of the recognized leaders of India should be regarded as ample proof of the measure of support needed. If the declaration of Lord Birkenhead that such a constitution will receive the best consideration at his hands and at the hands of other statesmen of England is not an empty shibboleth, he is put to a test and let us see if he rises equal to it. The preamble and the several clauses of the amendment have been worded in such a way that they should be acceptable to all the political parties of India. The greatest merit of this amendment lies in the

[Lala Duni Chand.]

fact that it provides for a transitional stage of political freedom. It opens avenues of service to the people of India in order to substantiate their claim of fitness to govern India and at the same time it gives you sufficient space of time to watch and see if we are fit to govern ourselves.

**Mr. President:** Order, order. The Honourable Member has exceeded his time limit.

**Lala Duni Chand :** No, Sir, there is one minute more.

**Mr. President :** Order, order. Mr. Abdul Haye.

**Mr. Abdul Haye** (East Punjab : Muhammadan) : Sir, I am thankful to you that even at the fag-end of the debate I have been afforded an opportunity to express my views on this all-important question. Sir, before I proceed, I want to impress upon this Assembly that we who occupy the back benches in this House lie under a great disadvantage. On almost all important occasions I have been on my legs, but have failed to catch the eye of the Honourable President. I would not have given expression to these views but for the speech of the Honourable Sir Frederick Whyte which he delivered at the time when the dinner was given in his honour. My grievance is that as I rise to give expression to my views the Treasury Benches are empty. It is only my friend the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett who is there. I hope this Honourable House will bear with me if I talk in parables to-day, because a Persian poet has said :

“ *Khushtar ún bashad ke sirre dilbarán,  
Gufta ayad dar hadís-i-digrán.* ”

which means :

“ When we have talk of those whom we love, it is better to talk in parables.”

Sir, to me it looks as if in this unfortunate country the bureaucracy had built a very lofty and palatial house for itself. As we, the sons of the soil, entered that compound we noticed that almost every nook and corner of that building was labelled “ For Europeans only ”. But it was the duty of the bureaucracy to accommodate us also. One gentleman, i.e. the agent of the bureaucracy, patrolling in front of the verandah, bluntly told us that our proper place was there at the outskirts of the estate where thatched houses were erected out of mud and sundried bricks. We were housed there. We lived there for generations, and all the time, I assure you, we continued swearing at the bureaucracy, although the bureaucracy evidently thought we were quite contented. It so happened that in the year of grace, 1914, the big palace caught fire. At midnight the lord of the house was on the top of the palace and was crying. He said, “ People of my house, my brethren, our house is on fire.” It was open to the lord to say, “ Strangers, neighbours, I am in trouble, come to my assistance out of sheer humanity.” The impression created at the time was that it was “ our ” house that was on fire. We stirred in our beds. In the darkness of the hour, half-naked, with buckets of water on our shoulders we left those dingy *kothries* and proceeded to the scene of the fire. Sir, the bureaucracy will excuse me if I say that our half nudity did not offend their sense of delicacy at the time. We laboured hard, we co-operated with the bureaucracy, we fought shoulder to shoulder, and the fire was brought under control. I am sorry, Sir, that His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief is not

in his seat, otherwise a gallant soldier as he is, His Excellency would have borne me out when I say that it was no mean part that we played in bringing the fire under control. The fire was quenched. With a sign of relief the bureaucracy was taking notice of the damage that was done to the palace. We who were intruders, we who were under that roof for the first time, were noticing what had remained of that big palace, and we thought that we were co-sharers in the building. What happened next? Smiles were extended and, Sir, a little while after that we were politely told that our people in the outhouses were waiting for us. Just at the time when we were thinking that the bureaucracy would also bring our people under that roof, we were told that our place as usual was there in the outhouses. Like a Drill Instructor the order was pronounced "As you were!" But mind you, Sir, we have refused to obey that order. We are not to-day in those outhouses, we are still in the verandah of that big building although we are being hustled out of it by men like my Honourable friend Sir Basil Blackett and the Honourable the Home Member.

Sir, in the heat of this discussion let us not forget certain stern realities that obtain in this country. It is my painful duty to strike a note of warning. Let it not be taken as a jarring note. I have never struck a jarring note on the floor of this Assembly so far, and if I am true to my religion and to my country, I deem it my duty to fight shoulder to shoulder with my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru and my Honourable friend Mr. Jinnah. But, Sir, a lot of argument has been advanced against this amendment. It has been said that one of the greatest obstacles that lie in our way is the Hindu-Muslim question. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that the danger of the Hindu-Mussalman question has been magnified. (Hear, hear.) Sir, even if these differences continue, we are bound to fight for Swaraj on the floor of this House. We shall have responsible government established in this country in spite of those differences. Sir, in this fight for liberty there are millions and crores of Indians that are arrayed against the bureaucracy. When in the face of these facts you find the noble Lord Birkenhead and His Excellency the Governor General refusing to recognise the justice of our cause, it is no doubt mainly due to the fact, as my Honourable friend Mr. Chaman Lal has put it, that they have at their back the power of the howitzer and the machine-gun. But apart from this, let me remind this Honourable House that they are also counting to a great extent upon our mutual differences. Sir, the bureaucracy knows that when the order for attack will be pronounced, and the time for making a charge will come, in all probability the Hindus and the Mussalmans of India, instead of directing their attack against the bureaucracy, would prefer to kick one another. Sir, I have already said that this argument of the bureaucracy does not hold good, but is it not our duty to meet them on their own ground by composing our differences at the earliest possible opportunity? (Applause.) Sir, may I not address a few words to the Honourable the Leader of the opposition? (*An Honourable Member*: "You cannot do that here".) When we came first to the Assembly, it was in February 1924, if the Honourable Members remember, the position was this. The memorable Resolution about the establishment of responsible government in this country was to come before this Assembly for discussion. We had some preliminary meetings in which some responsible leaders of Indian thought outside this House also participated. I deem it my duty to remind the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru that at the time amongst the Muhammadan Members

[Mr. Abdul Haya.]

of this House, there was a section that was diffident in moving along with us. What they said was that although they had no objection to taking a step forward, yet they wanted that the rights of the Mussalmans should be settled beforehand. The time at our disposal was very short, and I was one of those who thought that we should not make such settlement a condition precedent. I implored them to stand by the side of Pandit Sahib and to vote for the Resolution. Sir, I want to make it known to this House and through this House to the country abroad, that an assurance was given to us that early attempts would be made to compose all those differences, especially those that still obtain in the Punjab. Sir, to my great regret, no attempts have been made in that direction so far. Let it not be understood that I want in any way to lag behind. All I want to impress upon this Honourable House is the necessity of composing those differences, and on behalf of my community I want to make it known perfectly well that we want no favours. We want our legitimate rights to be protected. We are here to-day without any settlement of those rights, and still I am prepared to vote with you, but Sir, delay in these matters is dangerous. If you are going to sleep over these matters, I am afraid you would be sitting upon a volcano that may burst at any moment.

**Mr. K. Ahmed :** Hear, hear (raising his hand towards Pandit Motilal Nehru.) (Laughter.)

**Mr. Abdul Haya :** I only hope, Sir, that if ever that volcano bursts it will not be so big an affair as my Honourable friend Mr. Kabeerud-Din Ahmed is. With these few remarks I heartily support the amendment of my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru.

**Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha** (Chota Nagpur Division : Non-Muhammadan) : Sir, the political aspect of this question has been dealt with repeatedly by almost each Member coming from the provinces of Madras and Bombay in lengthy speeches. I propose to deal only with the economic aspect of the Resolution because to my mind Swaraj is as much an economic necessity for the masses of our countrymen as it is necessary for meeting our political aspirations. My learned and gallant friend who represents the European community of Bengal has told us that in his own drawing room and in the office of the European Association of Calcutta he has acquired a far greater experience of the masses of the people of this country than we who live and move amongst them. He told us that, whatever may be the differences here regarding the acceptability or the non-acceptability of the principles of dyarchy, the masses of the people in this country are not bothered by it. Well, Sir, that may be true, or it may not be true ; it is for those who pose as the representatives of the masses of India to say ; but there is one great fact from which my Honourable friend Colonel Crawford cannot escape. If he turns to examine the figures of famine and floods, the figures of disease and death, and the figures of the rise in prices without any corresponding rise in wages, the figures of the economical progress of the country within the last four years that the reforms have been in operation, he will be driven irresistably to the conclusion that the so-called reforms, the principle of dyarchy, has brought no relief to the masses of our countrymen whom he poses to represent. Well, Sir, I will read out to him an extract from a paper which is published as a semi-official docu-

ment, and it is very interesting reading for my friend Colonel Crawford. Describing the conditions of the Indian food problem, the writer says :

“ It is just possible that one-third of the above number, two-thirds of the population, may be getting a little less than 90 per cent. of their requirements, and the rest two-thirds, or one hundred millions, in spite of hard labour, may be getting for a better part of the year less than 60 per cent. of food grains that are given to the worst sort of criminals in the jails of the United Provinces and the Central Provinces.”

Well, Sir, that is the theory of trusteeship as it works in practice. And, Sir, if further evidence were necessary to prove how this theory has egregiously failed to bring about any relief to the masses of our countrymen I can quote no better authority than the Honourable Sir Charles Innes himself. In a report of which he is the author and which is called a “ Report on the operations of the Food Stuffs Commissioner ” he says :

“ These high prices have caused the greatest distress and embarrassment in India. They have pressed most hardly on the poorer classes of people living on small fixed incomes in the towns but the effect of them has been felt by every section of the community as well as by Government and by other large employers of labour. It is small comfort to the Indian to be told that on the whole he has kept more alive than the people of most other countries.”

Therefore, Sir, if we look at this question, from the economic point of view, from the point of view of the masses of India who have every day to face an economic struggle, who have every day to wage war against starvation and disease, we are driven to the conclusion that the present system of government has entirely failed to bring about any relief.

**Colonel J. D. Crawford :** Can the Honourable Member give me any figures before British rule in India ?

**Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha :** My Honourable friend refers me back to the days when neither he nor I, neither his ancestors nor my ancestors were responsible for the administration of the country. Well, Sir, if he wants the British Government in India to be compared to the Government of India during the Tuglak period or during the period of the Pathans, if he wants the achievements of the British Government to be compared with the achievements of non-Aryan races, I believe, Sir, I cannot convince him of the futility of his argument. I hope, Sir, his own British compeers will give him up as a hopeless proposition. We want to compare the British Government not with the bad governments of the past but with the good governments of the present time in other countries and with the good government which we hope to establish in India in the future.

It has been said in this House that the amendment proposed by my Honourable leader virtually accepts the theory that the western form of government is most acceptable to the needs of our country. Well, Sir, speaking for myself I do not read that meaning into the amendment of my Honourable leader, and I have absolutely no hesitation in averring that the principles embodied in the majority Muddiman Report and the principles underlying the Government of India Act, 1919, are not at all suited to the genius of our people and not fitted to meet the requirements of the Indian nation. Well, Sir, the amendment does not say that we must have either this form of government or that form of government. The amendment lays down certain general principles. The determination of the exact constitution of the country will be left in

[Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha.]

the hands of those who sit at a round-table conference. I personally believe, Sir, that in our country western institutions are unworkable, and even if they were workable they would not be of advantage to our people. Small units of government based upon democratic control are institutions that would in my humble opinion be more suitable for a country like India. We are at present asked to give our opinion as to whether or not the principle of dyarchy that has been in operation for the last 4 years and which my Honourable friend the Home Member's Resolution seeks to perpetuate for all time to come is good for this country. Our one answer is an emphatic "No!" Well, Sir, the Honourable the Commerce Member, with the instincts that prompt the administration of affairs in his Department, told us that the British people has for the last 150 years invested so much capital and energy in this country and naturally they are entitled to enjoy their dividend in the shape of rights and privileges. Well, Sir, I am not one of those who overlook the fact that we owe many things to our connection with Great Britain and with western countries. But if it is contended that in return for the obligations under which they have placed us we should grant them a lease in perpetuity whereby they will be able to exploit our natural resources for years to come, then I submit that they are labouring under a great delusion. In the field of politics, either in this country or in any other country, public memory is very short and obligation for things done in the past can be no sufficient inducement for forgetting the omissions, the misbehaviour and the misrule of the present generation.

Well, Sir, I support this amendment because we believe that neither the British Parliament nor the British nation are capable of devising a system of government which will be beneficial to the people of this country. This is no reproach them. In the nature of things they cannot understand the needs of the people of a country whose civilisation and mode of living are entirely different from theirs. If any illustration were necessary it will suffice to say that the kind of Swaraj, the kind of self-government, the progressive realisation of self-government which is foreshadowed in the Preamble to the Government of India Act of 1919, the kind of self-governing institutions which they promise to give us, is nothing but a system of government under which their own dividends in this joint stock company are ensured at the point of the bayonet. If they show us grace and if they are forced to give us further reforms it means only this, that they are prepared to take into partnership with them in this joint stock company a few landed and commercial magnates of this country. Well, Sir, self-government for the vast bulk of the people of this country is no mere fair equitable and just distribution of profits and dividends between Indian capitalists and European capitalists. Self-government is an ideal which stirs the masses of the people with the hope that it will bring them economic relief, that it will free them from the dangers to which they are subjected every day of their lives. And, Sir, it is certain that if that belief actuates the masses of the country an amount of energy will be generated which will be difficult for any Government, in spite of all its power and pomp, to resist. To-day across the floor of this House we are told that neither His Excellency the Viceroy nor His Lordship the Secretary of State for India will be coerced into granting further reforms by threats given by our leaders. Well, Sir, as has been observed by other Honourable

Members of this House, this assumption of self-complacency on the part of anybody who is responsible for the administration of Indian affairs is due entirely to the fact that at present they realise—and I hope it is a temporary phase—at present they realise that the nationalist movement in India has been temporarily divorced from the mass energy that at one time backed its demands. Well, Sir, if these economic forces are allowed to go on working and if the appeal for co-operation is made without its being accompanied by any programme which will bring economic relief to the country, the natural result will be that discontent will go on increasing. The time will come when the mass energy generated

5 P.M.

by the necessities of the economic situation would be yoked to the political aspirations that guide in the determination of the affairs of institutions that are called nationalistic, and when that time comes the British Army, the Navy and their armaments and also the Imperial conceit which the British nation possess will be of no avail to them. It was but a glimpse of that prospect which in December 1921 drove terror into the hearts of those who are responsible for the Government of India at present, and not only were they willing but they were eager to convene a round table conference and to consider proposals for further reforms. Well, Sir, if the Government of India continue their policy of total indifference to and total disregard of the needs of those whom they profess to represent and whose trustees they claim to be, I have no doubt that in due course the time will come when the mass energy, that would be generated by the appeals of those who base their claims upon the principles of national self-determination, will assume such a volume and shape that it will be impossible for the British nation or for the British people, much more for the Government of India, to resist. With these words I support the amendment.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum** (North-West Frontier Province: Nominated Non-Official) : Sir, having listened to the very eloquent speeches of the Honourable Members who have preceded me, perhaps the House might like to hear the common sense point of view of a resident of the North West Frontier Province. It is very seldom that we hear any mention of that unfortunate province made in the debates of this Assembly. At this late hour, Sir, I should like to mention one or two points only. I first speak as a Mussalman of the North West Frontier Province. As such, Sir, the Muslim point of view has already been expressed in this House by some of the Muslim Members, particularly Maulvi Muhammad Yakub and Mr. Abdul Haye.

**Mr. Devaki Prasad Sinha** : Not by Mr. Jinnah ?

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum** : The Muslim point of view, I say. Well, I expected that Mr. Jinnah would also mention something of the resolutions of the Muslim League that were passed at Lahore, but perhaps he thought it advisable to leave it to Maulvi Muhammad Yakub, who was also a member of the League and who, I believe, took part in its deliberations. The Muslim point of view was also expressed in a statement sent by the Muslim Members of this Assembly to the Muddiman Committee and I believe it is in the Report. I need not however worry myself much with the Muslim point of view, except that, as Mr. Rangachariar said, there is not a single Mussalman who does not want advancement by constitutional methods. However far I may

[Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

be coming from, I too want advancement in that direction. But both the Muslim League and the Muslim Parliamentary Party in this House have expressed their views under certain conditions and with certain essential provisions ; and if those provisions and conditions are fulfilled the advance will be most-welcomed by the Mussalmans. What the Muslims are really afraid of is that their condition might be that of the Indians in South Africa when Dominion status is achieved by India, and until then, Sir, the Muslims do not want to be left out of the administration and the government of the country, as they at present are to a great extent. Those are the only two conditions to be fulfilled, conditions which the Muslims are most anxious to be satisfied about and secure before any advancement is made. But, as I have said before, it is not this that I am driving at. It is the North West Frontier Province, that unhappy and unfortunate province, to which I should like to draw the attention of this House. In the Muddiman Report, both in the majority report and the minority report, I do not find any mention of my province. In the Resolution before the House and in the amendment proposed by the Honourable Pandit Sahib there is no mention of that province.....

**Pandit Motilal Nehru :** My amendment applies to the whole of India.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum :** There is just a slight mention of minorities ; but it is too vague. You do not bring in the question of the North West Frontier Province which is very very important and which should have been dealt with more clearly by the Muddiman Committee and by everybody.....

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** I should just like to explain, Sir, in reference to this that the Reforms Inquiry Committee dealt only with Governors' provinces. That was their reference.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum :** Then do I understand, Sir, that the North West Frontier Province is not part and parcel of the British Empire. The mention of the depressed classes and of labour is there. The Committee recommend some franchise for the depressed classes and some extension of the franchise for the labourer, but not for those stalwart robust people across the Indus. That is what surprises me very much, Sir.....

**Maulvi Muhammad Yakub :** They are too formidable for the franchise to be given to them.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum :** I will come to that point, Sir. The reasons which to my mind can be brought against the disfranchisement of that province can only be these.....

**Pandit Shamlal Nehru :** We want to give you complete self-government.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum :** But that will be only after you attain Swaraj. The reasons can be that we are either backward in education, that we are troublesome, that there is no money to be got for running the expensive machinery of a Council, or that there is no demand for Reforms. Those to my mind can be the only reasons for the disregard of our rights. The present Government of India Act

allows some sort of constitutional advancement and a Council for the North West Frontier Province but even that is denied to the Province. Sir, I think the reasons can only be these. As regards education I can assure you that we have made a great advance in education recently. We have got three fine colleges in the Province. We turn out a large number of graduates, if graduates can be of much use in this world, and we also give solid common sense education to our people. If you only go and see the rifles and other articles manufactured by some of our people you will know what kind of capacity they have got for practical education and practical knowledge. You will want these people one day and you may need to use them in the defence of the country one day. Sir, as regards the ordinary degree education, we have made a great advance in that direction. Not only that, Sir, but if you will compare us with the sister province of the Punjab and especially the western districts of that province, you will find they are more backward in education. Students from the Mianwali and other districts of the Punjab receive education in our institutions. Why should they enjoy reforms and not we? Simply because an administrative line is drawn between them and us and we are deprived of the benefit of these reforms.

The second argument perhaps is that we are turbulent. Turbulent we may be, Sir, but do you mean to say that we are more turbulent than the Bengalis? They go in for murders and dacoities not for gain but simply for political reasons. They are worse than us, because they do not gain anything by that materially. We only raid and commit offences when we want to get something to live upon, and when we have plenty to eat we do not go in for these offences.

The third reason may be an economic one, or the question of expenses. As a matter of fact there will not be much initial expense. The estimate that was made by the Frontier Inquiry Committee was not a very big one. It is a very modest one, Sir. I think in the long run there will be a saving and a good deal of money may be saved by starting some sort of reforms to secure the sympathies of the people there. You need not give daily allowances to the Members of the Council. You need not pay the Ministers at all. Somebody may come forward and work as honorary Minister. You may hold the meetings in one of the Houses now available there. Practically I do not think there will be much to spend in the initial stage and not much expense on the recurring side.

There is still one great objection which I believe is now passing in the mind of the Home Member and that is that he perhaps believes that there is no desire for reforms. I can honestly tell him and tell him through you, Sir, because you have said that the remarks must be addressed through the Chair, that there is a great demand or an earnest desire for it. If you want to make sure about it, you have only to turn to the pages of the Frontier Committee Report and you will find there an almost unanimous demand for advance. The only difference comes in when the shape of the advance is discussed. Some support the majority report and some the minority report, but there is a unanimous opinion of both the majority members and the minority members that the Frontier people are quite fit for advance. Well, as to the desire, Sir, there is a good deal of correspondence on this subject in the Press

[Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum.]

of the Punjab. We have not got any Press or else I should have quoted to you opinions from our own Press. We depend upon the Punjab Press. The Punjab Press publish some of our letters and articles but not much. If you wish that there should be another inquiry to show whether the people want the reforms or not, I can tell you that there will be a cent. per cent. demand, although there was 99 per cent. at the last time. I hope you are not waiting for the time when the people should protest about it in the form of a *hijrat*, or something of that sort. But I hope that things will not come to that pass and that some sort of reform will be given to that province. I appeal to the Members of this House : Will you not really put in and support a Resolution recommending some reforms for that unlucky province ? If you will not, then you will be lacking in patriotism in regard to a province which claims to be a part of British India. If you are asking for further reforms for yourselves, without our being given an opportunity to try the present reforms, I am not going to support your demand. So long as my province is left out, I do not believe that the rest of India deserves any advance.

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member has exceeded his time limit by three minutes.

**Nawab Sir Sahibzada Abdul Qaiyum :** I have not got much to say, Sir. All that I want to say is that either we must have some reforms or we should be left out of the Indian Empire. I think the rest of India should not be allowed to go any further until they also carry us along with them. I assure you, Sir, that if given reforms or a local Council we, the frontier Pathans, will prove to the world how a great majority can be tolerant, just and even generous to small minorities. There are numerous troubles in the country ; communal differences, and various other things. Only three years are left between now and 1929, and those three years can be most usefully spent in reconciling all those differences and troubles and in making a unanimous effort towards paving the way for an advance for everybody—the depressed classes the frontier Pathans, the Baluchis and others—by giving them the necessary education, etc., etc., and in preparing the whole country for an advance within these three years. I am sure that after these three years, during which we can set to work composing differences, etc., as suggested by Mr. Abdul Haye, there will be the time for substantial advance. I will not detain you further. (Laughter.)

**Mr. M. S. Aney** (Berar Representative) : Sir, it is rather late for me to take part in this debate ; and the Resolution has been discussed from so many points of view that for one who comes rather late, the task is somewhat difficult. The first thing that strikes me in this Resolution is that it is bald and blank. It puzzled me very much. The Resolution that has been moved by my Honourable friend Sir Alexander Muddiman has undoubtedly puzzled me as being rather a bald Resolution. There is no prelude to it showing the reasons on which the particular proposition is being supported. Probably the Honourable Member who moved the Resolution had no such reasons to support the Resolution. It is also blank because he wants us to say that the principle underlying the Report should be generally accepted, and that the Government of India should be allowed to deal with the recommendations in the vague manner laid down therein. It is asking us practically for a blank cheque : no attempt is

made to define the principle underlying the Resolution. What can be the principle of this Report as a matter of fact? The majority report—if an attempt is made to find out any principle—can be properly described in the terms of my leader as a report without any principle at all. That is the position. So in asking us, without making any attempt to define the principle to which the consent of this House is asked, the Home Member is virtually asking us to give a blank cheque to the Government of India to deal with the recommendations of the majority generally in the manner laid down in the Resolution. I do not think, Sir, that is the proper way of moving a Resolution on the Report of an important inquiry, a document like the Muddiman Committee Report, when that Committee has laboured for months together and formulated certain definite recommendations. Again, I was surprised to some extent when I found that the Government have really made up their mind as regards the recommendations contained in the minority report, but that as regards the recommendations contained in the majority report they have not yet made up their mind. I do not really know the manner in which the Executive Council discussed these questions. It has not been my privilege to peep into the mysterious working of that secret chamber. But I imagine they must have placed both these sets of recommendations side by side, and they must also have considered the evidence that was recorded and they must have in the light of the evidence recorded examined the recommendations. The recommendation on the same point by the minority and the recommendation on the same point by the majority must have been placed by them side by side before themselves, and if they could at once come to the conclusion that the minority recommendations could be rejected, certainly they must have also come to the conclusion that the majority recommendations should be accepted or should be accepted in some modified form. Without coming to that conclusion they cannot reject the minority report if they have tried to understand the minority recommendations in the least; and the only conclusion I can draw from their rejection is, to my mind, that they have rejected the minority recommendations without caring to go into the evidence on which those recommendations are based. They must have left the majority recommendations and the recorded evidence over for consideration later on. And therefore the judgment they have pronounced on the minority recommendations is probably a judgment formed on certain pre-conceived notions rather than a careful consideration of the evidence. It cannot be the result of weighing and considering the evidence which was put before them: and in that case I should be pardoned and excused if I say that they have approached the questions with a certain amount of bias and that they have not examined them in the proper light and in the way in which they ought to have been examined.

Secondly, Sir, while dealing with this Report what strikes me is that the Government really are on the horns of a dilemma. The Government are in this difficulty. The experiment of dyarchy has been tried in this country. Now they do not know what to say—whether they should say that dyarchy has succeeded or that dyarchy has failed, because they are still faced either way with a tremendous difficulty, and they do not know how to overcome that difficulty. If they say that dyarchy has succeeded, then this House has every right to ask them to grant a further advance on the present situation. They do not want to consent to such further advance at all, so they say that dyarchy has partially succeeded, knowing

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

that if they say that it has completely failed, then the responsibility is on them to make counter proposals in reply to the proposals which we have made. They are not prepared even for that. They are on the horns of a dilemma. This conclusion only forces me to say that the Muddiman Report is in my opinion the result of a muddled mentality and nothing else. That is the spirit in which the whole Report has been written.

Then, Sir, coming to another point, I mean the amendment, the questions are really comprehensive and have been already dealt with, and therefore I do not want to go into them ; but there is one general remark which I wish to make. I do not want to take the time of this House very much at the fag end of the day. The thing is this. If you say that you have not fairly tried the system of dyarchy, then what is the atmosphere in which you think it can be fairly tried ? If you go upon the evidence of those persons who have, in spite of public opinion against them, made up their minds and taken their courage in both hands to enter your Councils and done whatever they could do during these three years, what does it point to ? These persons come and make statements before you that they have tried their best but they think they could not succeed ; if the co-operation of these persons is not to be taken as the test of the success of the scheme, what other situation could be conceived in which the scheme could be given a better trial ? In this connection I would certainly like to draw the attention of this House to a passage in the minority report. It is a very telling passage, and to that passage no attempt has been made to give any satisfactory reply. So long as that passage remains unreplyed to, so long as there is no proper reply given by the Mover of the Resolution or those who support the Government Resolution, I say that the verdict that the scheme has not been fairly tried is not one which could be accepted by this House. This is the passage to which I shall draw the attention of the House—it is on page 151 of the minority report :

“ We do not agree with the criticism that the Reforms were not given a fair trial. We do not see how the Reforms could have been worked in a better spirit at their inception if instead of the men who offered to take advantage of them, others who were frankly opposed had entered the Councils. Actually the very abstention of the latter was helpful....”

—that is the verdict of those who have actually worked it—

“ Actually the very abstention of the latter was helpful, and we venture to think that if they had entered the Councils with the opinions they held at the time, the Reforms would have broken down at a very early stage. We do not wish to overlook the fact that the atmosphere which prevailed outside the Councils was one of hostility to the Government : but we do not think that such outside atmosphere prejudiced the working of the Reforms inside the Councils.”

Now, Sir, this is the opinion given by people who have done everything in their power to work the Reforms and they think that the abstention of those who were opposed to the Reforms was really an element that helped them in working the Reforms in the best possible manner. So the trial was made under circumstances which were entirely congenial to the working of the Reforms. The conclusion which they have drawn is that even under those favourable circumstances the reforms have not been worked successfully, because in their very nature they are unworkable. My Honourable and gallant friend Colonel Crawford stated that they are capable of being worked by reasonable men in a reasonable spirit. That is not the test of any constitution. You have to see that a constitution

which is given to a people is one which is capable of being worked by representatives who will be elected by the people. You will not take notice of the people and the sort of representatives that are likely to be elected by the people. I do not think you are the persons who can frame any constitution at all, if you say that the constitution can be worked by reasonable men in a reasonable spirit. What is the type of your reasonable men and what is the reasonable spirit? We will always be in the dark about that. You always make the assumption that, whatever you do is right, but we do not work in a reasonable spirit and we are not reasonable men. What is the reasonable spirit? What is the reasonable way? Who are the reasonable men whom you expect to work those reforms? The important point is this. If your constitutions have been properly worked, as they were undoubtedly worked, and have even then been found wanting, the only inference is that you were not capable of taking into consideration the conditions which prevailed in the country and the sort of constitution that the people demanded. The reforms have been, as I have shown, worked with the best of intentions by those persons who for the time being sacrificed their convictions just to give a trial to them. When you had got that type of men, are you prepared to say that they were not worked properly? The men whom my Honourable friend Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer referred to in his speech as the men for whom you had sometime before expressed a very high opinion and to whom you paid a tribute for having done their work in the best possible manner, are you now turning round to say that these men were an unreasonable set of men? Then you take it for granted that in India everywhere you will only find unreasonable men. An Indian is being looked upon by you as always behaving in an unreasonable spirit. You do not take into account when you frame your constitutions the real conditions prevailing in the country, the point to which aspirations have gone and the height to which the legitimate aspirations of the people have soared. You do not take that into account. And if you do not take that into account, anything that you may frame, anything that you may suggest must fall short of it and is bound to share the same fate as the present constitution. The amendment of my leader Pandit Motilal Nehru has got one virtue. It will save you from this humiliating position hereafter. Hereafter it will be a question for us to say that we have a constitution of our own. We shall prepare it, of course we shall previously discuss it with you. If there be a failure, the failure in that case will not be yours, it will be ours. Hereafter we do not want to blame you. We are tired of using strong language against you. (Laughter.) We are tired of saying anything that will be unnecessarily offensive. We want to avoid that if possible, and the only way in which it can be effected is by your making a generous concession. I ought not to use the word "generous", but I wish to give you a little bit of pleasure, you are being so severely criticised and censured. We want you to make a timely and generous concession to the very reasonable amendment that has been put forward. It is our reply to the invitation which has been given by Lord Birkenhead. Whatever may be his motive, or the underlying thing that was working in his mind, we have understood him in a particular way and this is our reply to him and I believe you will consider that reply in the spirit, in the generous spirit in which we have come forward to extend our hand of fellowship to you. If you fail to do that, it is not for a small man like myself to say anything about what may happen. Men who can speak authoritatively in the name of the nation,

[Mr. M. S. Aney.]

men who have worked for the masses, men who are idolised by the people in this country, have got to take this up. Do not ignore these warnings. These Resolutions which we are moving should be taken by you as symptoms of a mighty revolution in the land that is likely to come if you do not do justice in time. (Applause.) It is for you to accelerate it or to avert it. It is not for us to do anything. My only suggestion, I say submissive suggestion, is "catch time by the forelock." If you allow time to go, mind you, it is likely to inflict a stab. It is likely to stab you with the scythe in its left hand, and probably you will have to rue the day on which you did not give proper consideration to a reasonable proposition of this kind. With these words, I support the amendment.

**Sir Darcy Lindsay** (Bengal : European) : Sir, I have listened with close attention to the arguments put forward in favour of the amendment moved by my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru, but many of the speakers appear to have strayed from the issues before the House and there has been really very little said on the merits of the amendment, except that the vote in support of it was going to be unanimous. It appears to me, Sir, to be a child of premature birth and of doubtful parentage. It is rumoured that the Independent Party lay claim to parentage. We have heard from my Honourable friend Lala Duni Chand that the scheme was prepared in a matter of two or three hours and this probably accounts for the want of enthusiasm with which my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru moved his amendment. Whoever the parent may be, it serves the purpose of putting forward the views of some Members as to how India can best be governed until she obtains full responsible government within the Empire. Like the Honourable Pandit whom I understood to state he would not waste the time of the House in discussing the recommendations of the majority report, for he did not want the advance the recommendations may give, I do not propose to debate the pros and cons of the proposals he puts before us, not for the reason he gives, but because no time has been given to consider matters of such moment to India and of very far-reaching effect. It, however, appears to me, Sir, that when one wants to get something done it is not altogether wise to commence by kicking the person from whom favours are sought, be the cause ever so righteous.

**Pandit Motilal Nehru** : No favour is sought. (*An Honourable Member* : "Natural right").

**Sir Darcy Lindsay** : As pointed out by the Honourable the Home Member, there is no getting away from the fact, unpleasant as it may be to some, that the British Parliament have through the Secretary of State first to be won over to the cause of India if more rapid progress towards the ultimate goal is to be secured, and it is not by heroics and beating the big drum that a people thousands of miles away are likely to be convinced that the demands are just and must be acceded to at once. The House, I am sure, realises that extravagant speeches cut no ice and are likely to do harm to the cause of India. Sir, extravagance in speech is at times dangerous and apt to be misunderstood by those who are unable to realise that some Members do not always mean all they say. In reply to the Honourable the Home Member I heard an Honourable Member remark that it was mere rhetoric. Do not alienate the good-will that undoubtedly exists. You have only to read the speech of Lord

Birkenhead delivered in the House of Lords to realise the close and sympathetic interest he takes in Indian affairs, and his desire is to aid India if she will only respond. (*An Honourable Member* : "Question.") What he asks is that we should co-operate in working the present Act instead of refusing to have anything to do with it as is now happening in Bengal and the Central Provinces. (*An Honourable Member* : "Is the present Act workable ?") Certainly, Sir. Even assuming that there are defects, is that any reason for its entire rejection in the demand for immediate Swaraj? In inviting us to produce a new constitution which carried behind it a fair measure of general agreement among the people of India, he certainly imposes upon the political leaders a herculean task. It is not certain that if at the present time it were possible to frame a constitution reasonably acceptable to all in its protection of minorities and that could be worked successfully for the real benefit of India, we would have already produced the same? The best we can do at the moment is to put forward the scheme as outlined in the amendment which, as I said before, has received a very lukewarm blessing. By all means let it be considered by a Royal Commission or any other agency, but would it not have been better to bring it forward at another time and after fuller investigation by all parties in the country and not merely as a proposal put forward by the Members of the Assembly? Several speakers, including the Honourable Pandit and Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, have asked for a change of heart on the part of Government. But might I suggest that a little reciprocity in this direction might be beneficial. At present it is more take than give. (*An Honourable Member* : "What have you given ?") Also why should the National Party have the monopoly of distrust referred to by these speakers? There should be no talk of distrust and it is here where a change of heart is required. To my mind it is the germ of distrust that is responsible for most of our trouble. I say again, Sir, co-operate in working the reforms for all they are worth and prove that we understand responsibility in its true sense. It is by these means and these means only that the goal will be reached. You, Sir, have set us a fine example in your decision to co-operate in working the Reforms (Hear, hear) and I hope your earnest appeal to us also to co-operate will bear good fruit. The other course, namely obstruction, only helps to put the clock back, and where is the satisfaction to any of us? I suggest to the Honourable Pandit that co-operation should be mutual and not all one-sided as he appears to want it. I refer to the statement that his amendment forms the very minimum his Party can put forward. Other speakers endorsed this and in fact present a pistol at the head of Government with what appears to be threats. That is not my view of co-operation. The great advance India has secured under the present Act must surely by now be recognised by the large majority of those who condemned the reforms because in their view immediate self-government and nothing else would suffice. It is well-known that the present Assembly are doing real good work, especially in Committees (*An Honourable Member* : "Is it not co-operation ?") in the exercise of the powers they hold and there is an advance all along the line that was never possible under the old regime. The Members have discovered that the Act gives very real powers to the Assembly and Councils towards progress and that it is preferable to exercise same rather than adopt a policy of obstruction. In other words, grasp the substance instead of losing same by fighting for the shadow. I think it was the Honourable Pandit who said :

[Sir Darcy Lindsay.]

It is waste of time to try and work the reforms. Will he place his hand on his heart and say that he truly believes it? (*Pandit Motilal Nehru*: "Yes, I do.") Who can deny that the first Assembly made good use of their new powers and brought about important changes that will be of lasting benefit to India. Did we not in the very first Sessions drive home the necessity for retrenchment in every direction, and as an earnest of this all Demands for Grants were cut by 10 per cent. This brought about the appointment of the Retrenchment Committee with that great man Lord Inchcape as Chairman to whom India ought ever to be grateful. He and his Committee, the members of which were chosen from the very best India could give including our good friend Sir Purshotamas Thakurdas, who was then a Member of the Council of State, took off their coats and worked untiringly in their investigations. The result was the production of a report of much value that has become a standard work of reference to many Committees. We know how many crores have been saved to the country in addition to which economy is now the order of the day. Other important measures were introduced and I think it has been proved up to the hilt that the reforms have in many respects been a success and of much value so far as the Central Legislature is concerned. Surely my Honourable friend Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar must admit this in spite of what he said about coming here month after month only to know our votes do not count. It is largely due to the Lord Meston Award which left no money to many of the provinces that the results there have been unsatisfactory. But I do not quite agree with my Honourable friend Mr. Shanmukham Chetty who assured the House in solemn terms that dyarchy has absolutely failed and that it was but a camouflage of democracy.

To return to the main question before the House, namely, the consideration of the Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, the minority appear in some measure to endorse the main proposals of the majority for certain amendments within the Act and I accept the same and intend to vote for the Resolution. The debate has been so much on the political issue that few Members have made any effort to comment on the recommendations of the majority report. The very real and notable advance made in those recommendations has therefore escaped the notice of the House. I refer particularly to the relaxation of control by the Secretary of State to additions to and alterations in the Devolution Rules and Instrument of Instructions enjoining joint deliberation, joint responsibility of Ministers and alteration of the power of control of Governors. These recommendations if accepted will mean a real and notable advance in responsible government and are worthy of the earnest attention of the House. To vote for the amendment gives a direct negative to these recommendations.

It is true the minority ask for a Royal Commission or other agency with freer terms of reference and larger scope of inquiry. But I fail to see how we are at present in a position to put forward an unanswerable claim for advancement and proof that the country is really ready for the same. Judging by the amendment, the demand is for a very material advancement. If I were other than I hope a good friend of India I would support the demand for the early appointment of a Commission. To my mind the risk is great and the results of the

inquiry might prove far less satisfactory to Indian aspirations than an inquiry at a later stage—not necessarily 1929—when by co-operation and mutual trust the country can prove that it is more ready to advance.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** (Nominated : Labour Interests) : Sir, not being a constitutional politician, I propose to confine myself to my usual sphere. Considering the report of the majority of the Muddiman Committee, I think it has failed to do its duty entirely. They were asked to consider the defects in the working of the present reforms. They could not discover that the real defect in the working of these reforms was that the machinery itself was defective. The machinery constituted by the Reforms Act was unsuited to protect the interests of the Indian masses and the working classes. Sir, there are many protectors of the interests of the masses and the working classes in this House. The gallant Colonel Crawford is one of them. The representatives of the Government of India call themselves trustees of the three hundred millions of his country. The question is, they may be the trustees, but have they discharged their duties properly, considering the progress made by the Indian masses in every sphere of their lives, such as agriculture, education, sanitation ? It will be the verdict of any impartial observer that the trustees have failed entirely to discharge their duties. Sir, I am interested in the welfare of the working classes. I assure my friend Colonel Crawford that I do not claim to represent them. If I had claimed to represent them I would not have given notice of the amendment which I have given. I want the working classes to be represented in this House by their true representatives. Now, Sir, having studied the problem of the conditions of labour in this country, and the remedies taken by the Government of India, I can say this that the Government of India have almost failed to do their duty by the working classes. No doubt there is some labour legislation on the Statute-book of the Government of India, but what is the history of his legislation ? The first Factory Act was introduced by the Government of India and passed, not because they cared for the interests of the working classes but because they cared to protect the interests of Lancashire. An amendment was introduced with the same object. Then there were some further amendments made, but they were not due to the desire of the Government of India to do good to the working classes of this country, but these amendments were made because the international world put pressure upon the Government of India. What is the history of the Indian Mines Act ? It was the Kaiser of Germany who called a conference at Berlin, which made the Government of India introduce and pass the first Mines Act. The Indian Mines Act was also amended not because the Government of India cared to do any good to the working classes of this country but because pressure was put upon them by the International Labour Conference at Washington. But there is some kind of labour legislation. One of them is the Workmen's Breach of Contract Act which was passed by the Government of India in order to give control to European employers of this country over their employees. They passed the Assam Labour and Emigration Act for the same purpose. This legislation is to the credit of the Government of India. If the interests of the working classes are to be protected, the first thing necessary to be done is the introduction of responsible government in this country, and when I talk of this, let me make clear what I mean. I want that responsible government based upon suffrage of the common people of this country.

[Mr. N. M. Joshi.]

This brings me now, Sir, to the question of the franchise. Although I am ready to support the amendment of the Honourable Pandit I must express my disappointment at the wording about the franchise in his amendment. He suggests that the franchise should be as wide as possible. I am not satisfied with it. I want that every adult person—man or woman—in this country should have the vote, that he should be enfranchised. It is wrong to base the franchise on the property qualification. In my opinion it is almost immoral to base any franchise on the possession of property. It only means that you give greater value to property than to human life. If this constitution is to be improved, the first thing necessary to be done is that every adult person in the country should be given the vote. There may be difficulties of creating constituencies but I am sure that these difficulties could be overcome. As long as that is not done, any Legislatures that you may create will not be representative of the people of this country. I hope that the Honourable Pandit will, therefore, amend his amendment and introduce adult franchise, so that the common people of the country will be benefited by it.

Then on behalf of the working classes of this country I also want to make one more proposal. The majority and minority of the Muddiman Committee agree that representation of the working classes in the Indian Legislatures should be increased and they also express their opinion that that representation should be by election, if possible. I say, Sir, that as long as the employing classes in the country have special seats reserved for them to be elected by their own organisations, the working classes should likewise also have their seats to be elected by their own organisations. So long as the employing classes are given special seats, there is no reason why you should not give special seats to the working classes in the country. The All-India Labour Congress have therefore asked for representation for the working classes in the country to be elected by the organisations of the working classes. They ask that in the Central Legislature they should have at least 12 seats reserved for the working classes. Under the present constitution there are about 20 representatives of the employing classes in this Legislative Assembly. We, therefore, say, give us at least 12 representatives for the working classes to be elected by the organisations of the working classes. They also claim that in the provincial Legislatures they should be adequately represented. They ask for 12 seats in Bengal and Bombay, 8 seats in the Punjab, Madras, Bihar and Orissa and United Provinces and Burma, 6 seats in the Central Provinces and Assam. Sir, this demand is a very moderate demand. Personally I should have asked for a larger representation. I also make it quite clear that whatever representation is to be given to the working classes through their organisations must be based upon the principle of election. They do not want any nomination any more.

Sir, I should like also to say one word about the representation of the depressed classes and the other classes whose interests are generally neglected. I claim that in their case also adequate representation should be given to be elected by their organisations. Even in their case I say the principle of nomination should hereafter be given up. Sir, if the Government of

India give effect to my proposals for adult suffrage, and so long as the employing classes have got special representation, give special representation also to the working classes and to the depressed classes and the criminal tribes and the aboriginal classes, I am quite sure responsible government in India will be very helpful to the interests of the masses and the working class.

Sir, lastly, I would say only one word. When I ask for responsible government in this country in the interests of the masses and the working classes, I am not under a delusion that responsible government will immediately bring heaven for the working classes and the masses in this country. I am quite sure for many days to come, even after the introduction of responsible government and the granting of adult suffrage, the capitalist classes in this country will be very powerful. Still, Sir, what I feel is this, that under the present circumstances the capitalist classes are more powerful than they will be under any responsible government in this country. What is the position to-day? We have got the European officials who are the servants of the European capitalists. We have got the Indian officers, who sympathise with the Indian capitalists.....

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member, but did I hear him say the servants of the Crown are the servants of the European capitalists? Will he repeat that?

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** : Sir, they are in effect so.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : I note that.

**Mr. N. M. Joshi** : Sir, to-day, whenever you discuss any question of protection or such subject, you find almost an alliance between the Government benches, the Indian capitalist and the European capitalist. When real responsible government is introduced, at least one section of this triumvirate will be weakened, and to that extent the work of Indian labour and the Indian masses will be easier. I am quite sure, even under Swaraj, the working classes will have to make a great struggle to come into their own, but under responsible government that struggle will be more direct, more straight and easier. It is in this sense I support the amendment of the Honourable Pandit.

*Several Honourable Members* : I move the question be now put.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt** (Burdwan Division : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, almost from the very time when the new constitution for the Government of India was ushered into existence, there has been a demand for constitutional development. In the first Assembly, in response to a demand for provincial autonomy and responsibility in the Central Legislature, a Resolution was finally adopted without a division and accepted by the Government of India, asking for a re-examination and revision of the constitution at an earlier date than 1929, in view of the progress made by India on the path of responsible Government. The Secretary of State for India refused to entertain the proposal for advance on grounds which are familiar to every student of Indian contemporary history. This was followed by an expression of dissatisfac-

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

tion in the Legislative Assembly and a demand for further reforms possible under the constitution. All these were in the first Assembly, which was boycotted by those who refused to accept the reforms, and consisted of Members who honestly wished to give the new constitution a trial, and framed the Resolutions when they found out the hollowness of the reforms in their actual working. In the present Assembly the very first thing that the leader of the Swaraj Party did was to ask for a round table conference for the framing of a constitution for India, and he was supported in his demand by the great body of men which represented the Independent Party in the Assembly. Thus there was practical unanimity between all classes of politically-minded people in India as represented by the two parties for the demand of a new scheme of a constitution for India. But this demand did not find any favour with the Government of India, which in their turn appointed an official committee for the purpose of examining the Government of India Act and its working, and of exploring the possibilities of amendments for the improved working of the machinery, followed by the appointment of a mixed committee of officials and non-officials presided over by the Honourable the Home Member, whose so-called majority report we have been asked to support, so that the Secretary of State for India may consider what further advance may be made before the year 1929 towards the progressive realisation of responsible government under the present constitution. This is where we stand. We ask for a round table conference to frame a new scheme of the constitution. The Government in their turn ask us to repair and whitewash this constitution, the foundations of which are built upon quicksand, and help them in keeping up the tottering fabric which must sooner or later give way. I ask the Government in all seriousness, is it worth our while to waste our time in this futile attempt? Have not the non-official members of the Committee, with the exception of two, in no uncertain voice declared that the constitution should be put on a permanent basis, with provisions for automatic progress in the future? I may be here permitted to point out that Sir Muhammad Shafi publicly expressed his concurrence with this part of the recommendations of the so-called minority report as soon as he was freed from the shackles of office, and thus turned it into a majority report, so far as this part of the report was concerned. An analysis of the composition of the Committee will at once disclose the real character of the majority report. There were three officials, a representative of the British mercantile community, and a Maharaj-adhiraja, who till lately was an official, who formed the majority, while an ex-member of the Governor General's Council, an ex-member of a Governor's Council, an ex-Minister, and a distinguished member of the Muhammadan community formed the minority. They are all Indians and represent the moderate school of thought in Indian politics. The Committee realised from the very beginning the limitations and restrictions imposed upon them by the terms of reference, in the suggestion of remedial measures, while they were asked to traverse a large ground so far as the inquiry was concerned with respect to difficulties and defects in the working of the Government of India Act. The Honourable the Home Member, when moving the Resolution, defended the Majority Report by taking shelter under the restrictions imposed by the terms of reference. But may I not ask him whether he was consulted

as a member of His Excellency the Governor General's Council in this matter, and did he try his best to see that the terms of reference were not so limited from the very beginning? With such restrictions and limitations, the majority of the non-official members, who were also the majority of the Indian members, were compelled under the terms of reference to maintain the principle of dyarchy by the retention of only law and order on the reserved side. This proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that dyarchy should at once end and all the subjects in the provinces should be administered by Ministers responsible to the Legislature. And the Committee felt that no recommendations within the terms of reference would satisfy Indian public opinion. I ask the Secretary of State to take note of this fact, that had the terms of reference to the Committee permitted, the majority of the non-official members would have recommended the abolition of dyarchy. As regards the powers of the Governor General, under section 67B, the non-official majority has recommended the deletion of the words "interests" and to limit the extraordinary powers of certification to cases of "safety and tranquillity of British India". The majority as the custodians of the Governor General's autocratic powers are opposed to the deletion of the word "interests" on the ground that the Governor General's responsibilities are not confined to the safety and tranquillity of British India but to what else they do not explicitly state. Probably they had in mind the interests of that great body of beneficiaries of the trust estate, India, namely, the British Services and British commerce. Further it is argued that the Governor General is responsible to the British Parliament and not to the Indian Legislature. Here they are begging the whole question, for we have been demanding that the Governor General in Council should be made responsible to the Indian Legislature. I am not aware that progressive realisation of responsible government by stages is at all possible by being irresponsible to the Legislature. In framing a constitution for India the one thing necessary—more than any other—is that the Executive should be responsible to the Legislature.

Sir, neither the time at my disposal will permit me to discuss the recommendations of the majority report at length nor is it worth while discussing the same, considering the trivial nature of their recommendations; but I cannot pass over certain retrograde suggestions about ousting the jurisdiction of courts of law and Ministers' salaries. To attempt to place the Presidents of the Indian and provincial Legislatures out of the jurisdiction of courts of law indicates a desire to make them more submissive to an autocratic executive than to the representatives of the people. As for the restriction to reduction of Ministers' salaries, the intention is to continue dyarchy without any obstacle against the vote of the representatives of the people. There have been other recommendations, among which the enfranchisement of women has our hearty support, although here too the majority report has made it dependent upon the vote of the Legislature. The existing disqualification from being a Member of the Legislature, which follows from a conviction in a criminal court, should in our opinion be retained only in cases which indicate moral turpitude in the convicted person, and even in such cases should cease after the lapse of a year from the expiry of sentence. Such disqualifications ought on no account to apply to persons convicted of sedition and such other offences. As regards joint deliberation, the conclusions

[Mr. Amar Nath Dutt.]

of the so-called minority report, which is the non-official majority report, are worthy of consideration. They say :

“ We are anxious to guard ourselves against conveying the impression that given dyarchy to work we do not appreciate the value of joint deliberation between the two halves of the Government but we maintain that it is an inherent defect of the present constitution that the Government should be divided into two halves.”

The non-official majority report is no less emphatic about their views on the permanent services, when they recommend that they should be placed on the same basis as in England and this cannot be achieved by mere amendment of the rules or even by the delegation of certain powers under section 96B of the Government of India Act. The Committee felt themselves precluded from examining the question of responsibility in the Central Legislature as the same cannot be given effect to without a radical change of the constitution. The experiment of an irremovable executive and an elected Legislature, wherever tried, has failed and India is no exception to the general rule. Any alternative transitional system that may be suggested is also doomed to failure without a thorough overhauling of the present constitution which we have demanded.

The real question before us is the transference of power from the British to the Indians, the substitution of responsible government for the government by a bureaucracy which holds us under subjection. If this principle is accepted, the Secretary of State should not place any value upon the recommendations of the members of the bureaucracy or their henchmen, about the future constitution of India, for the simple reason of their being an interested party and it is impossible for them to think of India apart from the interests of the British Services and British commerce, apparently for the aggrandisement of which British India exists.

Sir, that is the spirit in which the majority report has been conceived and we can hardly be expected to support the Resolution that has been moved from the Treasury Benches by the Honourable the Home Member. The amendment that has been moved by the leader of the Swaraj Party contains the irreducible minimum of our national demands.....

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member has exhausted his time.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt :** And if that is accepted the first thing that I would ask the Government.....

**Mr. President :** Order, order.

**Mr. Amar Nath Dutt :** Sir, may I have another two or three minutes ?

**Mr. President :** The Honourable Member cannot go on now.

**Mr. M. C. Naidu (Burma : Non-European) :** Sir, I admired the speeches of the Honourable Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer and the Honourable Diwan Bahadur Rangachariar and others in support of the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru, but they seem to be only from a partisan's point of view. It is doubtful whether the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru is consistent with the structure, policy and purpose of the Government of India Act. Though I agree with the Honourable Mr. Jinnah that the constitution should be put on

a permanent basis with provisions for automatic progress in the future so as to secure stability in the Government and willing co-operation of the people, after having heard the speeches of the Honourable the Home Member, the Honourable Sir Charles Innes, the Honourable Sir Basil Blackett and others in support of the Resolution, I consider that the amendment of the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru is rather premature and I am not fully convinced why I should not support the original Resolution at the present stage.

Though dyarchy failed in some provinces in India and though it seems that the people will be satisfied with nothing less than the disappearance of dyarchy and the substitution therefor of provincial autonomy, as I represent the Burma non-European constituency and as the views of the Burma Government seem to be that hardly any difficulties have been experienced and hardly any defects discovered in the working of the constitution as noted at page 12 of the Report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee, and as it was also noted in the minority report at page 132 that the Members of the Committee had not had the advantage of examining any persons who have held office in the Burma Local Government, I should not be misunderstood if I vote in support of the Resolution of the Honourable the Home Member.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya** (Allahabad and Jhansi Divisions : Non-Muhammadan Rural) : Sir, I was very unwilling to take up the time of this House at this hour, but the very kind insistence of several friends that I should say a few words in support of the amendment has compelled me to seek your permission to do so. The Resolution has had a very full discussion for two days. Nearly all aspects of the question have been brought before the House, and I do not propose to travel over the ground which has been travelled over by many other speakers, so far as I can help it. I will draw attention to a few points which have not been dealt with because they came in very late in the debate. One was in the speech that my Honourable friend Sir Darcy Lindsay made. He drew attention to the great progress that has been made in this country, to the prosperity which has come in the wake of British administration. Another member, the Honourable Mr. Cocks, also laid stress upon that point. We do not dispute it. We gladly recognise that a great deal of progress has been made in material respects under the British administration. Our contention is that if we had a really representative Government, if we had a system of responsible government, the progress would have been ten times, perhaps twenty times, greater than it has been.....

**Mr. H. G. Cocks** : Perhaps not !

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya** : While therefore we gladly and gratefully acknowledge the work that has been done by British administrators, while we acknowledge that many of them laboured honestly and honourably to the end of their lives in the service of this country and the Crown, without in any way derogating from the work done by them, we feel that if we had the chance to co-operate with them as real co-workers, as co-adjutors, as men possessing the same powers that they possessed, the face of this country would have been more bright, more smiling, more a matter of honour and satisfaction both to England and to India.

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

Sir, I will now briefly invite attention to the genesis of the statement which Lord Birkenhead made. That statement, as the House is aware, was made on a motion brought in by Lord Olivier. Speaking on that motion Lord Olivier said :

“ This conclusion . . . ”

that there is no half-way house between the present constitution and a wholly new constitution—

“ is really implicit in the report of the majority, though they do not emphasise it, and this consideration the minority took up very seriously. Is it not expedient in the interests of all concerned that the recommendations of the minority, with which the Secretary of State and the Governor-General may agree, be now adopted, in order to ease the dissatisfaction of all parties with the present constitution, and give them hope that a real system of responsible government can be set up, and that the Government should at once take in hand the examination of all the known defects in the constitution ? ”

That, Sir, was the point which Lord Olivier put before Lord Birkenhead in the House of Lords, and he asked for a direct answer. In the course of his speech on that motion Lord Olivier drew attention to a very important fact, and that was the statement made by Sir Muhammad Shafi, who had signed the majority report, to a representative of the Press, which Lord Olivier quoted at length. In that statement, free from the trammels of office, Sir Muhammad Shafi said distinctly that he felt that there should be that larger inquiry which the minority had recommended. I do not wish to take up the time of the House by reading the whole of that statement. It is quoted in the official debates of the House of Lords. Sir Muhammad Shafi made it very clear that while he agreed with the recommendations made by the majority, he also agreed with the minority that there should be the larger inquiry which they had recommended. He said as follows :

“ While immediate acceptance by His Majesty's Government of the recommendations for action within the Act made by the majority would result in a smoother and more satisfactory working of the existing constitutional machinery, the institution of a larger inquiry as advocated by the minority into the defects and difficulties inherent in the constitution itself for the purpose of placing the constitution on a permanent basis with full responsible government as the final stage would satisfy by far the large majority of politically-minded Indians. Action on these lines is in my opinion certain to bring a two-fold result. It would in the first place oil the hinges of the existing constitutional machinery and, as I have said above, make its actual working far smoother and more satisfactory than is the case at present.”

Now, Sir, I ask the Honourable the Home Member and every member of the Government, and every Member of this House, whether the Government of India can justly ignore the statement made by Sir Muhammad Shafi. If the Government of India must take note of that statement, is not the report of the majority converted into the report of the minority ? My friends opposite may say that that is not a sound rule to lay down ; that if a man signed a report while he was in office he must be taken to hold the view which he then expressed, and that no subsequent statement by him should affect the matter. I submit, Sir, that in the present case where the statement of Sir Muhammad Shafi is very clear, the Government are bound to take note of it, and to consider whether in truth the report which they call the majority report should not now be treated as the report of the minority. After Lord Birkenhead had made his great statement, Lord Olivier in concluding his remarks on that statement said :

“ It is on that ground that I made my appeal to the noble Earl to take into consideration what I feel convinced is an accurate statement of the feelings of all

nationalists and propagandist parties in India in support of the minority report ; and whereas the noble Earl said and said truly that the question of what provincial autonomy means has not been explored that is one of the very reasons why I want to see and all who are interested in the development of India want to see the question of what is to be in the future directly tackled. When such a man as the late Governor of Madras tells us that some parts are ready for provincial autonomy and others are not, I want to see these ideas explored in order to find out whether it is impossible to develop this idea of provincial autonomy."

This is how Lord Olivier concluded his appeal. In view of this appeal of a late Secretary of State for India, of the opinions expressed by the gentlemen who formed the minority, and of the opinion expressed by Sir Muhammad Shafi, I ask the Government of India to consider whether it is not fair to themselves, to the country and to the British Parliament that they should put aside the report of the majority and deal with the minority report as in reality the majority report. I submit that if in the face of this expression of opinion, the Government still insist upon asking this House to lend their support to the report of the majority, they are putting themselves and the House in an unfair position. Can the Honourable the Home Member, can any member of Government ignore the fact that by this subsequent expression of his opinion Sir Muhammad Shafi has supported the report of the minority ? And who are the men who composed the minority ? Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru who has been honoured and esteemed as one of the best lawyers who ever adorned the office of the Law Member of the Government of India : Sir Sivaswamy Aiyer, who is respected by foe as well as friend for having the courage of his convictions, and for saying only what he believes to be true : Dr. Paranjpye, who is also known to be fearless and sincere in expressing the opinions he holds : and last but not least my esteemed friend Mr. Jinnah who has all along been trying to co-operate with the Government in the best way he could. These are the men who formed the minority. When such a minority has been strengthened by the opinion of Sir Muhammad Shafi, I ask the Government to consider whether it is not a clear case in which they should withdraw the majority report and not ask this House to lend it its support.

Sir, I come now to another question which was mentioned in the debate by Lord Olivier. For a long time past a great deal has been said by some of our European fellow-subjects about this country not being fit for self-government, for the adoption of self-governing institutions. The first speech I made in the Indian National Congress was in 1886. I remember very well that in that speech I tried to answer some of this criticism. From that time up to this these arguments have often been repeated—that India is not a nation, that Indians are divided by insuperable differences into opposing communities, that there are communal and religious differences which cannot be got over, and that there is no national feeling among us. These arguments have been repeated *ad nauseam*, and I thought it would be unnecessary in this debate to answer them again. I am sorry that those arguments have been advanced, and I am more sorry that one of the Honourable Members on the Government Benches went a little too far when he said that the Government gave us what we had not a hundred years ago, namely, peace. He should have remembered—and I do not speak with any bitterness when I say this, I regret the circumstance that he should have referred to it in the way in which he did—he should have remembered that for several thousands of years India knew peace as she does not know at the

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

present day ; that in the days of Asoka and of other old Hindu Emperors, India knew peace which is certainly not equalled at the present day. I say this without any desire to take away or derogate anything from the merits of British rule. India knew peace in the days of Akbar and Shah Jahan, which is not unknown to students of history. India knew peace to-day in the Indian States where Hindu and Muhammadan rulers rule over a mixed population of Hindus and Mussalmans. I submit, Sir, it is too late in the day to advance such arguments. They do not support the case which those who use them wish to establish. They only hurt the feelings of hundreds, of thousands, of millions of our fellow-subjects whom I am certain the speaker would not wish to hurt. And I regret to say that in this connection Lord Birkenhead committed a great blunder. I do not wish to speak with any discourtesy of his Lordship, but I do not remember that any of his predecessors made such a blunder as Lord Birkenhead made in speaking on this subject. His Lordship said :

“ To talk of India as an entity is as absurd as to talk of Europe as an entity.”

I wonder if, when he said so, his Lordship had present to his mind a picture of Europe with all its different Governments and peoples warring against each other and of India under a unitary system of government, where all the provincial Governments are merely delegates or agents of the Central Government here. He further said :

“ The nationalistic spirit which has created most of our difficulties in the last few years is based upon the aspirations and claims of a nationalist India. There never has been such a nation in the past. Whether there will be a nation, the future alone could show.”

This is very much like a mistake which a former Secretary of State, a far greater man, Lord Morley, once made in speaking of Indian affairs. His Lordship said that if self-government were given to us Indians we would not be able to carry it on for a week. He had the good sense and the courtesy to withdraw that remark. You will find it deleted from the authorised version of his speech. I hope Lord Birkenhead will do the same. I am glad to find that Lord Olivier did not overlook this point. Speaking after Lord Birkenhead, Lord Olivier said :

“ I should like to make one final observation. I think that the noble Earl may have a little under-estimated, as many people do, the strength of what may be called national feeling and national pride in India and the national disposition to claim that Indians shall have a great deal to say with regard to the framing of their own constitution. It is not enough to say, as the noble Earl has said and as has been said repeatedly, that you have got two great communities in India, that you have many religions, many languages and so on, and that therefore it is idle to speak of India as a nation. That is very much less true to-day than it was even ten years ago. Whereas ten years ago you might have said that the masses of India cared very little about national religion or about politics, it is, I am perfectly convinced from all that I have been able to learn in the last two or three years, equally unquestionable that this era has passed away, that there is a strong and universal sentimentally nationalist feeling in India upon which the leaders who speak in the name of Indian nationality can count.”

I should be sorry if I had to rely only upon Lord Olivier's opinion, though I esteem it, to support the idea that India is a nation. I do not wish to go into a scholastic discussion as to what constitutes a nation. A people however divided they may be by religions and creeds, who live in one country, who are the subjects of one sovereign, who are governed by one system of Government, by one set of laws which affect

them equally, do constitute a nation in the opinion of every political philosopher who has dealt with the subject. And we are such a nation. We have long been a nation and shall continue to be a nation despite all the differences that divide us.

Now, Sir, that brings me to another question. I really fail to understand what the Honourable the Home Member, or rather the Government, intended or expected when they brought forward the present motion before the House. They know the sentiments of the country generally. They know that the bulk of the House can not be in favour of the modicum of reforms which the majority of the Committee have suggested. They have no doubt done what they considered to be the best in the circumstances of the case. I have no quarrel with them. They were bound by the terms of reference and they felt that they could not go beyond those terms. I have not a word of complaint against their action. But I wish the Government realised the position of this House better. It contains a large number of the representatives of men who have for many years been earnestly, honestly trying to persuade the Government to grant a much larger measure of reform than they have introduced, and for the Government to expect this House to support the Honourable the Home Member's Resolution, if they did so, was rather expecting too much.

And now let us see what is the complaint that is made against the amendment which has been brought before the House. In the situation in which we were placed, what were we to do? We could not support the proposal of the Honourable the Home Member. We have before us the statement of Lord Birkenhead, supported by the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy that we should suggest a constitution, and that if what we suggest has a fair measure of general agreement among the peoples of India, it would be carefully examined by the Government. Could we disregard this invitation? Could we throw away this opportunity? Can anybody reasonably blame us for putting forward at this juncture our ideas, such as they are, of the fundamental principles on which the constitution should be based, for the consideration of the Government? My friend the Honourable the Home Member and the Honourable the Finance Member also seemed somewhat surprised that we had definitely committed ourselves to the model of western institutions. I thought they must know that we decided to adopt western institutions long ago, but we have taken care to put in one clause in it, which will make all the difference in the world. We have said that the constitution should be framed in the first instance on the recommendation of a conference which will contain representatives of all sections of Indian public opinion, and secondly that it should be framed with due regard to the interests of minorities. That is the one great distinction that we have made. That is a guarantee that the constitution we shall frame will not be a mere copy of any institution existing in any other part of the world, and that we shall take note of the divergent interests that obtain in this country and will try to meet them. But, Sir, so far as the decision to select western institutions is concerned we made it long ago. In 1885, that large-hearted Englishman, Allan Octavius Hume, brought about the organisation of the Indian National Congress. Since that time we have been holding the Congress year after year. Representatives have been elected to it from all parts of India. Representatives of all classes and creeds have met year after year. We have carried on our deliberations

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

on the most important public questions in a manner which I submit would do credit to any assembly in the world. For more than half a century the Government themselves have been training us to value these institutions. The British Parliament decided in 1858 that western representative institutions should be established in India. Since the Indian Councils Act came into operation in 1861, the Government have been regularly training us in the working of those institutions. For forty years we have from time to time asked for changes and reforms in those institutions. We pressed for the introduction of a really representative system of Government in the Congress of 1886, and that great Englishman Charles Bradlaugh came out to India in 1889 to attend the Congress at our request. He introduced a Bill in the House of Commons on the lines we desired, and the Government of the day in England then thought it wise to introduce a Bill of their own which became the Act of 1892. Many years afterwards the Minto-Morley proposals brought in the second instalment of reforms, and lastly came the reforms of 1919. Thus it has been under the direct pressure of the public opinion of India, Hindu, Muhammadan and Christian, that the Government have from time to time reformed the constitution of the Government in India. The constitution as it exists in India to-day is, I am sorry to say, a very bad copy of representative institutions in England and the other countries of the West. But it is to this that we have been invited by the Government to give our co-operation. We have come here to give our co-operation. I am surprised and pained to hear so much said against non-co-operation. Can anybody shut his eyes to the fact that there are so many men sitting in this Assembly who believed in non-co-operation, but who have yet taken the oath of allegiance to His Majesty in order to carry on the work of this Assembly, and who are here day after day to take part in your deliberations? What is it that you find of non-co-operation here? Do you object to a single motion being defeated? Do you object to any particular Bill or Bills being defeated? Can that rightly be described as non-co-operation? I submit not. It is nothing but co-operation. When we come here to take part in the work of the Assembly, we certainly co-operate with you, every one of us. But the attitude of those who adopted the policy of non-co-operation is certainly entitled to some consideration. That attitude of mind is due to the conviction that you do not take us Indians into your confidence, that you do not respect the opinions which we express, and that therefore we cannot heartily co-operate with you. It is for you to win our hearty co-operation. It is for you, as my friend said, to show a change of heart. Most certainly I plead, and plead with all the earnestness I can command, I appeal to every European and Indian to bring about a real change of heart. I pray for myself and I ask my friends to pray that I should myself undergo a little change of heart for the better. I confess myself guilty of having sometimes spoken in a manner which has irritated some of my European friends. I am sorry for it. But let me tell my English friends that ever since I joined the Indian National Congress and ever since I joined the Councils, I have spoken with the same freedom with which an Englishman would speak in the House of Commons. I cannot allow any English fellow-subject to say that I am not free to speak in the Legislature of my country even as he

speaks in the House of Commons. I may be wrong in my opinions. I may be mistaken in my views. That must be excused by every reasonable man. But I assure my friends that my intention has never been to hurt or to alienate the feelings of any of my British fellow-subjects. There has been no suggestion throughout this debate that there should be a separation between England and India, and the talk of peace being disturbed and the horrors of a hundred years back coming back into existence if the reforms we urge are carried out is entirely beside the mark. His Majesty's Government is going to continue. It is going to last for a long time. Our proposals imply that His Majesty will continue to rule over India, that his Government will work with us to ensure the protection of India. All that we are asking for is that, while matters of war and peace should be left to His Majesty's Government to decide as they may think best, that while even questions relating to the strength and the administration of the Army should, by an understanding between the representatives of the people and the Government be placed on a footing satisfactory to Government, in all matters of a domestic character the Government of India should take the representatives of the people into their confidence and be responsible to them. I ask my Honourable friends, the European Members on the Government Benches, I ask them most humbly, most earnestly, to say what would it matter to them, what difference would it make to them if, instead of the three Indian Members who have been selected by the Government of India—I mean no disrespect to them—if instead of the three Indian Members who have been selected by the Government of India, three Members were selected by His Excellency the Viceroy upon a consideration of the fact that they commanded the confidence of the largest body of opinion in this House? What difference would it make to them? Do they expect less co-operation from such Members? I cannot believe it. The whole of our request comes to this that in all matters of a domestic character, in matters which do not affect war and peace, in matters of internal administration, the Government should appoint members who command the confidence of the representatives of the people, and that they should be responsible to the Assembly, instead of the Indian Members who are at present appointed. Of course the rule of responsibility to the Assembly will apply to the European Members also, but that would not prevent the appointment of gentlemen whose knowledge and experience it may be necessary to secure for efficiently carrying on the work of the Government.

Sir, there is another point which the Honourable the Home Member urged against the amendment. It was that the amendment showed that we thought that this Assembly was not sufficiently representative of the people and that it was therefore that we suggested that another body should be created to frame a constitution. If I correctly understood my Honourable friend, he did not correctly appreciate the amendment. What is meant is this. You say that we Indians have differences among ourselves. We know unfortunately to our sorrow that we have. But we want a representative conference to solve these differences. The first thing we want to be assured of is that we are to proceed on a serious business. It is therefore that we ask that there should be a preliminary declaration of policy by Parliament. Unless such a declaration of policy is made, or unless there is a preliminary indication that Parliament will be prepared to consider the proposals which we urge, it would be a waste of time for public men to sit at a conference. That explains the first part

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

of the proposition. The second part requests Government to bring together a representative conference, so that they may sit together and discuss and try to meet the requirements of all communities and all minorities, and try to come to an understanding. The Government Members are not unaware that in 1916 Hindus and Muhammadans met at Lucknow and came to a pact which Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu found to be accepted all over the country. Why is it inconceivable that we may again be able to arrive at an understanding which will save the Government a lot of trouble and discussion in the matter of communal differences? That is the reason for desiring a convention or a conference or whatever suitable agency the Government may choose to appoint for the purpose. Our object is that an opportunity should be given to us to try to make the task of Government easier, to suggest proposals which may possibly be acceptable, which we hope will be acceptable.

Then my Honourable friend the Home Member said, "But you say you will not recognise the authority of Parliament." In his own frank and sober manner which disarms much opposition, he seemed to say, 'But you don't want to submit to the authority of Parliament'. I fear that he misunderstood the amendment. Constituted as we are, we must recognize the authority of Parliament. Who denies it? The amendment says that when we have threshed out the matter, when we have prepared a scheme, it should be submitted to this Assembly, and after it has been improved by discussions in this Assembly it should be submitted to Parliament. Do we not in saying so bow to the authority of Parliament? Do we not acknowledge the authority of Parliament? If we did not, where would be the necessity of the amendment? My Honourable friend the Home Member knows and every other Member knows that in other cases too that has been the procedure. In the case of the South African constitution, for instance, the whole constitution was prepared by the representatives of the South African people, and then submitted to Parliament. We do not ask for anything more. We know that as we stand, we are subject to the authority of Parliament. There is no desire to ignore that authority. We are fully conscious of the authority of Parliament. And what is more, let me say frankly and in absolute truth, that there is no desire in us at present to get entirely away from the authority of Parliament. We wish to continue to be subject to the authority of Parliament in certain matters. That is the clear meaning of the amendment. The amendment does not ask for full responsible government; it asks for a measure of responsible government subject to limitations, which means that we are willing to continue within the limitations to be subject to the authority of Parliament and of the Secretary of State. How long that time will be will depend upon the action of my British fellow-subjects and ourselves. I hope God will guide us both in such a manner that we may continue to be united for a long time to come to the advantage of both countries; but that must be by an agreement which will be both honourable and profitable to India, as it will be honourable and profitable to England. That is the position. I submit that if the amendment is regarded in that light, it need not frighten anybody, much less should it excite any angry criticism. The amendment is presented as embodying the fundamental principles which it seems to us should find a place in the next Statute of Parliament, which will amend the Government of India Act. We do

not say that they should not be considered before being placed on the Statute-book. Let them first be considered by the Cabinet in England. Let them then be considered by a round table conference or a convention or a Royal Commission or whatever suitable agency the Government may like. My Honourable friend the Home Member thought that we suggest that the big changes we ask for should be introduced without any inquiry by a Royal Commission. We did nothing of the kind.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** Is there any mention in the amendment of a Royal Commission ? Has any speaker ever referred to it before ?

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya :** What then is the meaning of the words " or any other suitable agency " ? Do they or do they not cover a Royal Commission ?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** I doubt if they do.

**Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya :** I regret I do not agree. I submit that that expression does include a Royal Commission also. My Honourable friends on the Government Benches are very anxious that we should co-operate with them and understand them. I beg of them to try and understand us also. If they will do so, I am certain that they will not say that the words " or any other suitable agency " exclude a Royal Commission. Let the matter be investigated and inquired into by a Royal Commission. But let it be a Commission which should include trusted representatives of the people of India of all important shades of public opinion, a Commission which should command the confidence and call forth the gratitude of all sections of the people of this country towards the Government. The amendment only endeavours to take the next step which in the situation created by Lord Birkenhead's speech and His Excellency the Viceroy's speech is called for. We could not do anything else. We do not mean that all the commas, all the semi-colons and all the full stops should remain as they have been put down. After the Honourable Sir Charles Innes expressed his opinions in the manner he did, it was not surprising that Pandit Motilal Nehru should have said what he did say. He might even now repeat it, but we do not mean that all the commas, semi-colons and full-stops must necessarily stay. (Laughter.) Let us come to the stage when the commas, the semi-colons and the full-stops will have to be considered. I request my Honourable friends opposite to look to the substance of the thing, to the substance of what the amendment seeks to indicate, and try to understand us and to help us. I appeal to every friend, official and non-official particularly to every European friend, to try to understand us. Do not regard us as opponents. Do not think that we have come here merely for the pleasure of opposing you. There is no pleasure in doing so. Believe me, and I speak for many others here, believe me, it is an overpowering sense of duty that brings us here. We wish to understand you, and we beg you also to try to understand us. The days have gone by when India could be satisfied with the existing system of Government. You say yourself, the Honourable the Home Member has himself said, that dyarchy cannot be said to have succeeded, and that it cannot be said to have failed. That is the verdict expressed by many officials. If dyarchy cannot be said to have succeeded, it should be given a decent burial. Many officials, many gentlemen who were examined, have said so. Therefore, do not let us waste any more time in trying to keep up that

[Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya.]

which cannot be justified. Let us consider what the next step should be. Towards that end, this amendment makes a carefully considered suggestion, and I hope the suggestion will yet commend itself to the Government. (Loud Applause.)

*Several Honourable Members* : I move that the question be now put.

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

The motion was adopted.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : Sir, I should not have again addressed the House at any length but for the speech which has just been delivered. That speech at the end of the long debate extending over two days gives me an entirely different view of an amendment, which to me has been always somewhat difficult to understand from the first. The gloss that the Honourable the Pandit proposes to put on this amendment gives a meaning entirely different from what I had gathered from the whole debate. A new point has been raised at a quarter past six in the evening and has been developed to ten minutes to seven. Sir, I do not know whether the Honourable Mover of this amendment accepts this gloss or whether the interpretation of the Honourable Pandit, who is always desirous of putting a reasonable interpretation on all things, is accepted by the Honourable Mover. But I must confess that it would not have occurred to me that any one would recommend a statutory Commission, or a Royal Commission, subsequent to a declaration of Parliament on an important matter of policy. One would have thought that would proceed not follow such a declaration. Further I should not have thought that a Royal Commission could have been constituted in consultation with the Legislative Assembly. I should not have thought that in a considered amendment such a commission would have been referred to as a round table conference or other suitable agency. I should have doubted whether the rules of *ejusdem generis* would have applied. I should not have thought a Royal Commission would have been in the nature of a round table conference, nor should I have thought that "Indians, Europeans and Anglo-Indians" would have been summoned on a Royal Commission to frame with due regard to the interests of minorities a detailed scheme. I should have thought that a Royal Commission would have been wanted to settle the principles which are mentioned very definitely and very firmly in the first part of the amendment put down by my Honourable friend. I am still in rather a difficulty in knowing what is intended and, as far as I can see, gentlemen of very different opinions will go into the same lobby and vote for a Resolution which apparently means different things to different people.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Bangachariar** : Reasonable construction.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : Reasonable construction? The construction I put in my first speech, I think, was a reasonable construction. If the construction is otherwise, my Honourable friend Pandit Motilal Nehru and a number of gentlemen will be voting for the amendment under a mis-apprehension. (*Some Honourable Members* : "No.")

Now, Sir, I cannot at this late hour attempt to review the whole of the debate or even the long speech we have just listened to. I must, however, refer to one or two remarks which have fallen from individual

members. Mr. Joshi says he does not approve of nomination in any shape as a representation of the classes whose interests he has so much at heart. If nomination had never been followed in regard to those classes, Mr. Joshi himself would not be a Member of this House. (*An Honourable Member* : "He would always come in.") Not as a representative of the particular classes, because there is no constituency to represent these classes. I think, therefore, that it is a little ungrateful for the Honourable Member to take that line. (*An Honourable Member* : "No.")

**Mr. C. S. Ranga Iyer** : Why don't you give labour votes ?

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman** : If the Honourable Member will allow me to proceed with my speech, the House will be in a position to come to a decision earlier. Now, there was a much more important statement made by Mr. Joshi. He said that the European servants, by which, I understand, he referred to the servants of His Majesty the King, were the servants of European capitalists. Now, that statement was either made rashly or it was made deliberately. If it was made deliberately, it is not, I regret to say, based on fact. There is hardly any Member of this House who would not be prepared to agree that during the administration of India by the King's servants, the exploitation of India has been very largely prevented by the presence of English servants of the Crown. (Hear, hear, and cries of "Oh", and "Question".) You say "Question", but it is true.

The next remark I have to make is with reference to the point taken by the Honourable Pandit in regard to Sir Muhammad Shafi's opinion or change of opinion. Sir, I do not propose to say much on that. I am concerned with his opinion as far as it appears in the report. Sir Muhammad Shafi was my colleague. He is now a private individual and he is in that capacity in a position to defend or justify any action he has taken in the matter if such defence or justification is necessary. I do not propose to refer to that further.

Now, Sir, the debate has run to great length and I note with gratification that the tone of the speeches has been on the whole very moderate. There has been a desire, an earnest desire, expressed from many quarters for co-operation. We have been called upon to co-operate : you have been called upon to co-operation, and that is the note on which I would wish to end the debate. I do not doubt the House will proceed to pass the amendment. Too many people have spoken on the subject for me to entertain any hope that any words of mine will deter them from following that course. But, Sir, I cannot help feeling this House may yet perhaps regret that course. I leave that. At any rate the House has had a very full and a very lengthy debate on this report. Such a debate was promised by the Government and that pledge, I think the House will agree, has been amply redeemed.

Now, I do not wish you to think that we like ploughing the sand any more than you do. It is, I think, under the existing constitution a legitimate ambition for those of my service to attain to the post that I now hold and to which others of my colleagues similarly have attained. It is perhaps the one occasion after a long service when one has hopes of bringing forward long cherished schemes and possibly of righting some of the wrongs that one has experienced in one's long career. It is no

[Sir Alexander Muddiman.]

pleasure to bring forward proposals which we feel are not considered on their merits but are turned down because they emanate from our Benches. Now, as the Honourable Pandit pointed out, co-operation does not mean that you should support every Bill, every Resolution, that is brought forward. Sir, no one has ever suggested that that is co-operation. What

7 P.M.

I do consider co-operation is that the Bills or Resolutions or whatever they may be should be decided on their merits and not set down with a black mark because they emanate from the Benches on which I sit.

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar :** We have been doing so all along.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** Would the Honourable Member place his hand on his heart and say that ?

**Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar :** I do.

**The Honourable Sir Alexander Muddiman :** The gesture comes too often.

Sir, the hour is late and the House has to proceed to a decision on this great matter. I will not detain the House one moment longer from that decision. I can only hope that the decision that it may come to may be in the best interests of India.

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

“ That this Assembly recommends to the Governor General in Council that he do accept the principle underlying the majority report of the Reforms Inquiry Committee and that he do give early consideration to the detailed recommendations therein contained for improvements in the machinery of Government.”

Since which the following amendment has been moved :

“ That for the original Resolution the following be substituted :

‘ This Assembly while confirming and reiterating the demand contained in the Resolution passed by it on the 18th February 1924, recommends to the Governor General in Council that he be pleased to take immediate steps to move His Majesty’s Government to make a declaration in Parliament embodying the following fundamental changes in the present constitutional machinery and administration of India :

- (a) The Revenues of India and all property vested in or arising or accruing from property or rights vested in His Majesty under the Government of India Act, 1858, or the present Act or received by the Secretary of State in Council under any of the said Acts shall hereafter vest in the Governor General in Council for the purposes of the Government of India.
- (b) The Governor General in Council shall be responsible to the Indian Legislature and subject to such responsibility shall have the power to control the expenditure of the Revenues of India and make such grants and appropriations of any part of those Revenues or of any other property as is at present under the control or disposal of the Secretary of State for India in Council, save and except the following which shall for a fixed term of years remain under the control of the Secretary of State for India :
  - (i) Expenditure on the Military Services up to a fixed limit.
  - (ii) Expenditure classed as political and foreign.
  - (iii) The payment of all debts and liabilities hitherto lawfully contracted and incurred by the Secretary of State for India in Council on account of the Government of India.
- (c) The Council of the Secretary of State for India shall be abolished and the position and functions of the Secretary of State for India shall be assimilated to those of the Secretary of State for the self-governing Dominions save as otherwise provided in clause (b).

- (d) The Indian Army shall be nationalised within a reasonably short and definite period of time and Indians shall be admitted for service in all arms of defence and for that purpose, the Governor General and the Commander-in-Chief shall be assisted by a Minister responsible to the Assembly.
- (e) The Central and Provincial Legislatures shall consist entirely of members elected by constituencies formed on as wide a franchise as possible.
- (f) The principle of responsibility to the Legislature shall be introduced in all branches of the administration of the Central Government subject to transitional reservations and residuary powers in the Governor General in respect of the control of Military, Foreign and Political affairs for a fixed term of years :

Provided that during the said fixed term the proposals of the Governor General in Council for the appropriation of any revenue or moneys for military or other expenditure classified as ' Defence ' shall be submitted to the vote of the Legislature ; but that the Governor General in Council shall have power, notwithstanding the vote of the Assembly, to appropriate up to a fixed maximum any sum he may consider necessary for such expenditure and in the event of a war to authorise such expenditure as may be considered necessary exceeding the maximum so fixed.

- (g) The present system of dyarchy in the Provinces shall be abolished and replaced by unitary and autonomous responsible Governments subject to the general control and residuary powers of the Central Government in inter-provincial and all-India matters.
- (h) The Indian Legislature shall after the expiry of the fixed term of years referred to in clauses (b) and (f) have full powers to make such amendments in the constitution of India from time to time as may appear to it necessary or desirable.

This Assembly further recommends to the Governor General in Council that necessary steps be taken :

- (a) to constitute in consultation with the Legislative Assembly a convention, round table conference or other suitable agency adequately representative of all Indian, European and Anglo-Indian interests to frame with due regard to the interests of minorities a detailed scheme based on the above principles, after making such inquiry as may be necessary in this behalf ;
- (b) to place the said scheme for approval before the Legislative Assembly and submit the same to the British Parliament to be embodied in a Statute."

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

The Assembly divided :

AYES—72.

Abdul Haye, Mr.  
 Abhyankar, Mr. M. V.  
 Ahmad Ali Khan, Mr.  
 Aiyangar, Mr. C. Duraiswami.  
 Aiyangar, Mr. K. Rama.  
 Aiyer, Sir P. S. Sivaswamy.  
 Alimuzzaman Chowdhry, Khan Bahadur.  
 Aney, Mr. M. S.  
 Badi-uz-Zaman, Maulvi.  
 Belvi, Mr. D. V.  
 Chaman Lall, Mr.  
 Chanda, Mr. Kamini Kumar.  
 Chetty, Mr. R. K. Shanmukham.  
 Das, Mr. B.  
 Das, Pandit Nilakantha.  
 Datta, Dr. S. K.  
 Duni Chand, Lala.  
 Dutt, Mr. Amar Nath.  
 Ghazanfar Ali Khan, Raja.  
 Ghose, Mr. S. C.

Ghulam Abbas, Sayyad.  
 Ghulam Bari, Khan Bahadur.  
 Goswami, Mr. T. C.  
 Gour, Sir Hari Singh.  
 Govind Das, Seth.  
 Gulab Singh, Sardar.  
 Hans Raj, Lala.  
 Hari Prasad Lal, Lal.  
 Ismail Khan, Mr.  
 Iyengar, Mr. A. Rangaswami.  
 Jajodia, Baboo Runglal.  
 Jinnah, Mr. M. A.  
 Joshi, Mr. N. M.  
 Kartar Singh, Sardar.  
 Kasturbhai Lalbhai, Mr.  
 Kazim Ali, Shaikh-e-Chatgam Maulvi  
 Muhammad.  
 Kelkar, Mr. N. C.  
 Lohokare, Dr. K. G.  
 Majid Baksh, Syed.

## AYES 72—contd.

Malaviya, Pandit Krishna Kant.  
 Malaviya, Pandit Madan Mohan.  
 Mehta, Mr. Jamnadas M.  
 Miera, Pandit Shambhu Dayal.  
 Misra, Pandit Harkaran Nath.  
 Murtuza Sahib Bahadur, Maulvi Sayad.  
 Mutalik, Sardar V. N.  
 Narain Dass, Mr.  
 Nehru, Dr. Kishenlal.  
 Nehru, Pandit Motilal.  
 Nehru, Pandit Shanilal.  
 Neogy, Mr. K. C.  
 Phookun, Mr. Tarun Ram.  
 Purshotamdas Thakurdas, Sir.  
 Rajan Buksh Shah, Khan Bahadur  
 Makhdum Syed.  
 Rajnachandra Rao, Diwan Bahadur M.

Rangachariar, Diwan Bahadur T.  
 Ranga Iyer, Mr. C. S.  
 Ray, Mr. Kumar Sankar.  
 Reddi, Mr. K. Venkataramana.  
 Sadiq Hasan, Mr. S.  
 Samiullah Khan, Mr. M.  
 Sarfaraz Hussain Khan, Khan Bahadur.  
 Shafee, Maulvi Mohammad.  
 Singh, Mr. Gaya Prasad.  
 Sinha, Mr. Ambika Prasad.  
 Sinha, Mr. Devaki Prasad.  
 Sinha, Kumar Gunganand.  
 Syamacharan, Mr.  
 Venkatapatiraju, Mr. B.  
 Vishindas, Mr. Harehandrai.  
 Yakub, Maulvi Muhammad.  
 Yusuf Imam, Mr. M.

## NOES—45.

Abdul Mumin, Khan Bahadur Muhammad.  
 Abdul Quaiyum, Nawab Sir Sahibzada.  
 Ajab Khan, Captain.  
 Akram Hussain, Prince A. M. M.  
 Ashworth, Mr. E. H.  
 Ayyar, Mr. C. V. Krishnaswami.  
 Bajpai, Mr. R. S.  
 Bhore, Mr. J. W.  
 Blackett, The Honourable Sir Basil.  
 Burdon, Mr. E.  
 Carey, Sir Willoughby.  
 Chalmers, Mr. T. A.  
 Chartres, Mr. C. B.  
 Clow, Mr. A. G.  
 Cocks, Mr. H. G.  
 Cosgrave, Mr. W. A.  
 Crawford, Colonel J. D.  
 Fleming, Mr. E. G.  
 Gordon, Mr. E.  
 Gordon, Mr. R. G.  
 Graham, Mr. L.  
 Gurner, Mr. C. W.  
 Harper, Mr. K. G.

Hira Singh Brar, Sardar Bahadur Captain.  
 Innes, The Honourable Sir Charles.  
 Langley, Mr. A.  
 Lindsay, Sir Darcy.  
 Lloyd, Mr. A. H.  
 Macphail, Rev. Dr. E. M.  
 Maguire, Mr. L. T.  
 Makan, Mr. M. E.  
 Mitra, The Honourable Sir Bhupendra  
 Nath.  
 Muddiman, The Honourable Sir Alexander.  
 Naidu, Mr. M. C.  
 Panduranga Rao, Mr. V.  
 Raj Narain, Rai Bahadur.  
 Roy, Mr. G. P.  
 Sira, Mr. G. G.  
 Singh, Rai Bahadur S. N.  
 Singh, Raja Raghunandan Prasad.  
 Stanyon, Colonel Sir Henry.  
 Sykes, Mr. E. F.  
 Tonkinson, Mr. H.  
 Vijayaraghavacharyar, Diwan Bahadur T.  
 Webb, Mr. M.

The motion was adopted.

The substituted Resolution was adopted.

The Assembly then adjourned till eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 9th September, 1925.